United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 2012 *No. 65*

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 9, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GREGG HARPER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 17, 2012, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

STUDENT LOAN DEBT

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, right now, families across this country are sitting around their kitchen tables trying to figure out how they can send their kids to college. They're talking about how to finance a college education when the cost of that is rising faster than the cost of health care.

Parents are making some very difficult decisions. Should we refinance our homes and dwindle our retirement? How much money can we borrow? How much can we ask our kids to borrow in order to put this financial package together? And for the first time, many of these parents are considering the unthinkable: maybe they can't afford to send their kids to college.

Meanwhile, in 52 days, if Congress does not act, a very bad situation will get worse. On July 1, the interest rates on the Stafford student loans will double from 3.4 to 6.8 percent. Vermont students, American students and parents need action from Congress and need it now.

Over the past few weeks, I've been asking Vermonters to share their real-world stories, and I'd like to tell a few.

Katie from West Glover graduated with $36,000 in student loan debt. And it's a tough economy. She's had a hard time finding a job, so she took an internship so she can keep advancing her career. She works 5 to 6 days a week making 25 bucks a day. She's essentially providing well-educated, cheap labor, but she doesn't have a choice. She doesn't regret her decision to go to school, but she's getting extremely apprehensive about her ability to get this financial albatross off her back.

Sue from Newport has $125,000 in debt. She also has some medical problems which limit the kind of work that she can do, but she does work and has a full-time job. But student loan payments are $600 a month, making it very difficult for her to pay her other bills, and she has no savings and no retirement.

Peter, a parent from Calais, Vermont, he always believed that he could send his son to college. Now he's not sure that he can. His son has done his part, graduating from high school with honors, and he's been accepted to a number of very good institutions. But with tuition costs at those schools ranging from $30,000 to $56,000 a year, Peter from Calais is just not sure that their family is going to be able to make this work out.

Julie from Huntington, Vermont. She grew up in a single-parent home, living below the poverty line, but she was told that if she worked hard in school, studied, she could achieve a great future. She did her part. She also was taught, by the way, that she should avoid debt at all costs. She is pursuing college but working three jobs while she's going to school full-time. And she's still piling up debt. She was taught to believe that if she worked hard and applied herself she could achieve great things. Now working three jobs, piling up debt, ''Is there a way out?'' is the question she's asking.

Mr. Speaker, this is more than about extending the low interest on the Stafford loans. It's really about whether we're going to have a pathway for people trying to climb into the middle class to get there and for people in the middle class to stay there. How much more burden can we impose on folks who want a future for their families, for their kids? It is absolutely unconscionable, in this world that we're in, to double student interest rates from 3.4 to 6.8 percent.

It is time for Congress to stand up for the middle class, for those folks from Vermont and around the country who are trying to do the best for themselves and for their country.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, climate deniers have buried their heads so deep in the sand they can't hear the Secretary of Defense warning us about the risk of climate change.

Last week, Secretary Panetta gave a speech about the impact of climate change on national security. He said,

''The area of climate change has a dramatic impact on national security. Rising sea levels, severe droughts, the melting of the polar caps, and devastating natural disasters all raise demand for humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.'' And he might have added, and threaten military bases, especially naval bases, all around the world.

Americans are experiencing that severe weather already, including record-breaking droughts in the South and Southwest and unprecedented tornadic activity in the South and the Midwest.

Severe weather manifestations of climate change have a direct impact on our armed services and national security. Secretary Panetta focused on the geopolitical risks of increased flooding, drought, famine, and hurricanes. These troubling events create new demands for humanitarian intervention but can also destabilize political regimes and enable the rise of extreme elements.

Congress may be fiddling while Texas and wildfire regions of the mountain west burn, but the armed services are responding aggressively to the threat of climate change.

The Navy is leading the effort to boost production of biofuels and to protect the military and taxpayers against rising oil prices. The Department of Defense consumes some 350,000 barrels of oil every day. Each $10 increase in a barrel of oil costs our Department of Defense and the taxpayers $1.3 billion every year. By creating a supply of biofuels, the Navy's protecting taxpayer interests from volatile oil prices, while reducing greenhouse gas pollution associated with fossil fuels. The Navy also is reducing its own dependence on Middle Eastern oil, since it makes no sense for the DOD to be providing business to governments that support terrorism.

The Army and the Air Force have also made groundbreaking investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency, reducing global warming pollution while strengthening our national security posture. At Fort Detrick, for example, and other installations, the Army is deploying energy efficient retrofits and renewable energy generation to achieve net zero energy consumption, meaning that the bases produce as much energy as they consume. These efforts reduce global warming pollution and protect critical facilities from a cyberattack on the grid.

The Army's implemented numerous energy savings performance contracts at other bases, including in my district at Fort Belvoir, to reduce energy consumption and associated greenhouse gas pollution. By reducing the $24.5 billion every year that Federal agencies spend on electricity consumption, these efforts protect taxpayers.

In today's fiscal climate, the Secretary of Defense is aware that the Federal Government needs to make better use of limited resources. He recognizes that investing in clean energy will reduce the Department of Defense's oil dependence and lower its fuel costs to free up resources for other priorities and to reduce the burden on taxpayers.

I'm surprised by the resistance of a few Members who wrap themselves in the mantle of fiscal responsibility, even while opposing the Defense Department's efforts to save money on energy costs.

□ 1010

The DOD's success in this area is actually a model for other agencies to follow.

There used to be a bipartisan consensus here, and we should address the threats posed by climate change. John Warner, who served as the Secretary of the Navy in a Republican administration before serving as the Republican Senator from my home State of Virginia for 30 years, introduced the first bill to address global warming which came to the Senate floor. Since his retirement in 2008, he has been a leading advocate for reductions in global warming pollution in order to improve our national security. Sadly, the House Republican leadership would take America in the opposite direction by blocking the Clean Air Act enforcement of carbon pollution limits and by reversing energy efficiency standards for lights and appliances.

As the impacts of climate change become more apparent with each passing season, we should heed Secretary Panetta's warning and take action to control the pollution, which endangers our warfighters abroad and threatens communities here at home.

[The Cutting Edge News, May 4, 2012]

PANETTA WARNS CLIMATE CHANGE HAVING 'DRAMATIC IMPACT' ON NATIONAL SECURITY

(By Carlo Munoz)

Climate change has had a direct effect on national security, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta said this week.

Panetta told an audience at the Environmental Defense Fund that climate change has raised the need for humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, hitting national security in the process.

''The area of climate change has a dramatic impact on national security,'' Panetta said. ''Rising sea levels, severe droughts, the melting of the polar caps, the more frequent and devastating natural disasters all raise demand for humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.''

Panetta spoke to the Environmental Defense Fund on Tuesday at an event honoring the Defense Department for advancing clean-energy initiatives.

In recent years, the Defense Department and the services have spearheaded a number of alternative-energy initiatives and seemingly embraced environmentally friendly practices on the battlefield.

President Obama effectively put the Pentagon at the forefront of an ambitious alternative energy strategy during the State of the Union speech in January. The Navy and Air Force have already spent billions to integrate biofuels into their fleets of fighter jets and warships.

Marine Corps combat units in Afghanistan are using mobile solar panels to recharge batteries for their night vision and communications in the field. Solar power is also helping to run a number of Marine Corps combat outposts in the country.

But the Pentagon's adoption of environmentally sensitive practices was driven more by the department's dire fiscal situation than politics, Panetta said on Tuesday. DOD spent roughly $15 billion to fuel its fighters, tanks and ships in 2012, the Defense chief said. The Pentagon spends $50 million on fuel each month to keep combat operations in Afghanistan going, Panetta added. As oil prices continue to skyrocket, the department ''now [faces] a shortfall exceeding $3 billion of higher-than-expected fuel costs this year,'' according to Panetta.

In order to dig its way out of that financial hole, DOD has no choice but to look to alternative fuel technologies. Pentagon officials plan to invest more than $1 billion into developing those technologies in fiscal 2013, he said. However, Republicans on Capitol Hill have taken issue with that decision, arguing the department will be sacrificing needed much-needed combat systems in favor of alternative energy work. In March, Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) claimed the Navy's ongoing biofuels work was devolving into another ''Solyndra situation.''

During a March 13 hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee, McCain compared the now-bankrupt solar-energy company, into which the White House sank $535 million in loan guarantees, to Navy-led efforts in alternative energy. Rep. Randy Forbes (R-Va.), a member of the House Armed Services subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, took Navy Secretary Ray Mabus to task in February over the service's plans. ''Shouldn't we refocus our priorities and make those things our priorities instead of advancing a biofuels market?'' Forbes asked at the time. Before Mabus could respond, the Virginia Republican took a clear shot at the secretary: ''You're not the secretary of the Energy. You're the secretary of the Navy.''

OFFERING CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILY OF JUNIOR SEAU, NFL GREAT AND SON OF AMERICAN SAMOA

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with deep sympathy in order to offer my condolences to the family and friends of a beloved son, father, brother, uncle, leader, an NFL great, and a son of American Samoa, Junior Seau, whose life ended tragically on the morning of May 2, 2012, in Oceanside, California.

It is a very sad time for, not only the national sports world, but also for our Polynesian community. We have lost a Samoan brother who was an icon in football and a pioneer for many of our Polynesian sons who are in the National Football League. A beautiful life has come to a tragic end, yet we remember Junior as a young man full of life, a charismatic leader able to light up any room, a devoted son and father and community leader. We remember the strength of this unique individual, a true Samoan warrior.

Junior was born Tiaina Baul Seau, Jr., on January 19, 1969, in San Diego, California, to American Samoan parents Mr. Tiaina Seau, Sr., of the village of Aunu'u, and Mrs. Luisa Mauga Seau of the village of Aoa. After Junior was

born, the family returned to American Samoa where Junior grew up for several years before returning to the San Diego area.

Junior attended Oceanside High School where he lettered in football, basketball, as well as in track and field for the Oceanside Pirates. In football, he was a starter at linebacker and tight end, and received numerous awards for his achievements as a student athlete. In 1987, the year he graduated, Parade Magazine selected Seau to its high school all-American team. He was also named California Interscholastic Federation San Diego Section Defensive Player of the Year, All-North County, Avocado League Offensive Player of the Year, as well as being named to California's all-academic team, with a 3.6 grade point average. After graduating high school, Seau played for the University of Southern California Trojans from 1987 to 1990, and in 2009, would be inducted into the USC Hall of Fame.

In the 1990 NFL draft, Junior was drafted into the First Round and 5th Overall Pick by the San Diego Chargers. Seau immediately became the heart and soul of the Chargers' defense, earning the nickname ''Tasmanian Devil'' for his passion and explosive athletic skill on the field. In the locker room and on the field, Seau had an innate ability to motivate his teammates. He was named the NFL's Defensive Player of the Year in 1998 and 1999, and was voted the Chargers' Most Inspirational Player in 1997 and 2002. Junior played in 12 consecutive Pro Bowls from 1991 to 2002, the most of any player in the history of the Chargers, and he tied for the third longest streak ever in the NFL. He was also selected All-Pro six times in his career, and led the Chargers to their first ever Super Bowl appearance in 1995.

After 13 years in San Diego, Junior played 3 years for the Miami Dolphins where he received the Miami Dolphins' Don Shula Leadership Award for 2 consecutive years. After only 1 day of retirement in 2006, he answered the call by the New England Patriots, and became defensive co-captain during the Patriots' 18 0 season, which took the team to the Super Bowl in 2008. Junior finally retired in 2010, having played 20 seasons in the NFL and finishing with a career of 1,849 tackles, 56.5 sacks, 18 interceptions, three forced fumbles, and 21 pass deflections.

Junior Seau is widely acknowledged as one of the best linebackers in NFL history, but his passion and success in football was paralleled in his community involvement and in his work off the field.

In 1992, Junior established the Junior Seau Foundation, giving San Diego area youth ongoing support for programs that inspired them to face life's challenges with enthusiasm, hope and dignity. Since its inception, the foundation has distributed nearly $4 million to organizations providing services to children and young adults, including over $800,000 in scholarships through the Scholars of Excellence program and over $330,000 in Junior's ''Shop with a Jock'' program, which provides for underprivileged youth to shop alongside a professional college athlete for Christmas gifts for their families. In April 2007, The Wall Street Journal ranked the Junior Seau Foundation, as the 13th largest Professional Athlete Foundation based on assets.

As much as he was an outstanding football player, Junior will also be remembered as a humanitarian, as a supporter for those who needed help the most, as a dear friend, and as a motivational figure. He was a charismatic leader who could not walk into a room without having an effect on those around him. He was loved by everyone who knew him, and his magnetism both on and off the field impacted fans nationwide and any individual he encountered.

When one speaks of Samoans in the NFL, Mr. Speaker, Junior Seau is one of the first names that comes to mind. Junior was an ambassador for Asian and Pacific Americans, and through his success, he was able to broaden the public's understanding and appreciation of our Polynesian people.

Reaching the NFL is a dream of many young men, but Junior Seau gave young Samoan men an image of success in the league—something that they could aspire to.

In closing today, I would like to offer words of comfort to the Seau family, especially Mr. Tiaina Seau Sr. and Mrs. Luisa Seau, Junior's parents, as well as Junior's children, his siblings, and his extended family, or as we say in Samoan his aiga.

In the Book of Romans, Chapter 12, Verse 15 we are called to "rejoice with those who rejoice, and weep with those who weep." In all of Junior's amazing accomplishments throughout his life, we have rejoiced with the Seau family, sharing your joy. And now in this time of great sorrow, we stand with you, though with heavy hearts, sharing in your grief.

Ia manuia lau faigamalaga. (Have a blessed journey home), Junior.

THE KEEPING ALL STUDENTS SAFE ACT

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last year, I reintroduced the Keeping All Students Safe Act, to protect children from abusive seclusion and restraint practices in school.

Two years ago, this legislation passed the House with bipartisan support. Unfortunately, it never became law, and the incidents of students who are being abused or inappropriately restrained while in school continue to occur. We cannot sit idly by. Congress must step up to the plate and protect our Nation's children. In recent months, we've been hearing more disturbing stories of students who are being dangerously restrained by teachers and staff while in school. In several of these cases, students have suffered serious injuries or have even died as a result of their injuries.

In December, in Kentucky, 9-year-old Christopher Baker, who has autism, was stuffed into a duffel bag at school as punishment. In Connecticut, children have been afraid to go to school because they've heard other students screaming in small, windowless rooms. The students in these elementary schools refer to these rooms as ''scream rooms.''

In Texas, 10-year-old Lukas Hines, who suffers from seizures, dyslexia, and ADHD, was put in a choke hold while riding home on a Texas school bus. For 4 minutes, the school supervisor refused to release him into the care of his mother, and instead kept him in the dangerous choke hold.

Then, on April 18, at the Leake and Watts School in New York, 16-year-old Corey Foster was restrained by the school staff, who were trying to remove him from a basketball court. Witnesses reported that several staff members piled on top of him. Corey told the staff he could not breathe. Tragically, while he was being restrained, he went into cardiac arrest and died.

Corey's story is far too similar to a story I learned of several years ago. That was the story of Cedric, a 14-year-old in Texas. Cedric was restrained, facedown, with his teacher sitting on top of him. He yelled out that he couldn't breathe. Minutes later, Cedric died on the floor of his classroom.

□ 1020

Tragedies like Cory's and Cedric's need to stop. In March, the Department of Education released nationwide data showing that tens of thousands of children are subject to restraint and seclusion in school each year.

This map shows that 31 States have had reports of abusive incidents since the last time that we tried to enact the Keeping All Students Safe Act. No corner of the country is immune from abuse. It is widespread, and it has gone on far too long. This map shows that we need a nationally driven reform, because where States have enacted, students are still subject to the worst practices in these educational settings.

According to the report released last month, only 30 States have any meaningful protection for the use of seclusion and restraint in school. Only 18 States prohibit restraint that restricts breathing. Only 16 States limit the use of restraining to emergencies involving immediate risk or harm. Only 16 States ban the use of mechanical restraints. And only 24 States have any requirement that their parents be notified that their child was restrained or secluded in school. In fact, children can go to school day after day, be restrained, be secluded, be locked in dark rooms, kept in those rooms where they urinate on themselves, and their parents are never notified.

When parents are excluded from the information about their students,

where is that a matter of good public policy? The child and their safety should not depend upon what State they live in. The Federal Government, this Congress, needs to set minimum standards and model standards.

We have the Federal laws in place to prevent seclusion and restraint abuses that happen in hospitals and other health facilities, but children do not have any Federal protection against these potentially dangerous and torturous practices when they're in school.

Schools are supposed to be a safe place, a place for children to learn, a place for children to socialize, and parents should never have to worry about the safety of their children when they're at school. No child should be forced to suffer abuse, neglect, injury, or even death while they're trying to learn.

The Keeping All Students Safe Act would set minimum safety standards for the use of restraint and seclusion in schools and provide training and support for school personnel to reduce the use of seclusion and restraint. It makes it illegal to strap children to chairs, put children in duffle bags, or restrict their breathing. Seclusion restraint practices should only be used in emergency situations by trained staff and should end as soon as the emergency has passed. This legislation makes it clear that there's no room for torture and abuse in America's schools.

News reports showing children being tied up with duct tape, sat on by staff, locked in rooms for hours at a time is unacceptable. Our children deserve better. This legislation won't bring back Corey or Cedric, but it can prevent future abuses from occurring.

I've called upon the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce to mark up this important legislation so we can move forward on passing this critical legislation into law. Our children deserve nothing less.

MOTHER'S DAY

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

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, this week we're very busy in the House, and last night we didn't get out until well beyond midnight. But there's also something that's happening this week that's very important not only to this body, but the whole Nation, and that's Mother's Day.

The father of our Nation, George Washington, said of his mother:

> All I am I owe to my mother. I attribute all my success in life to the moral, intellectual, and physical education I received from her.

The role a mother plays in her child's life is unlike anything else. She is the life-giver, the caregiver, and the source of strength and guidance throughout her children's life. She wipes away the tears, she cleans the scrapes, and heals the hurts we all experience. And not just through our childhood, but beyond. We owe everything to our moms, and they deserve the recognition and respect they've rightly earned.

My mother raised my brothers and sisters and me with a level of tenderness shown by no other. She taught us the virtues of hard work, humility, and selflessness by living each of those virtues herself. My mom is no longer with me, but this weekend I will celebrate her and remember and honor the legacy she and every mother leaves behind.

Our Nation must always value the work that mothers do and their incalculable contribution to our society. If we ever fail to recognize the work both inside and outside the home, then we begin to lose sight and the strength of our Nation. Without our moms, we fail to realize the promise within each of us, for they are our greatest supporters. They are central to our lives and vital to our success.

Happy Mother's Day to every mother in America. We thank you, and we honor you for your invaluable service, endless love, and sacrifice.

CONGRATULATIONS TO LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Oregon's Lincoln High School on winning the 2012 National Finals of the We the People competition. These students worked diligently all year to achieve this honor, demonstrating outstanding teamwork and an impressive understanding of our country's Constitution.

We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution is a civic education curriculum in which students learn about our country and government while preparing for a mock congressional hearing. During the hearing, students are challenged to demonstrate their critical thinking skills, knowledge of current events, ability to work as a team, and understanding of the Constitution and its origins. After winning Oregon State's competition, the Lincoln High team traveled to Washington, D.C., to compete in the national finals. After 3 days of competition against classes representing 47 States, Washington, D.C., and the Northern Mariana Islands, Lincoln High School was declared the winner.

To the students of Lincoln High School—our future leaders—your hard work and dedication has not only brought you this award, it's made you outstanding citizens and models for your peers. Congratulations to the entire winning class: Avery Ballato, Catherine Barton, Marty Berger, Hallie Blashfield, Ryan Bloom, Danny Brillhart, John Carey, Julian Dann, Julia Eckelmann, Michael Field, Natina Gilbert, Nikhil Goyal, Kendra Hong, Robin Jayaswal, Katie Kelly, Sierra Killian, John Kim, Emma Lane, Duncan MacEachern, William Mao, Olnita Martini, Evan Neuhausen, Sara Newman, Vicki Niu, Sammy Purnell, Justin Richter, Beckett Rueda, Emma Simmons, Sage Smiley, Nita Sridharan, Eri Stern, Mara Strauss, Molly Walls, Carolyn Wheatley, Ajeya Woods, and Cole Zollinger.

Thank you to the Classroom Law Project for organizing the program in Oregon and for all you do to teach students about democracy.

And last, but certainly not least, I congratulate Tim Swinehart, the students' teacher, whose leadership was instrumental to Lincoln High School's success, as well as their coaches: Steve Griffith, Jason Trombley, Jeff Edmundson, Christy Splitt, Jennifer Hill, Ben O'Glasser, Jonathan Pulvers, and Alison Brody.

Great work, Lincoln High School. Congratulations.

IN MEMORY OF RICK EAGAN

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and in memory of a very dear friend of mine and a very dear friend of Brown County, County Commissioner Rick Eagan.

Rick's passion for community service spanned his entire life. He was a member of the Ripley Fire Department for almost 30 years. He served 14 years in local law enforcement. He was also a former council member and vice mayor of Ripley, Ohio.

But Rick didn't stop there. He wanted to do more. He wanted to be county commissioner because he felt he could lead the county forward. So he ran for commissioner and lost. He ran again and lost. They say the third time is the charm, and Rick decided to test that water. In 2010, he threw his hat in the ring. Unfortunately, very early on, he was involved in a very tragic automobile accident, one that nearly took his life. It took his leg; it took his ability to breathe, and he had a tracheotomy until a few weeks ago. He was in the hospital for nearly a year. He came out that August, campaigned, and miraculously won the election. His dream came true, and he began to serve his community in another way.

He loved his community; he loved his country, and he loved his family. He fought every day to make the world a better place. A few weeks ago, the doctors believed they could change his course and take the trach out and allow him to breathe normally again. And they did. But complications ensued, and we lost Rick this week.

□ 1030

I am so sad for our community to have lost such a dynamic and wonderful individual. Public servants like Rick are hard to come by. But I'm even saddened more by the fact that his wonderful wife, Margaret, and his children, Douglas and Tiffany, will no

longer be able to live with that remarkable man, no longer be able to love him and hug him.

So I ask this body to remember those like Rick Eagan who put their lives before themselves, work hard to make our country a better place to live, work, and raise a family. And I ask that the Lord allow Commissioner Rick Eagan to be in His hands, and may my dear friend and my community rest in peace.

MULTIPLE SALES REPORTING

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week the ATF announced the results of the first 8 months of its Multiple Sales Reporting program, or MSR, for semiautomatic rifles. The numbers prove the MSR is already an invaluable tool in fighting gun trafficking along the southwest border. There were more than 3,000 reports accounting for the purchase of 7,300 rifles between Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. These reports resulted in more than 120 criminal investigations; and, subsequently, 25 cases involving 100 defendants have been recommended for prosecution. The ATF also reported a decline in large volume rifle purchases, indicating that traffickers are altering their criminal activity due to the new reporting requirement.

The MSR program was created to counteract the dangerous trafficking of guns along our border with Mexico. These guns fuel the cartels' war in Mexico, destabilizing our southern neighbor and third-largest trading partner. According to ATF data, 70 percent of the firearms recovered and traced from drug cartel crimes in Mexico originated in the United States.

So in light of the positive impact the MSR has had, what is the House voting to do just this week? That's right, repeal the measure. A policy rider in the Commerce, Justice, and Science 2013 appropriations bill would cut off funding for reporting the sale of multiple semiautomatic rifles. Yes, this House will vote to block funding that is successfully removing semiautomatic rifles from the underground gun trade. These are the guns that endanger Americans along the border and fuel an all-out war in a neighboring country. Ending the MSR requirement is not about protecting anyone's rights.

Reporting the sale of multiple semiautomatic rifles does not infringe on Second Amendment rights. In fact, a similar Multiple Sales Reporting requirement has been in place for handguns for over 20 years. The necessary paperwork takes gun dealers 12 minutes to complete, but can give law enforcement crucial intelligence on straw purchased rifles.

A George Bush-appointed Federal judge upheld the MSR requirement, finding that it did not disturb the balance between regulation and a gun owner's right to privacy. So the gun lobby has now turned to cutting its funding because why allow programs successfully fighting gun trafficking to continue undisturbed? This has become an all-too-familiar event for the ATF, which has operated under temporary leadership since 2006 due to blocked confirmation in the Senate. But it's beyond just that administration.

According to The Washington Post, in 2010, the ATF had the same number of agents it had in 1970 while the FBI has grown by 50 percent and the DEA by 233 percent. Gun ownership records are kept on paper because the NRA has successfully lobbied against funding computerized records.

With recordkeeping from the fifties and funding from the seventies, it's no wonder law enforcement struggles in 2012. So maybe it's not surprising the MSR program would encounter such heated opposition. An effective investigative tool for law enforcement with only a negligible effect on gun dealers, that would be evidence of regulatory solutions that can work for everyone—the dealers, the buyers, and, most importantly, the public. And that's exactly what the gun lobby doesn't want.

If commonsense solutions like Multiple Sales Reporting can stand, what's next? Requiring background checks for sales at gun shows, which 69 percent of NRA members support? Denying people on the terrorist watch list the right to buy a gun?

To the gun lobby, there's nothing scarier than common sense winning out. So this week, let's scare them. Let's win one for common sense. Let's keep reporting the sale of multiple semiautomatic rifles like we do with handguns. Let's allow the ATF to continue making progress against dangerous gun trafficking on our southwest border. Let's make a choice that's best for law enforcement, our security, and for common sense.

GOP AGENDA: SHREDDING THE SAFETY NET WHILE PROTECTING DEFENSE

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow this body will vote on a Republican budget bill that is nothing short of reprehensible. Once again, my friends on the other side of the aisle are insisting that the poor and working-class families continue to suffer and struggle because heaven forbid we should ask the Department of Defense to do its share to meet our fiscal challenges.

You can't walk into this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, without hearing a self-serving and self-righteous lecture from a Member of the majority about fiscal responsibility. But when they say, Let's cut spending, what they really mean is, Let's shred the safety net.

So their bill puts a giant bull's-eye on the programs that struggling families need to keep their heads above water, especially in this tough economy. Under their bill, fewer women will get breast cancer screenings, fewer poor children will get meals at school or access to health care, and 1.7 million fewer seniors will get Meals on Wheels and other home-based services. They are willing to cut Medicare child abuse prevention and consumer financial protection, and they want to push 1.8 million people off the food stamp program—a program, by the way, that my family needed to survive when I was a single working mom more than 40 years ago. I don't know what we would have done without food stamps.

But guess which part of the Federal Government—which bloated, well-fed bureaucracy—continues to get lavish support from the majority? That's right—the Pentagon, the military industrial complex. Even though the sequester is supposed to apply across the board, the majority wants to exempt defense and make domestic programs absorb all the cuts. That's the way they do business. They pinch pennies on the very real human needs of the American people. They nickel and dime hardworking families who deserve a fair shot and need a hand up.

For 10½ years, Mr. Speaker, we've been at war. And between Iraq and Afghanistan, the American people are out $1.3 trillion—that's trillion, with a T, Mr. Speaker—$1.3 trillion wasted on a policy that is killing our people, hurting our national security, and undermining our standing in the world.

For pennies on the dollar, we could replace permanent warfare with a SMART Security platform that will keep our country safe by focusing on development, diplomacy, and investment in humanitarian needs in the developing world. And we'd have plenty left over—plenty—to shore up the safety net, fund antipoverty programs, and restore the American Dream.

If we're serious about reducing the deficit, then progressives are willing to talk, but there has to be a shared sacrifice. There has to be a balanced approach. We won't take it out on our most vulnerable people, not when we're waging a failed war that is our biggest ticket item, not when we continue to throw billions of dollars at Cold War aircraft and weapons systems that are serving absolutely no purpose.

□ 1040

And not when we continue to maintain a nuclear arsenal that's enough to destroy civilization several times over. Targeting social services while giving defense and war spending a free pass is not fiscal responsibility. It's ideological warfare.

Let's get our priorities straight. It's time to cut defense spending, Mr. Speaker. It's time to bring our troops home. And it's time to reinvest in the American people. And the time is now.

LIFTING OF MORATORIUM ON POSTAL CLOSURES

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

Ms. SEWELL. I rise today in support of America's postal workers, small businesses, senior citizens, and rural communities across this Nation. I stand before this Chamber gravely concerned about the future of the United States Postal Service and the impact of its fiscal crisis on communities across America.

The Postal Service is an iconic American institution woven into the fabric of our everyday lives. For more than 200 years, the men and women of the United States Postal Service have fulfilled their mission to deliver universal, trusted, timely, and effective service to the American people. Americans depend on the postal service, rain or shine, six days a week, from Montana to Alabama, from New York to California, from Florida to Alaska. Whether it's overnight, flat rate, first class, the United States Postal Service delivers.

Today, the Postal Service is teetering on the brink of insolvency and its future remains uncertain. Significant declines in first-class mail volume, evolving consumer trends, and increasing expenditures and operating costs mean that the Postal Service must reduce its footprint, reorganize, and take drastic measures to remain viable and competitive in the 21st century.

On May 15, the moratorium on postal closure will be lifted and thousands of post offices and mail processing facilities across this country will be targeted for closure. If Congress does not act, the lifting of this moratorium could mark the beginning of a slow and painful process of downsizing, layoffs, and reorganization for the U.S. Postal Service. We must take swift and decisive action to create a more efficient business model for the United States Postal Service. I believe that an investment in the future of the Postal Service is an investment in our economy, in small businesses, and in the American people. It requires our prompt attention and deserves our immediate action.

So much is at stake in this debate over postal reform. We know that reform is necessary, given the current market reality. But we cannot reform the postal service on the backs of the rural and underserved communities throughout this country. For so many of these communities, the post office is the meeting place—the place where you send your packages and receive your medicine.

The lifting of the moratorium on May 15 is an issue of utmost concern to the constituents that I represent in Alabama. In towns like Oak Hill, Magnolia, and Sawyerville, Alabama, the local post office is much more than a place for sending and receiving mail. Post offices are vital lifelines for these rural, isolated communities. These lifelines must be preserved and protected. I am committed to ensuring that we as Americans have access to affordable, reliable, and efficient postal service.

Consider the ripple effect and the economic impact of the closure of a post office and how that may affect an entire community. Imagine small town America, where the local post office lies at the heart of the community and is an integral part of its history and identity. This is the case in many of the communities across my district. The fact is, the closure of postal offices will devastate small towns like Gainesville, Coy, and Myrtlewood, Alabama, and so many across this Nation.

Yes, we must all buckle up. We must all decide to show fiscal responsibility. And in these market conditions, we know that reductions are necessary. But surely we can do something to make sure that these reductions are not on the backs of the rural, underserved, and underprivileged communities. Many of the postal services that are being offered are irreplaceable in these communities. For seniors who can't leave their homes, mail carriers deliver lifesaving medication. And for small businesses, postal services like bulk and flat-rate mail enable them to grow and create jobs.

The United States Postal Service provides Americans with universal and invaluable service, and I urge my colleagues to come together and pass a bipartisan comprehensive plan for the future of the United States Postal Service that will not disproportionately affect underserved communities.

ATF LONG GUN PROVISION IN CJS BILL

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong objection to an unwise and dangerous policy provision that is included in the Commerce-Justice-Science Appropriations bill on the floor today. It would undermine the ability of Federal law enforcement to investigate and curb gun trafficking along the Southwest border.

In August of last year, the ATF began a program to require licensed gun dealers in the four most dangerous border States to report when an individual buys multiple assault rifles within 5 business days—just as all dealers have reported multiple handgun sales for over 20 years. The current rule is narrowly tailored to generate useful intelligence on illegal gun trafficking by Mexican drug cartels. According to ATF data, 70 percent of firearms recovered and traced in drug cartel crimes in Mexico originated from the United States. We know that semiautomatic assault rifles sold by U.S. dealers near the border fuel Mexican cartel violence—violence that has killed more than 47,000 people in Mexico, including thousands of police and military personnel.

This rule is working. In just the past 9 months, ATF opened more than 120 criminal investigations based on multiple assault rifle sales reports. And this action is constitutional. The rule is indisputably constitutional. The authority to operate such a program has been upheld by Federal courts. So there's no question about the legal authority. But this bill that we will vote on today, at the behest of the NRA and other gun groups, would block funding for this vital law enforcement program.

Unfortunately, this is only the latest in a long list of irresponsible actions this Congress has taken on gun policy, such as the fact that due to Congressional action, loaded firearms are now permitted in National Parks. The D.C. voting rights bill that enjoyed joint bipartisan support was scuttled by requiring restrictions on the D.C. City Council regarding the type of gun safety laws that they could enact if they wanted their right to vote.

Restrictions blocking State and local law enforcement access to important crime gun trace data were made permanent. Just last year, the House passed legislation to override the concealed carry requirements of individual States, establishing a lowest common denominator Federal standard.

Despite all of these actions to weaken gun laws, judging by the outlandish statements from the NRA, you would think that the Second Amendment was under constant bombardment. Wayne LaPierre, vice president of the NRA, said last year that the claim that the Obama administration has done virtually nothing to restrict the rights of gun owners is ''a big fat stinking lie.'' He went further to claim that the President's lack of action is ''all part of a massive Obama conspiracy to deceive voters and hide his true intentions to destroy the Second Amendment in our country.'' Again, another LaPierre quote.

Actions are supposed to speak louder than words, but apparently for some people, crazy conspiracy fantasies speak loudest of all.

Instead of weakening gun laws further, we should be passing commonsense measures that are supported by the vast majority of Americans. In fact, according to a poll conducted by Republican pollster Frank Luntz, 82 percent of NRA members and 86 percent of non-NRA gun owners support prohibiting suspected terrorists from purchasing guns; 69 percent of NRA members and 85 percent of non-NRA gun owners support background checks for all gun sales at gun shows.

□ 1050

And yet the NRA opposes these commonsense restrictions and gets this Congress to do so as well.

There are bills introduced in Congress right now to address these two issues, the Denying Firearms and Explosives to Dangerous Terrorists Act and the Fix Gun Checks Act. Neither one has received so much as a subcommittee hearing in this Republican Congress.

Instead, we are debating a bill that includes a provision that would remove a modest, yet valuable, tool for Federal law enforcement to stop the illegal smuggling of firearms and the killing of thousands of innocent people. Where are our priorities?

I do want to thank Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member FATTAH for including $12 million in the CJS bill to implement the NICS Amendments Improvement Act. It's a $7 million increase over last year; that's progress. In fact, it's a program that assists States in the establishment and upgrade of information such as mental health records entered into databases that are used to determine eligibility for firearm purchases. If we had had that, perhaps our colleague, Gabby Giffords, would not have been shot. Increased funding is a step in the right direction, but the inclusion of the ATF provision is not. It will only serve to undermine Federal law enforcement's ability to stop illegal gun trafficking. Congress needs to stop weakening gun policy to serve the narrow interests of the gun lobby and start enacting laws to protect the safety of the American public.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

Bless the Members of this assembly as they set upon the work of these hours, of these days. Help them to make wise decisions in a good manner, and to carry their responsibilities steadily with high hopes for a better future for our great Nation.

Deepen their faith, widen their sympathies, heighten their aspirations, and give them the strength to do what ought to be done for this country.

May Your blessing, O God, be with them and with us all this day and every day to come, and may all we do be done for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. HIGGINS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I wear this pin today in honor of May as National Foster Care Month. At the end of fiscal year 2010, over 100,000 foster youth were eligible and waiting for adoption. Sixty-five percent of former foster children experienced at least seven school changes while in care. In 2010, almost 30,000 youth ''aged out'' of the foster care system without a permanent family. In some States, up to 50 percent of former foster and probation youth become homeless within the first 18 months of emancipation. In some cities, nearly 60 percent of victims of domestic minor sex trafficking are youth from the foster care system.

All children deserve safe, loving, and permanent homes. We must work together to create good policy for foster youth, and I would encourage anyone thinking about becoming a parent to consider changing a life through adoption and foster care.

POSTAL REFORM

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind this House of the far-reaching impact that proposed postal facility closures would have. In my Buffalo community, closing the William Street mail processing facility would affect 700 jobs. Closures would also adversely impact our printing and mailing industry, in addition to nonprofit agencies in local municipalities who rely on regular mail service.

Last week, the Senate took the first step in postal reform by passing legislation that would prevent the large-scale closure of postal facilities by requiring the postal service to maintain overnight delivery for at least 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, though the Senate bill is not perfect, we must bring it to the floor immediately in order to achieve real reform. This bill is our best path forward.

MEDICAL DEVICE TAX

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee approved bipartisan legislation to reauthorize and reform the Food and Drug Administration user-fee program. This bill will smooth the process of reviewing medical devices and drugs, increasing transparency and predictability. It's a big step in the right direction for helping American companies continue to lead the world in medical research. Unfortunately, the medical device industry faces a huge setback starting next year.

Last week, Senator TOOMEY and I visited Precision Medical Products in Denver, Pennsylvania. In a roundtable meeting, we heard from a dozen medical device companies about how the new ObamaCare medical device tax will destroy jobs and stall research. This new 2.3 percent tax is on all revenue—and not just profits—meaning even if a company is struggling to break even or even losing money, they have to pay this hefty tax bill. This new tax is over and above the new user fees that they have agreed to pay.

Already, some companies have cut back. Yesterday, we took a big step forward. But if this new tax becomes reality next year, we could still lose the edge on medical device equipment. It should be repealed.

STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Yesterday was President Harry S. Truman's birthday. One of his quotes is particularly appropriate today. He said:

The purpose of our society is to enable the individual to attain the highest achievement of which he is capable.

The highest achievements that have sprung from our education system have included harnessing the atom, claiming the high ground in space, and curing previously fatal diseases. But now, because of our failure to adequately fund education, tuition is skyrocketing. Graduates who wish to reach for achievement are anchored to Earth by thousands of dollars in debt. For us to also allow interest rates to double on these student loans is morally unacceptable and economically foolish.

To paraphrase President Truman: the extra bucks stop here.

Let's stop the student loan interest rates from doubling July 1. Stop the political games. Let's support American students to attain their highest achievements.

RURAL POST OFFICES

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I rise today to highlight a subject that is personal in Arkansas's First Congressional District: the proposed closure of thousands of rural post offices across the country.

This week I sent a letter to Postmaster General Patrick Donahoe asking him to give the House of Representatives time to pass meaningful postal reform legislation. As it stands now, over 3,600 post offices are slated for closure on May 15. In my district alone, 100 post offices have been put on the closure list.

In November, I filed the Protecting Our Rural American Post Offices Act of 2011. The bill would prohibit the postal service from closing rural post offices that do not have an alternative office within 8 miles accessible by public roads. The bill is an effort to level the field between rural and urban post office closures.

So many of the challenges we face in Washington are not Democrat versus Republican, but rather urban versus rural interests. Americans living in rural communities rely on their post offices for medicine delivery and Social Security benefits and veterans benefits, among other things. Access to postal services should not be limited to urban families.

I urge Postmaster General Donahoe to give the House time to pass meaningful postal reform legislation. The postal service cannot hope to cure all their budget woes on the backs of rural Americans.

□ 1210

INVESTING IN AMERICA

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the golden opportunity to travel with our President to the capital region of upstate New York to visit our nanotechnology center. This campus is poised for tremendous growth as we witness an investment in public and private partnership.

The President utilized that visit to showcase a very glowing example of the appropriateness of investing in advanced manufacturing. It's a great path toward job creation, job retention. The President underscored the value of investing in precision technology, in R&D, in efficiency, and in workforce development—workforce development, development that comes in many dimensions, training and retraining and apprenticeship programs, and, yes, the path to success via higher education.

Speaking to that, our higher education dreams need to be fostered with affordability and availability. The 3.4 percent cap on interest rates for student loans cannot grow to 6.8 percent. We will dumb down the dreams of our young adults who are looking to go onward with their careers through higher education. We need to pass legislation so as to hold that cap at 3.4 percent, and we cannot allow it to grow come July 1 because of inaction by this Congress. I ask us to pass that measure in this House.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to recognize National Teacher Appreciation Week by sharing my heartfelt praise of Pennsylvania's teachers and educators throughout this great country.

I would like to recognize Tricia Miller, Pennsylvania's Teacher of the Year from Penns Valley Area School District located in my home county in the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District, and Margaret McLaughlin of Garnet Valley Area School District in eastern Pennsylvania, who was the recipient of the Education Support Professional of the Year Award for Pennsylvania. Their accomplishments are impressive, and both are the type who go above and beyond when helping our students achieve academic success.

Like so many other teachers, they remain tirelessly committed to high achievement and developing the next generation of leaders. And while these two are Pennsylvania's award winners, there are countless others who dedicate their lives day in and day out to ensure that students live up to their individual potential and strive to push young learners to surpass that potential.

As a Nation, we must make sure that we celebrate outstanding educators every day. During National Teacher Appreciation Week, I want to thank all teachers for their hard work and dedication.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor our teachers during National Teacher Appreciation Week. Teachers do not merely just teach in the classroom, they listen to their students and gently push them to reach their full potential. Teachers serve as role models and mentors.

Because of the mentorship of my teachers in high school, I applied for college. I was fortunate to be given a scholarship and an opportunity that I would not have known about if it were not for my teachers. Upon graduating, I decided to give back to my community and became a teacher.

New Jersey has among the most talented teachers in the country, and our students are lucky to learn from them. While we are honoring them this week, we should be thankful for their service every day. We trust teachers with our most valuable resources—our children.

While we ask teachers to prepare our children to meet the challenges of the 21st century, we must give them the tools to rise to these challenges. Competitive salaries and financial resources must be provided.

Let's join together in recognizing our teachers in New Jersey and across the country. Take the time to thank your teacher for their leadership and inspiration.

EDUCATION IS KEY TO SOUND FUTURE

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, as a former community college trustee member, I understand that good education is key to a sound future. Sadly, many working families in America now find themselves unable to afford higher education for their children. And even worse, if Congress does not act soon, the interest rate for students will double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent; 7.4 million American students will face thousands of dollars in new debt if we do not act before July.

Last week, House Republicans showed they are unwilling to work on a real solution to this crisis. In a sham vote, Republicans put forward a bill to pay for the interest rate halt by slashing funds for women and children's health services.

America's young people deserve better. Let's keep their dreams alive. Let's get serious about a bipartisan solution to strengthen Pell Grants and keep student loan interest rates low. Let's help our students become the leaders of tomorrow.

NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

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

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize May as National Foster Care Month. The goal of this special month is to raise awareness about the experiences and needs of more than 400,000 youth in the foster care system.

The Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth asked young people around the country to tell us their experiences via our Web site, Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth. Throughout the month,

you will hear both Democrats and Republicans sharing these stories.

For example, Renee, a young woman from Los Angeles, was in foster care for over 8 years. She was placed in six different homes until she aged out of the system in June 2008. She currently attends UCLA and hopes to pursue a career in social work or community health.

Renee says:

Being in foster care has played an integral role in shaping and developing my character and the person I am today. My experience with the foster care system has exposed me to speaking up, communicating with adults, and being open with my peers about my situation, not ashamed of who I am.

In honor of Renee's courage and tenacity, I invite my colleagues to join the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth and cosponsor the bipartisan resolution in recognition of National Foster Care Month and to wear the blue ribbon.

CONGRATULATING BOB OSTERHAUS

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

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I take a moment to honor and congratulate a constituent and personal friend, Bob Osterhaus. Bob is being recognized by the University of Iowa with an Honorary Doctor of Science degree for his service to our State and his work with the University of Iowa pharmacy program.

Bob has spent his entire life serving other people. After he finished his education at the University of Iowa, he served in the United States Army and later served in the Iowa House of Representatives, contributing his perspective as a health care professional in shaping legislative initiatives like the HAWK-I insurance plan for children from low-income families.

He has served his community of Maquoketa, Iowa, in many ways. Osterhaus Pharmacy is a staple in the community, and he is active with the Maquoketa Chamber of Commerce, Rotary Club, Sacred Heart Church, and the Knights of Columbus. He was cofounder of the Maquoketa Area Community Foundation and served as its chairman for 7 years.

Tomorrow, Bob will receive his Honorary Doctor of Science degree. The university could not have made a better selection, and I congratulate Bob for his outstanding service to Iowa, the pharmacy profession, and his country.

PROGRESS MADE BY WORKING TOGETHER

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I have had the great privilege of serving in Congress with Senator RICHARD LUGAR. He was in the Aspen Institute, and I visited with him on those occasions, and received an award from the American Bar Association the same day he did, as did JOHN LEWIS, which made it more important than any other reward I have received.

RICHARD LUGAR's loss is a great loss to this country. He worked in a bipartisan fashion, and worked with President Obama on nuclear proliferation treaties and on the approval of Supreme Court Justices.

He said, last night, we are experiencing days of political division in our society. These divisions have stalemated progress in critical areas. They have, indeed. And unless the Republican side works with the Democratic side in a bipartisan fashion, we won't be successful, as RICHARD LUGAR tried to do, and was defeated for doing it.

There's something wrong in the constituencies that don't realize that progress is made by parties working together, not by one party conquering the other.

□ 1220

ISSUES FACING AMERICA

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in recognizing the crisis that is being faced by the postal offices across America, both urban and rural. We look forward to bringing a contingent of workers and postal persons from around the country to this Congress to urge it to move forward quickly and utilize the Senate proposal.

At the same time, I am deeply saddened by a reconciliation budget proposal by my friends on the other side of the aisle that's going to cut the Social Services Block Grant, it's going to cut Medicaid, it's going to cut Meals on Wheels. As a former chairperson of the Interfaith Ministries in Houston, Texas, what a sad day to cut Meals on Wheels.

Today and this week is Teacher Appreciation Week, and I salute them. They are great and grand as they teach our children that they can reach for the sky. That is why today, the Congressional Children's Caucus will host Lee Hirsch, the producer and director of the movie ''Bully.'' Eighteen million children have been bullied, like Asher Brown, who lost his life, like a 13-year-old Girl Scout who said that she's been bullied since age 5.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me at 1:30 in 2237 for a press conference saying there should be a national call to ending bullying—intervention, and at the same time to come at 2 o'clock to see the movie. Third floor, Library of Congress, Madison Building. There must be, and I call for, a national solution to bullying in our children's lives.

PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to become cosponsors of my bill, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

While current law prohibits discrimination based on pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions, and directs employers to treat pregnancies the same as any other condition that might temporarily limit an employee's ability to perform some job functions, these protections have proven inadequate. Case law shows that courts are uncertain, even confused, about the scope of the law, requiring Congress to set the record straight.

While several States have clarified pregnant workers' rights, this is a national problem that warrants a national solution. My bill would require an employer to make reasonable accommodations for these workers unless this creates an undue hardship on the employer. An employer would be prevented from forcing a pregnant worker to take an accommodation that she does not want or need, and an employer would be prevented from forcing a pregnant worker to take leave when another reasonable accommodation could keep her on the job.

This is a simple solution to a problem our women and families should not be facing. I urge my colleagues to become a cosponsor of this bill to ensure that a pregnant woman need never decide between maintaining a healthy pregnancy and maintaining her paycheck.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION ACT

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and I urge passage of H.R. 2072, of which I am a cosponsor.

In 2011, the Ex-Im Bank supported 290,000 jobs in the United States. Additionally, over the past 10 years, the Ex-Im Bank actually returned $900 million to the United States Treasury.

When a program supports so many manufacturing jobs and it doesn't cost the taxpayer a dime, you would expect this bill to be an easy win, and yet some Members on the far right are prepared to put extreme ideology above jobs for Americans. This bill is a real jobs bill, and I urge its support.

POSTAL SERVICE PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. The clock is ticking. Six days from today, an incompetent, ideological Board of Governors in the United States Postal Service intends to close thousands of post offices and processing centers, degrading service and denying access for millions of individual Americans, especially seniors, veterans, small business owners, and others. And what's the reaction of the Republican leadership in the House? Nothing. Silence.

We were in session until 1 o'clock in the morning voting on imaginary amendments to a bill that's not going anywhere, but they can't bestir themselves to bring forward a bill to save this critical institution. The Senate has acted. Their bill is not perfect, but it's better than inaction in face of the wrecking crew that is governing our postal services.

I urge my colleagues to support my bill, cosponsor my bill, H.R. 3591, put the postal service on a sustainable path toward a 21st century postal service, modernized and self-sufficient. But inaction and indifference will destroy this critical institution.

TIME TO PASS A TRANSPORTATION BILL

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan was the last President to raise the Federal gasoline tax to support transportation programs when he signed the Surface Transportation Act of 1982. He justified the gas tax increase as necessary to pay for needed investments in building and maintaining our Nation's surface transportation infrastructure and to help jump-start an economy that was then also stuck in a recession. He referred to the highway bill as a ''jobs'' bill to promote economic growth.

Since that bill was signed into law back in January of 1983, Republican-controlled Congresses have allowed the highway fund to go bankrupt, necessitating multiple infusions from general funds to allow it to limp along with short-term extensions of current law. Today, some within this Chamber won't even support a Federal transportation bill at current funding levels, as if the crumbling interstates and growing list of structurally deficient bridges are no longer a Federal responsibility. Instead, they insist on including unrelated measures like the Keystone XL pipeline that is designed to stall completion of even a modest, multiyear transportation authorization.

Mr. Speaker, the Keystone XL pipeline should have nothing to do with the transportation bill and will have no impact on gasoline prices despite what its advocates claim. Today, there is already an estimated 20-year excess capacity of oil pipelines from Canada to the United States. This is about being able to export oil from the gulf coast to other countries.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to pass a responsible transportation bill for the 21st century.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2012.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 9, 2012 at 9:22 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2668.

That the Senate passed S. 743.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SYRIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112 107)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency, unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the Federal Register for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions of the Government of Syria declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004, as modified in scope and relied upon for additional steps taken in Executive Order 13399 of April 25, 2006, Executive Order 13460 of February 13, 2008, Executive Order 13572 of April 29, 2011, Executive Order 13573 of May 18, 2011, Executive Order 13582 of August 17, 2011, Executive Order 13606 of April 22, 2012, and Executive Order 13608 of May 1, 2012, is to continue in effect beyond May 11, 2012.

While the Syrian regime has reduced the number of foreign fighters bound for Iraq, the regime's own brutality and repression of its citizens who have been calling for freedom and a representative government endangers not only the Syrian people themselves, but could yield greater instability throughout the region. The Syrian regime's actions and policies, including obstructing the Lebanese government's ability to function effectively, pursuing chemical and biological weapons, and supporting terrorist organizations, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect the national emergency declared with respect to this threat and to maintain in force the sanctions to address this national emergency.

In addition, the United States condemns the Asad regime's use of brutal violence and human rights abuses and calls on the Asad regime to step aside and immediately begin a transition in Syria to a political process that will forge a credible path to a future of greater freedom, democracy, opportunity, and justice. The United States will consider changes in the composition, policies, and actions of the Government of Syria in determining whether to continue or terminate this national emergency in the future.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 9, 2012.*

□ 1230

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2012

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2072) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2072

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.

Section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f) is amended by striking ''2011'' and inserting ''2014''.

SEC. 3. LIMITATIONS ON OUTSTANDING LOANS, GUARANTEES, AND INSURANCE.

Section 6(a)(2) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635e(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''and'';

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking the comma at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(F) during fiscal year 2012 and each succeeding fiscal year, $120,000,000,000, except that—

''(i) the applicable amount for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 shall be $130,000,000,000 if—

''(I) the Bank has submitted a report as required by section 4(a) of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012; and

''(II) the rate calculated under section 8(g)(1) of this Act is less than 2 percent for the quarter ending with the beginning of the fiscal year, or for any quarter in the fiscal year; and

''(ii) notwithstanding clause (i), the applicable amount for fiscal year 2014 shall be $140,000,000,000 if—

''(I) the rate calculated under section 8(g)(1) of this Act is less than 2 percent for the quarter ending with the beginning of the fiscal year, or for any quarter in the fiscal year; and

''(II) the Bank has submitted a report as required by subsection (b) of section 5 of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012, except that the preceding provisions of this subclause shall not apply if the Comptroller General has not submitted the report required by subsection (a) of such section 5 on or before July 1, 2013; and

''(III) the Secretary of the Treasury has submitted the reports required by section 11(b) of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012.''.

SEC. 4. EXPORT-IMPORT BANK EXPOSURE LIMIT BUSINESS PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2012, the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall submit to the Congress and the Comptroller General a written report that contains the following:

(1) A business plan that—

(A) includes an estimate by the Bank of the appropriate exposure limits of the Bank for 2012, 2013, and 2014;

(B) justifies the estimate; and

(C) estimates any anticipated growth of the Bank for 2012, 2013, and 2014—

(i) by industry sector;

(ii) by whether the products involved are short-term loans, medium-term loans, long-term loans, insurance, medium-term guarantees, or long-term guarantees; and

(iii) by key market.

(2) An analysis of the potential for increased or decreased risk of loss to the Bank as a result of the estimated exposure limit, including an analysis of increased or decreased risks associated with changes in the composition of Bank exposure, by industry sector, by product offered, and by key market.

(3) An analysis of the ability of the Bank to meet its small business and sub-Saharan Africa mandates and comply with its carbon policy mandate under the proposed exposure limit, and an analysis of any increased or decreased risk of loss associated with meeting or complying with the mandates under the proposed exposure limit.

(4) An analysis of the adequacy of the resources of the Bank to effectively process, approve, and monitor authorizations, including the conducting of required economic impact analysis, under the proposed exposure limit.

(b) GAO REVIEW OF REPORT AND BUSINESS PLAN.—Not later than June 1, 2013, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Congress a written analysis of the report and business plan submitted under subsection (a), which shall include such recommendations with respect to the report and business plan as the Comptroller General deems appropriate.

SEC. 5. STUDY BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL ON THE ROLE OF THE BANK IN THE WORLD ECONOMY AND THE BANK'S RISK MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Within 10 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete and submit to the Export-Import Bank of the United States, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report which—

(1) evaluates—

(A) the history of the rate of growth of the Bank, and its causes, with specific consideration given to—

(i) the capital market conditions for export financing;

(ii) increased competition from foreign export credit agencies;

(iii) the rate of growth of the Bank from 2008 to the present;

(B) the effectiveness of the Bank's risk management, including—

(i) potential for losses from each of the products offered by the Bank; and

(ii) the overall risk of the Bank's portfolio, taking into account—

(I) market risk;

(II) credit risk;

(III) political risk;

(IV) industry-concentration risk;

(V) geographic-concentration risk;

(VI) obligor-concentration risk; and

(VII) foreign-currency risk;

(C) the Bank's use of historical default and recovery rates to calculate future program costs, taking into consideration cost estimates determined under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.) and whether discount rates applied to cost estimates should reflect the risks described in subparagraph (B);

(D) the fees charged by the Bank for the products the Bank offers, whether the Bank's fees properly reflect the risks described in subparagraph (B), and how the fees are affected by United States participation in international agreements; and

(E) whether the Bank's loan loss reserves policy is sufficient to cover the risks described in subparagraph (B); and

(2) makes appropriate recommendations with respect to the matters so evaluated.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT BY THE BANK.—Not later than 120 days after the Bank receives the report, the Bank shall submit to the Congress a report on the implementation of recommendations included in the report so received. If the Bank does not adopt the recommendations, the Bank shall include in its report an explanation of why the Bank has not done so.

SEC. 6. MONITORING OF DEFAULT RATES ON BANK FINANCING; REPORTS ON DEFAULT RATES; SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS REVIEW.

Section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) MONITORING OF DEFAULT RATES ON BANK FINANCING; REPORTS ON DEFAULT RATES; SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS REVIEW.—

''(1) MONITORING OF DEFAULT RATES.—Not less frequently than quarterly, the Bank shall calculate the rate at which the entities to which the Bank has provided short-, medium-, or long-term financing are in default on a payment obligation under the financing, by dividing the total amount of the required payments that are overdue by the total amount of the financing involved.

''(2) ADDITIONAL CALCULATION BY TYPE OF PRODUCT, BY KEY MARKET, AND BY INDUSTRY SECTOR; REPORT TO CONGRESS.—In addition, the Bank shall, not less frequently than quarterly—

''(A) calculate the rate of default—

''(i) with respect to whether the products involved are short-term loans, medium-term loans, long-term loans, insurance, medium-term guarantees, or long-term guarantees;

''(ii) with respect to each key market involved; and

''(iii) with respect to each industry sector involved; and

''(B) submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on each such rate and any information the Bank deems relevant.

''(3) REPORT ON CAUSES OF DEFAULT RATE; PLAN TO REDUCE DEFAULT RATE.—Within 45 days after a rate calculated under paragraph (1) equals or exceeds 2 percent, the Bank shall submit to the Congress a written report that explains the circumstances that have caused the default rate to be at least 2 percent, and includes a plan to reduce the default rate to less than 2 percent.

''(4) PLAN CONTENTS.—The plan referred to in paragraph (3) shall—

''(A) provide a detailed explanation of the processes and controls by which the Bank monitors and tracks outstanding loans;

''(B) detail specific planned actions, including a time frame for completing the actions, to reduce the default rate described in paragraph (1) to less than 2 percent.

''(5) MONTHLY REPORTS REQUIRED WHILE DEFAULT RATE IS AT LEAST 2 PERCENT.—For so long as the default rate calculated under paragraph (1) is at least 2 percent, the Bank shall submit monthly reports to the Congress describing the specific actions taken during such period to reduce the default rate.

''(6) SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS REVIEW.—If the default rate calculated under paragraph (1) remains above 2 percent for a period of 6 months, the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide for an independent third party to—

''(A) conduct a review of the loan programs and funds of the Bank, which shall determine—

''(i) the financial safety and soundness of the programs and funds; and

''(ii) the extent of loan loss reserves and capital adequacy of the programs and funds; and

''(B) submit to the Secretary, within 60 days after the end of the 6-month period, a report that—

''(i) describes the methodology and standards used to conduct the review required by subparagraph (A);

''(ii) sets forth the results and findings of the review, including the extent of loan loss reserves and capital adequacy of the programs and funds of the Bank; and

''(iii) includes recommendations regarding restoring the reserves and capital to maintain the programs and funds in a safe and sound condition.''.

SEC. 7. IMPROVEMENT AND CLARIFICATION OF DUE DILIGENCE STANDARDS FOR LENDER PARTNERS.

Section 2 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) DUE DILIGENCE STANDARDS FOR LENDER PARTNERS.—The Bank shall set due diligence standards for its lender partners and participants, which should be applied across all programs consistently. To minimize or prevent fraudulent activity, the Bank should require all delegated lenders to implement 'Know your customer practices'.''.

SEC. 8. NON-SUBORDINATION REQUIREMENT.

Section 2 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635), as amended by section 7 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) NON-SUBORDINATION REQUIREMENT.—In entering into financing contracts, the Bank shall seek a creditor status which is not subordinate to that of all other creditors, in order to reduce the risk to, and enhance recoveries for, the Bank.''.

SEC. 9. NOTICE AND COMMENT FOR BANK TRANSACTIONS EXCEEDING $100,000,000.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(c) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(10) NOTICE AND COMMENT REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Before any meeting of the Board for final consideration of a long-term transaction the value of which exceeds $100,000,000, and concurrent with any statement required to be submitted under section 2(b)(3) with respect to the transaction, the Bank shall provide a notice and comment period.

''(B) FINANCIAL THRESHOLD DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of determining whether the value of a proposed transaction exceeds the financial threshold set forth in subparagraph (A), the Bank shall aggregate the dollar amount of the proposed transaction and the dollar amounts of all long-term loans and guarantees, approved by the Bank in the preceding 12-month period, that involved the same foreign entity and substantially the same product to be produced.

''(C) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Bank shall—

''(I) publish in the Federal Register a notice of the application proposing the transaction;

''(II) provide a period of not less than 25 days for the submission to the Bank of comments on the application; and

''(III) notify the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives of the application, and seek comments on the application from the Department of Commerce and the Office of Management and Budget.

''(ii) CONTENT OF NOTICE.—The notice published under clause (i)(I) with respect to an application for a loan or financial guarantee shall include appropriate information about—

''(I) a brief non-proprietary description of the purposes of the transaction and the anticipated use of any item being exported, including, to the extent the Bank is reasonably aware, whether the item may be used to produce exports or provide services in competition with the exportation of goods or the provision of services by a United States industry;

''(II) the identities of the obligor, principal supplier, and guarantor; and

''(III) a description, such as type or model number, of any item with respect to which Bank financing is being sought, but only to the extent the description does not disclose any information that is confidential or proprietary business information, that would violate the Trade Secrets Act, or that would jeopardize jobs in the United States by supplying information which competitors could use to compete with companies in the United States.

''(D) PROCEDURE REGARDING MATERIALLY CHANGED APPLICATIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If a material change is made to an application to which this paragraph applies, after a notice with respect to the application is published under subparagraph (C)(i)(I), the Bank shall publish in the Federal Register a revised notice of the application and provide for an additional comment period as provided in subparagraph (C)(i)(II).

''(ii) MATERIAL CHANGE DEFINED.—In clause (i), the term 'material change', with respect to an application for a loan or guarantee, includes an increase of at least 25 percent in the amount of a loan or guarantee requested in the application.

''(E) REQUIREMENT TO ADDRESS VIEWS OF COMMENTERS.—Before taking final action on an application to which this paragraph applies, the staff of the Bank shall provide in writing to the Board of Directors the views of any person who submitted comments on the application pursuant to this paragraph.

''(F) PUBLICATION OF CONCLUSIONS.—Within 30 days after a final decision of the Board of Directors with respect to an application to which this paragraph applies, the Bank shall provide to a commenter on the application or the decision who makes a request therefor, a non-confidential summary of the facts found and conclusions reached in any detailed analysis or similar study with respect to the loan or guarantee that is the subject of the application, that was submitted to the Board of Directors. Such summary should be sent within 30 days of the receipt of the written request or date of the final decision of the Board of Directors, whichever is later.

''(G) RULE OF INTERPRETATION.—The obligations imposed by this paragraph shall not be interpreted to create, modify, or preclude any legal right of action.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 10. CATEGORIZATION OF PURPOSE OF LOANS AND LONG-TERM GUARANTEES IN ANNUAL REPORT.

Section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635g), as amended by section 6 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) CATEGORIZATION OF PURPOSE OF LOANS AND LONG-TERM GUARANTEES.—In the annual report of the Bank under subsection (a), the Bank shall categorize each loan and long-term guarantee made by the Bank in the fiscal year covered by the report, and according to the following purposes:

''(1) 'To assume commercial or political risk that exporter or private financial institutions are unwilling or unable to undertake'.

''(2) 'To overcome maturity or other limitations in private sector export financing'.

''(3) 'To meet competition from a foreign, officially sponsored, export credit competition'.

''(4) 'Not identified', and the reason why the purpose is not identified.''.

SEC. 11. NEGOTIATIONS TO END EXPORT CREDIT FINANCING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury (in this section referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall initiate and pursue negotiations—

(1) with other major exporting countries, including members of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and non-OECD members, to substantially reduce, with the ultimate goal of eliminating, subsidized export financing programs and other forms of export subsidies; and

(2) with all countries that finance air carrier aircraft with funds from a state-sponsored entity, to substantially reduce, with the ultimate goal of eliminating, aircraft export credit financing for all aircraft covered by the 2007 Sector Understanding on Export Credits for Civil Aircraft (in this section referred to as the ''ASU''), including any modification thereof, and all of the following types of aircraft:

(A) Heavy aircraft that are capable of a takeoff weight of 300,000 pounds or more, whether or not operating at such a weight during a particular phase of flight.

(B) Large aircraft that are capable of a takeoff weight of more than 41,000 pounds, and have a maximum certificated takeoff weight of not more than 300,000 pounds.

(C) Small aircraft that have a maximum certificated takeoff weight of 41,000 pounds or less.

(b) ANNUAL REPORTS ON PROGRESS OF NEGOTIATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives—

(1) a report on the progress of any negotiations described in subsection (a)(1), until the Secretary certifies in writing to the committees that all countries that support subsidized export financing programs have agreed to end the support; and

(2) a report on the progress of any negotiations described in subsection (a)(2), including the progress of any negotiations with respect to each classification of aircraft set forth in

subsection (a)(2), until the Secretary certifies in writing to the committees that all countries that support subsidized export financing programs have agreed to end the support of aircraft covered by the ASU.

SEC. 12. PUBLICATION OF GUIDELINES FOR ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSES AND DOCUMENTATION OF SUCH ANALYSES.

(a) PUBLICATION OF GUIDELINES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall develop and make publicly available methodological guidelines to be used by the Bank in conducting economic impact analyses or similar studies under section 2(e) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945. In developing the guidelines, the Bank shall take into consideration any relevant guidance from the Office of Management and Budget.

(b) MAINTENANCE OF DOCUMENTATION.—Section 2(e)(7) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(e)(7)) is amended by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subparagraphs (F) and (G), respectively, and inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

''(E) MAINTENANCE OF DOCUMENTATION.—The Bank shall maintain documentation relating to economic impact analyses and similar studies conducted under this subsection in a manner consistent with the Standards for Internal Control of the Federal Government issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.''.

SEC. 13. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the implementation or rejection by the Bank of the recommendations contained in the report of the Government Accountability Office entitled ''Export-Import Bank: Improvements Needed in Assessment of Economic Impact'', dated September 12, 2007 (GAO 07 1071), that includes—

(1) a detailed description of the progress made in implementing each such recommendation; and

(2) for any such recommendation that has not yet been implemented, an explanation of the reasons the recommendation has not been implemented.

SEC. 14. EXAMINATION OF BANK SUPPORT FOR SMALL BUSINESS.

Within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall examine and report to Congress on its current programs, products, and polices with respect to the implementation of its export credit insurance program, delegated lending authority, and direct loans, and any other programs, products, and policies established to support exports from small businesses in the United States, and determine the extent to which those policies adequately meet the needs of the small businesses in obtaining Bank financing to support the maintenance or creation of jobs in the United States through exports, consistent with the requirement that the Bank obtain a reasonable assurance of repayment.

SEC. 15. REVIEW AND REPORT ON DOMESTIC CONTENT POLICY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Export-Import Bank of the United States shall conduct a review of its domestic content policy for medium- and long-term transactions. The review shall examine and evaluate the effectiveness of the Bank's policy—

(1) in maintaining and creating jobs in the United States; and

(2) in contributing to a stronger national economy through the export of goods and services.

(b) FACTORS TO CONSIDER.—In conducting the review under subsection (a), the Bank shall consider the following:

(1) Whether the domestic content policy accurately captures the costs of United States production of goods and services, including the direct and indirect costs of manufacturing costs, parts, components, materials and supplies, research, planning engineering, design, development, production, return on investment, marketing and other business costs and the effect of such policy on the maintenance and creation of jobs in the United States.

(2) The ability of the Bank to provide financing that is competitive with the financing provided by foreign export credit agencies and the impact that such financing has in enabling companies with operations in the United States to contribute to a stronger United States economy by increasing employment through the export of goods and services.

(3) The effects of the domestic content policy on the manufacturing and service workforce of the United States.

(4) Any recommendations the members of the Bank's Advisory Committee have regarding the Bank's domestic content policy.

(5) The effect that changes to the Bank's domestic content requirements would have in providing companies an incentive to create and maintain operations in the United States and to increase jobs in the United States.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Bank shall submit a report on the results of the review conducted under this section to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 16. IMPROVEMENT OF METHOD FOR CALCULATING THE EFFECTS OF BANK FINANCING ON JOB CREATION AND MAINTENANCE IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) GAO STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the process and methodology used by the Export-Import Bank of the United States (in this section referred to as the ''Bank'') to calculate the effects of the provision of financing by the Bank on the creation and maintenance of employment in the United States, determine and assess the basis on which the Bank has so used the methodology, and make any recommendations the Comptroller General deems appropriate.

(b) REPORT.—Within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Congress and the Bank the results of the study required by subsection (a).

(c) IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—If the report submitted pursuant to subsection (b) includes recommendations, the Bank may establish a more accurate methodology of the kind described in subsection (a) based on the recommendations.

SEC. 17. PERIODIC AUDITS OF BANK TRANSACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Within 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and periodically (but not less frequently than every 4 years) thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit of the loan and guarantee transactions of the Export-Import Bank of the United States to determine the compliance of the Bank with the underwriting guidelines, lending policies, due diligence procedures, and content guidelines of the Bank.

(b) REVIEW OF FRAUD CONTROLS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall review the adequacy of the design and effectiveness of the controls used by the Export-Import Bank of the United States to prevent, detect, and investigate fraudulent applications for loans and guarantees, including by auditing a sample of Bank transactions, and submit to the Congress a written report which contains such recommendations with respect to the controls as the Comptroller General deems appropriate.

SEC. 18. PROHIBITIONS ON FINANCING FOR CERTAIN PERSONS INVOLVED IN SANCTIONABLE ACTIVITIES WITH RESPECT TO IRAN.

(a) PROHIBITION ON FINANCING FOR PERSONS THAT ENGAGE IN CERTAIN SANCTIONABLE ACTIVITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States may not approve any transaction that is subject to approval by the Board with respect to the provision by the Bank of any guarantee, insurance, or extension of credit, or the participation by the Bank in any extension of credit, to a person in connection with the exportation of any good or service unless the person makes the certification described in paragraph (2).

(2) CERTIFICATION DESCRIBED.—The certification described in this paragraph is a certification by a person—

(A) that neither the person nor any other person owned or controlled by the person—

(i) engages in any activity described in section 5(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104 172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) for which the person may be subject to sanctions under that Act;

(ii) exports sensitive technology, as defined in section 106 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8515), to Iran; or

(iii) engages in any activity prohibited by part 560 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (commonly known as the ''Iranian Transactions Regulations''), unless the activity is disclosed to the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury when the activity is discovered; or

(B) if the person or any other person owned or controlled by the person has engaged in an activity described in subparagraph (A), that—

(i) in the case of an activity described in subparagraph (A)(i)—

(I) the President has waived the imposition of sanctions with respect to the person that engaged in that activity pursuant to section 4(c), 6(b)(5), or 9(c) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104 172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note);

(II)(aa) the President has invoked the special rule described in section 4(e)(3) of that Act with respect to the person that engaged in that activity; or

(bb)(AA) the person that engaged in that activity determines, based on its best knowledge and belief, that the person meets the criteria described in subparagraph (A) of such section 4(e)(3) and has provided to the President the assurances described in subparagraph (B) of that section; and

(BB) the Secretary of State has issued an advisory opinion to that person that the person meets such criteria and has provided to the President those assurances; or

(III) the President has determined that the criteria have been met for the exception provided for under section 5(a)(3)(C) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 to apply with respect to the person that engaged in that activity; or

(ii) in the case of an activity described in subparagraph (A)(ii), the President has waived, pursuant to section 401(b)(1) of the

Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8551(b)(1)), the application of the prohibition under section 106(a) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 8515(a)) with respect to that person.

(b) PROHIBITION ON FINANCING.—Beginning on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States may not approve any transaction that is subject to approval by the Board with respect to the provision by the Bank of any guarantee, insurance, or extension of credit, or the participation by the Bank in any extension of credit, in connection with a financing in which a person that is a borrower or controlling sponsor, or a person that is owned or controlled by such borrower or controlling sponsor, is subject to sanctions under section 5(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104 172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(c) ADVISORY OPINIONS.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of State is authorized to issue advisory opinions described in subsection (a)(2)(B)(i)(II).

(2) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—If the Secretary issues an advisory opinion pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of the opinion not later than 30 days after issuing the opinion.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES; PERSON.—The terms ''appropriate congressional committees'' and ''person'' have the meanings given those terms in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104 172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(2) CONTROLLING SPONSOR.—The term ''controlling sponsor'' means a person providing controlling direct private equity investment (excluding investments made through publicly held investment funds, publicly held securities, public offerings, or similar public market vehicles) in connection with a financing.

SEC. 19. USE OF PORTION OF BANK SURPLUS TO UPDATE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS.

Section 3 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) AUTHORITY TO USE PORTION OF BANK SURPLUS TO UPDATE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (3) and (4), the Bank may use an amount equal to 1.25 percent of the surplus of the Bank during fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014 to—

''(A) seek to remedy any of the operational weakness and risk management vulnerabilities of the Bank which are the result of the information technology system of the Bank;

''(B) remedy data fragmentation, enhance information flow throughout the Bank, and manage data across the Bank; and

''(C) enhance the operational capacity and risk management capabilities of the Bank to better enable the Bank to increase exports and grow jobs while protecting the taxpayer.

''(2) SURPLUS.—In paragraph (1), the term 'surplus' means the amount (if any) by which—

''(A) the sum of the interest and fees collected by the Bank; exceeds

''(B) the sum of—

''(I) the funds set aside to cover expected losses on transactions financed by the Bank; and

''(ii) the costs incurred to cover the administrative expenses of the Bank.

''(3) LIMITATION.—The aggregate of the amounts used in accordance with paragraph (1) for fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014 shall not exceed $20,000,000.

''(4) SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATIONS.—The authority provided by paragraph (1) may be exercised only to such extent and in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriations Acts.''.

SEC. 20. MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) REPRESENTATION OF THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY.—Section 3(d)(1)(B) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a(d)(1)(B)) is amended by striking ''and State government'' inserting ''State government, and the textile industry''.

(b) ACCESS TO BANK PRODUCTS BY THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY.—

(1) CONSIDERATION BY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 3(d) of such Act (12 U.S.C. 635a(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) In carrying out paragraph (4), the Advisory Committee shall consider ways to promote the financing of Bank transactions for the textile industry, consistent with the requirement that the Bank obtain a reasonable assurance of repayment, and determine ways to—

''(A) increase Bank support for the exports of textile components or inputs made in the United States; and

''(B) support the maintenance, promotion and expansion of jobs in the United States that are critical to the manufacture of textile components and inputs.''.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS ON ADVISORY COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—Section 8 of such Act (12 U.S.C. 635g), as amended by sections 6 and 10 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) ACCESS TO BANK PRODUCTS BY THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY.—The Bank shall include in its annual report to the Congress under subsection (a) of this section a report on the determinations made by the Advisory Committee under section 3(d)(5) in the year covered by the report.''.

SEC. 21. FINANCING FOR GOODS MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES USED IN GLOBAL TEXTILE AND APPAREL SUPPLY CHAINS.

(a) ANALYSIS OF TEXTILE INDUSTRY USE OF BANK PRODUCTS.—The Export-Import Bank of the United States (in this section referred to as the ''Bank'') shall conduct a study of the extent to which the products offered by the Bank are available and used by manufacturers in the United States that export goods manufactured in the United States used as components in global textile and apparel supply chains. In conducting the study, the Bank shall examine the following:

(1) Impediments to use of Bank products by such firms.

(2) The number of jobs in the United States that are supported by the export of such component parts and the degree to which access to financing will increase exports.

(3) Specific proposals for how the Bank, using its authority and products, could provide the financing, including through risk-sharing with other export credit agencies and other third parties.

(4) Ways in which the Bank can take into account the full global textile and apparel supply chain—in particular, the ultimate purchase, and ultimate United States-based purchaser, of the finished good, that would result from the supply chain—in making credit and risk determinations and the creditworthiness of the ultimate purchaser.

(5) Proposals for new products the Bank could offer to provide the financing, including—

(A) the extent to which the Bank is authorized to offer new products;

(B) the extent to which the Bank would need additional authority to offer the new products; and

(C) specific proposals for changes in law that would enable the Bank to provide such financing in compliance with the credit and risk standards of the Bank.

(b) REPORT.—Within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Bank shall submit to the Congress a report that contains the results of the study required by subsection (a).

(c) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635g), as amended by sections 6, 10, and 20(b)(2) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) TEXTILE AND APPAREL SUPPLY CHAIN FINANCING.—The Bank shall include in its annual report to the Congress under subsection (a) of this section a description of the success of the Bank in providing effective and reasonably priced financing to the United States textile and apparel industry for exports of goods manufactured in the United States that are used as components in global textile and apparel supply chains in the year covered by the report, and steps the Bank has taken to increase the use of Bank products by such firms.''.

SEC. 22. TECHNICAL CORRECTION.

Section 2(b)(2)(B)(ii) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(2)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking subclauses (I), (IV), and (VII) and by redesignating subclauses (II), (III), (V), (VI), (VIII), and (IX) as subclauses (I) through (VI), respectively.

SEC. 23. SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Section 2(b)(9)(B)(iii) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(9)(B)(iii)) is amended by striking ''2011'' and inserting ''2014''.

SEC. 24. DUAL USE EXPORTS.

Section 4 of Public Law 109 438 (12 U.S.C. 635 note; 108 Stat. 4376) is amended by striking ''2011'' and inserting ''2014''.

SEC. 25. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as provided in section 9(b), this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the earlier of June 1, 2012, or the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous material to the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

Today we are considering H.R. 2072, the Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act, a bill which will reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. This legislation is the product of bipartisan discussions surrounding a common theme: maintaining and creating jobs in the United States.

The key to our economic recovery is jobs, without a doubt. In order to expand and hire new workers, American companies must have the ability to compete in a global economy. To create jobs, American companies need to be competitive with foreign companies

that have access to credit in their countries.

While the U.S. is a leading voice in the effort to eliminate market-distorting export subsidies, the Ex-Im Bank has helped to ensure that there's a level playing field for American companies when they compete with foreign competitors who are basically supported by aggressive credit agencies.

Ex-Im responds to market distortion by leveling the playing field. Ex-Im loans and guarantees are often countervailing measures to compete against other foreign credit agencies.

Some Members have concerns about this program. This bill directs the Treasury Department to initiate and pursue negotiations with other countries to substantially reduce their subsidized export financing programs and other forms of export subsidies.

The problem we face is the option of allowing China to dominate the export market. This bill ensures that U.S. companies, large and small, can compete and win against foreign competitors like China and, as a result, create U.S. jobs without putting U.S. taxpayers at risk.

During the reauthorization process, we have made taxpayer protection our top priority. This bill includes strong language to ensure that surpluses that the Ex-Im Bank returns to the Treasury are continued today and in the future. We want the bank to be a continually self-financing entity.

The bill increases accountability and risk management requirements for the bank, as well as provides for an audit of bank transactions to monitor the effectiveness and adequacy of the bank's due diligence practice and lending policies.

The bill ensures that the bank stays true to its purpose as a lender of last resort and does not compete against private sector commercial banks.

The bill includes language to make sure default rates stay low. Ex-Im loans and loan guarantees present very low risks because they are backed by collateral of the real goods for which a buyer has already been found and prices have been agreed upon.

The current default rate at the bank is less than 2 percent, much lower than commercial banks. Even with the bank's track record of extremely low defaults, the bill includes language to ensure that default rates stay below 2 percent, and includes corrective action requirements if the rate ever goes above that level. The bank does not put taxpayers at risk now. Our goal in this bill is to ensure that the bank does not put taxpayers at risk in the future either.

The bill also includes a new transparency provision for large transactions and gives the public the opportunity to comment on such transactions. The provision seeks to ensure the bank has information it needs to confirm it is not supporting transactions used to support products that could be used to compete with American companies.

This provision was crafted in a way that does not impact U.S. companies' ability to sell their products and services to global customers. Proprietary information, confidential information, and trade secrets are absolutely protected in this provision.

In addition, while many of the large projects supported by the bank are known to the market, I want to emphasize that the bank, at its sole discretion, has the authority to determine the information disclosed to ensure that the competitiveness of American companies is not compromised by information provided by the Federal Register notice.

The legislation also provides information included in the technology improvements, a review of the bank's domestic content policy, and improvements to the access of textile industries to bank operations. This is absolutely necessary in this country. These provisions will ensure that our American companies can utilize bank products to compete globally.

This is not a subsidy and is no cost to the taxpayers. That needs to be emphasized. The way Ex-Im Bank allows U.S. companies to compete globally is an example of how our government can facilitate job growth without contributing to the national debt.

Far from being a handout to corporations, Ex-Im Bank is self-financing, it turns a profit for the American taxpayer, and it helps create jobs here at home.

Since 2005, the bank has forwarded more than $3.4 billion in profits to the Treasury above all costs and loss reserves, including $400 million in 2011 alone. The legislation before us today ensures that Ex-Im Bank will continue to turn a profit for American taxpayers.

Some will say that Ex-Im only benefits large corporations. However, small businesses account for 87 percent of Ex-Im's transactions. These small business transactions do not include the tens of thousands of small- and medium-sized businesses that supply goods to these large corporations.

Dave Ickert, vice president of Air Tractor of Olney, Texas, a small business engaged in the manufacturing and sale of agriculture and firefighting planes, said at one point in our hearing:

> Ex-Im has contributed to the growth of Air Tractor and helped both create and maintain jobs in Olney, Texas. Ex-Im's support has allowed us to sell aircraft to customers who without that support would not have purchased our product. This is a direct contribution to our growth.

Air Tractor has 270 employees in a town that has a population of 3,000. Over 10 percent of the population who are adults work for this company in this town. It's the largest employer in Olney. Since 1994, when they did the first Ex-Im transaction, their export sales have increased from 10 percent of what they produced to 56 percent. With 56 percent export sales in 2010, there are over 100 employees at Air Tractor in Olney, Texas, that owe their jobs and have their jobs due to use of Ex-Im bank.

Mr. Ickert said:

> As I have described it before, Olney is three red lights and a Dairy Queen; and the significance of this is that if we can create jobs on Main Street Olney through small business exporting, it can be done in small businesses from California to New York. If we can do it in Olney, Texas, we can do it all over this country.

Once again, I would like to thank my colleagues from both sides of the aisle for coming together to put American jobs before politics. Together, we have crafted a strong bill to ensure the bank is able to continue to support U.S. companies as they compete globally and, as a result, create American jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2072, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012. I would also like to thank Majority Leader CANTOR and Minority Whip HOYER for their leadership on this bill, as well as full committee Chairman BACHUS and Ranking Member FRANK, and certainly my chairman on the subcommittee, Mr. MILLER.

But I also would like to thank all of the staff for their hard work on this important legislation, especially Lesli Gooch from Chairman MILLER's staff and Georgette Sierra from my staff, who worked on this for over a year.

I'm very proud to be supporting the bill before us today. Our Nation is at a crossroads. One job at a time, we are gradually emerging from one of the worst recessions in living memory. At this moment we can either stand in the way of America's ongoing recovery or speed it up. American businesses have recently watched their counterparts in other countries, like China, become world leaders in exporting. I believe strongly that now it's America's turn. It's America's turn to put our workers, the best workers in the world, to work in selling their goods and services to an untapped global market. It's America's turn to see its innovative businesses reach their full potential to grow and create local jobs in communities across this country. I'm confident with the help from the Export-Import Bank, American businesses can help make our Nation an unrivaled world economic leader once again.

□ 1240

But the clock is ticking, and we must act now.

The legislation before us brings certainty to many U.S. businesses that are anxiously awaiting Congress to reauthorize the bank before the May 31 deadline. H.R. 2072 provides a 3-year reauthorization and an incremental increase in the bank's exposure limit, allowing the bank to meet the increased demand from U.S. export companies. The bill includes provisions to enhance the bank's accountability by allotting

funds for much-needed technology upgrades, requiring the bank to submit a business plan and to monitor and report to Congress if their default rate goes above 2 percent.

The Export-Import Bank is the export credit agency of the United States, and it provides export financing for American companies when private financing isn't available. The bank is critical for helping U.S. companies create American jobs and compete in global markets by selling their goods and services to foreign buyers. Throughout the financial crisis, the bank played a crucial role in ensuring that American companies were able to continue exporting when private trade financing options were not available. The bank has allowed the United States to remain competitive in the global economy by fulfilling its mission of creating or sustaining U.S. jobs across the 50 States through exports.

In fiscal year 2011, the bank provided over $30 billion in financing to 3,600 companies in the USA which supported nearly 290,000 American jobs. Over 80 percent of those transactions were for small businesses, like Aerolyusa, Inc., which sells aerospace parts in my own district in New York.

It is important to note that the work of the bank is done at no cost to the American taxpayer, as the bank is self-sustaining, funding its finance programs and administrative costs from fees and the returns on its investments. In fact, the bank returns money to the Treasury, and since 2008, it has returned almost $2 billion to the Treasury.

Foreign governments are aggressively supporting their own exporters so that they can dominate new markets and be world leaders in exporting. Through the Export-Import Bank's assistance, we will ensure that American companies have the tools to be globally competitive and will continue to create jobs in the United States and move our economy forward. Prominent business organizations such as the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Business Roundtable, and labor understand the important role of the bank and support its reauthorization. It shows how we have all worked together, with Mr. MILLER's help, to bring this bill to the floor.

In just a few weeks, the bank's charter will expire. Without Congress quickly enacting a long-term reauthorization and cap increase, thousands—thousands—of American jobs will be lost, and the U.S. businesses that rely on bank financing will be in jeopardy.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2072, which provides the certainty that businesses around our country need that rely on the bank in order to continue growing and creating jobs here at home through exports.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), a staunch advocate for textile exports in this country.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan taught us you don't negotiate from a position of weakness.

There are over 80 foreign government export credit agencies that vigorously support their local companies in winning export sales. We cannot unilaterally disarm our manufacturers by ending Ex-Im. That will only empower our competitors to snatch away export and job opportunities from our companies. Some of these businesses are critical to our defense industrial base and need commercial sales to support their national security work. Reagan recognized this reality. That's why he supported Ex-Im Bank.

When I chaired the Small Business Committee, I had the opportunity to establish the small business desk, or division, at the Export-Import Bank. A constituent of mine was able to obtain an $11,000 loan in order to start her exporting business from a very tiny company.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote for the reauthorization in order to be a part of helping our manufacturers sell their products abroad.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. I yield 5 minutes to the minority whip, Mr. HOYER, and thank him again for his leadership on this issue.

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

Mr. HOYER. I want to thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today. We are here as the result of the work of some extraordinary staff people, and I want to start by mentioning them.

First of all, I want to congratulate and thank Mr. MILLER and his staff. I want to thank the staff of the Banking Committee. Mr. John Hughes of my staff, formerly of the Banking Committee and the Financial Services Committee, has worked tirelessly with an extraordinary policy director, Neil Bradley, who works for Mr. CANTOR. We worked on this matter in a bipartisan fashion. This bill comes to the floor as a bipartisan bill, and I am hopeful and believe it will pass with an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote.

Mr. Speaker, today, we are ending the uncertainty for American manufacturers waiting for Congress to act by coming together to reauthorize the U.S. Export-Import Bank. I want to thank the Republican leader, Mr. CANTOR, and his staff—and as I mentioned Neil Bradley before—for working with Democrats to find common ground and to reach an agreement that is supported by both business and labor, Democrats and Republicans.

I also want to commend Ranking Member BARNEY FRANK of the Financial Services Committee and those on his staff: Kelly Larkin, Dan McGlinchey, and Kirk Schwarzbach. CAROLYN MCCARTHY, as the ranking member, has done such an extraordinary job on this effort, as well as Mr. MILLER, who chairs the International Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee. Their hard work has been important in making sure this agreement will help American businesses save and create jobs. I also want to thank Representative RICK LARSEN for his tireless advocacy for a long-term reauthorization of the bank.

In addition, I would be remiss if I did not mention my dear and good friend, who is the ranking Democrat on the Appropriations Committee but who has been an extraordinary leader in making sure that America creates jobs and exports products around the world. He is Mr. NORMAN DICKS. Congressman DICKS, from Washington State, has been working with me every day that we've been at these negotiations. I want to thank him for his contributions to this outcome.

For 2 years, Mr. Speaker, House Democrats have been promoting a comprehensive jobs plan called Make It in America. Mr. DON MANZULLO was on the floor, and he has been focused on that. They may not use my phrase of ''Make It in America,'' but so many Republicans have been focused on trying to build jobs here in America. We've been promoting a Make It in America agenda.

The Export-Import Bank financing is and has been a part of our published Make It in America agenda. By financing American companies' efforts to export their products overseas, the Export-Import Bank plays a direct role, as Chairlady MCCARTHY has pointed out, in helping our businesses expand and hire more employees for well-paying jobs, jobs that will not be shipped overseas.

The Export-Import Bank doesn't cost taxpayers a single penny. In fact, it has generated $1.9 billion—$2 billion rounded, as the chairlady said—in excess revenues for U.S. taxpayers over the past 5 years, and it provides a critical service that our companies need to access foreign markets on a level playing field. I am encouraged that we were able to reach this agreement to increase the Export-Import Bank's exposure limit to $120 billion through the end of this fiscal year and to raise it to $140 billion over the next 2 years.

In 2011, financing from the Export-Import Bank helped to create nearly 300,000 jobs at 3,600 private companies across America. This is a jobs bill, a jobs bill for Americans. Yes, I said 3,600 companies. An undermentioned fact is that over 85 percent of the bank's transactions are for small businesses. We talk a lot about the large businesses, Boeing in particular, which is one of our best exports and job creators—but 3,600 businesses, most of which are small businesses. The products American workers make are the best in the world.

□ 1250

American workers and American entrepreneurs can compete with anybody in the world if they have a level playing field. This helps get there. When

that happens, our workers succeed, and that means more of our people can make it in America. That's what Americans want to do: they want to make it; they want to succeed; they want to have their kids have opportunities; and they want to make it. One of the ways we're going to Make It in America is to make it in America, manufacture it in America, grow it in America, and sell it here and around the world, and create jobs here, good-paying jobs for our people. They'll feel better about that.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation. I hope this vote is unanimous. It's a vote for America, America's workers, and America's ability to compete globally.

EX-IM BANK SUPPORT

Machinists, US Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Business Roundtable, National Foreign Trade Council, Airlines 4 America, General Aviation Manufacturers Association, Air Line Pilots Association, National Small Business Association, Small Business Exporters Association, Financial Services Roundtable, Information Technology Industry Council, National Council of State Legislatures, Boeing, Delta.

LABOR, BUSINESS URGE SUPPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT REAUTHORIZATION AGREEMENT

The agreement announced last week on a long-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank ends uncertainty for businesses and provides the Export-Import Bank resources needed to keep American manufacturers competitive in a global market. This agreement is an important part of Democrats' Make It In America plan to create an encouraging environment for businesses to innovate and make products here in the U.S., and is supported by everyone from labor to business:

Thomas Buffenbarger, President of International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers: ''The bipartisan bill H.R. 2072 . . . represents a clear break from the Beltway politics that have failed to address the real struggles of ordinary Americans. During this time of intense global competition and persistent high unemployment, U.S. exporters need the critical resources of the Ex-Im Bank. I strongly urge you to support American jobs and to vote for this important legislation.''

Thomas J. Donohue, President and CEO of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce: ''This is great news for thousands of American workers, businesses of all sizes, and taxpayers, who can cheer the fact that this bill will reduce the deficit by hundreds of millions of dollars. When other countries are providing their own exporters with an estimated $1 trillion in export finance—often on terms more generous than Ex-Im can provide—failure to reauthorize Ex-Im would amount to unilateral disarmament and cost tens of thousands of American jobs. This bill will guarantee a level financial playing field in export markets and ensure transparency in Ex-Im's operations. For that reason, the Chamber urges Congress to swiftly pass this bill to reauthorize Ex-Im.''

R. Bruce Josten, Executive Vice President for Government Affairs of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce: ''Failure to enact this bill would put at risk the nearly 300,000 American jobs at 3,600 companies that depend on Ex-Im to compete in global markets. Ex-Im is especially important to small- and medium-sized businesses, which account for more than 85 percent of Ex-Im's transactions. . . . The Chamber strongly supports H.R. 2072 and urges the House to consider this issue as expeditiously as possible. The Chamber will include votes on, or in relation to, this bill in our annual How They Voted scorecard.''

Jay Timmons, President and CEO of National Association of Manufacturers (NAM): ''The bill announced today to reauthorize the Bank and increase its lending cap brings us a step closer to protecting these jobs and will be a vital tool for small manufacturers exporting to new markets. It is essential to manufacturers' global competitiveness, and we are pleased that Majority Leader Cantor and Minority Whip Hoyer have come together on an authorization. . . . We urge all members of the House to support this jobs legislation, and we hope the Senate will also move forward quickly. The Ex-Im Bank means jobs and increased exports, which will help us grow our economy and remain competitive.''

Doug Oberhelman, Chairman and CEO of Caterpillar Inc., and Chair of Business Roundtable's International Engagement Committee: ''The Ex-Im Bank is critical to the ability of U.S. companies—large and small—to compete on a level playing field against overseas competitors who have access to similar export credit programs. . . . Failure to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank on a long-term basis and at appropriate credit levels would disadvantage U.S. businesses competing for sales in foreign markets, potentially putting thousands of U.S. jobs at risk.''

Tim Keating, Senior Vice President of Government Operations of The Boeing Company: ''. . . H.R. 2072 is bipartisan legislation authorizing EXIM to operate for the next three years and raising the Bank's lending authority to $140 billion. The legislation also contains a number of important initiatives and reforms that will strengthen Congress's ability to oversee the Bank's operations and improve the transparency of the Bank's transactions. . . . Reauthorization of the EX-IM Bank is critical to the ability of U.S. exporters to compete on a level playing field in a commercial market where current and future competitors continue to enjoy aggressive support from their countries' export credit agencies. I urge your strong support for H.R. 2072.''

Andrew Liveris, Chairman and CEO of The Dow Chemical Company: ''I am writing to urge you to support the pending legislation to reauthorize the Export-Import (ExIm) Bank. The proposed draft three-year reauthorization with a graduated cap to $140 billion provides certainty and support for America's exporters. . . . I urge your favorable vote to support and sustain American jobs, boost small businesses, and expand export opportunities for U.S. companies.''

Capt. Lee Moak, President of the Air Line Pilots Association, International: ''This is a positive move toward leveling the playing field for U.S. airlines and their workers in the global marketplace. The reauthorization bill will aid in ending subsidies for widebody airplanes. This action will help to level the playing field for U.S. airlines that compete with foreign airlines, including many that are state-sponsored, that buy U.S.- and European-manufactured planes at below-market rates unavailable to U.S. and many European airlines. This subsidized financing gives our foreign competitors a significant cost advantage, allowing them to drive U.S. airlines out of international routes and costing airline workers' jobs.''

Nicholas Calio, President and CEO of A4A: ''We appreciate the hard work of Republican House Majority Leader Eric Cantor and Democratic House Minority Whip Steny Hoyer, who negotiated a bipartisan agreement that ensures increased transparency in the Ex-Im bank's lending practices, calls for greater economic impact analysis of loans and would implement other important reforms, and we urge passage of the agreement.''

Pete Bunce, President and CEO of General Aviation Manufacturers Association: ''General aviation jobs will be put in jeopardy if the Export-Import Bank is not reauthorized. Furthermore, general aviation manufacturing is one of the few remaining industries that contribute positively to the U.S. balance of trade. Our member companies have dramatically increased their use of Export-Import Bank financing over the past several years. Continued lending authority is essential to the success of general aviation manufacturing to compete globally. . . . We appreciate the bi-partisan effort in the House to move this legislation and we urge every House member to support it. We also call on the Senate to act quickly in order to avoid any lending disruption.''

Letter from Local Chambers of Commerce: ''Without Ex-Im reauthorization, our country's exporters won't be able to compete effectively in the global marketplace. We urge you to join us in supporting swift Ex-Im Bank reauthorization.''

John Hardy, Jr., President of Coalition for Employment through Exports (CEE) and William Reinsch, President of National Foreign Trade Council (NFTC): ''[We] write in support of H.R. 2072, the Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011, and strongly [urge] your affirmative vote for reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank of the U.S. H.R 2072's three year extension provides assurance of Ex-Im Bank's continued critical presence in the global export market, its lending limit provides adequate flexibility for the Bank to respond to market demands, and it contains increased taxpayer protections to ensure the continued viability of the Bank.''

Cass Johnson, President of National Council of Textile Organizations (NCTO) and Kevin Burke, President & CEO, American Apparel & Footwear Association (AAFA): ''[We] write in strong support of H.R. 2072—Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011. In addition to re-authorizing the Export-Import Bank. . . . the legislation contains provisions that will create important new avenues of financing for the textile and apparel global supply chain.''

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to engage the chairman of the subcommittee in a colloquy regarding section 9 of the bill relating to a new notice and comment period for bank transactions over $100 million. Specifically, I wish to inquire of the chairman the scope of the bank's ability to exclude from the notice required to be published in the *Federal Register* information that is proprietary or confidential that would violate the Trade Secrets Act or would jeopardize jobs in the U.S. by supplying information which competitors could use to compete with companies in the U.S.A.

I yield to the chairman for his response.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her inquiry.

The bill requires that the *Federal Register* notice include the identities of the obligor, principal supplier, and guarantor. In addition, the notice is to include a description of the item being financed. However, that description must be constructed in a way as to not disclose proprietary or confidential information or information that would violate or otherwise requires disclosure of a trade secret as defined by the Trade Secrets Act, or information that would jeopardize jobs in the U.S. by supplying information which competitors could use to compete with companies in the U.S.

When determining what description to use in describing an item being financed, the bank must take into account the totality of the *Federal Register* notice. For example, the description of the item should be done in a way that when combined with the name of the principal supplier, information is not disclosed which foreign competitors could use to compete against U.S. suppliers, thereby jeopardizing jobs in the U.S.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to inquire of the chairman further.

What is the expectation with respect to the amount of time transactions might be delayed as a result of the new notice and comment period?

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her inquiry.

The bill requires that the public be given not less than 25 days for the submission of comments prior to the board's consideration of the proposed transaction. Upon the conclusion of those 25 days, the bank should expeditiously prepare materials submitted in public comments for consideration by the board. Transactions in excess of $100 million are currently subject to review by the Congress for 25 days a session, which can be longer than 25 calendar days, as our intent is that the board proceed with consideration of a pending application as soon as legally and practically possible.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill in that it reauthorizes the Export-Import Bank for 3 years. It ends uncertainty for business and provides the resources necessary to keep American manufacturers competitive in the global market—$32 billion in financing to thousands of companies, which supports 290,000 jobs.

In Massachusetts, the Ex-Im Bank works with InteliCoat Technologies, a manufacturer of coated paper in South Hadley, that employs 100 people. It also has an important role with Wyman-Gordon, a manufacturer in the aerospace industry located in North Grafton, Massachusetts, with almost 600 employees.

This is critical support that is offered for American employers who seek to level the playing field against global competitors. It's supported broadly by labor and business, and I urge all of us to support H.R. 2072.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri, my friend, Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), and I rise today in support of H.R. 2072, the Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act.

There's been a lot of distracting talk surrounding reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. So I would like to be clear.This is a jobs bill. The Ex-Im financing helps provide jobs for employees of U.S. manufacturers and small businesses, all at no cost to taxpayers. In fact, this government program actually makes money and returns it to the Treasury.

Critics say that Ex-Im lending only benefits the Nation's largest corporations, but this is simply not the case, as the minority whip just indicated a moment ago.

I have 5 companies in my district that benefit from Ex-Im Bank financing. Not one of them is a multinational corporation and none have received millions and millions and millions of dollars. It's because of the support of Ex-Im that they have been able to grow their businesses, hire employees, and increase their exports.

One of those small businesses had this to say about Ex-Im:

For the last 5 years, Ex-Im has supported 17 percent of our export sales. That converts to 10 full-time jobs for 5 years. Our employees and their families rely on Ex-Im financing to support our export sales.

This isn't the testimony of a Fortune 100 CEO. This is the voice of a family-run, multigenerational small business that relies on Ex-Im to help manage the risk of extending credit to buyers outside the U.S. This is a manufacturer that during the housing crisis had to lay off three-quarters of its employees, but thanks in large part to Ex-Im, financing was able to survive the downturn, and it started to grow again.

I want to remind my colleagues that this bill also makes meaningful reforms to the Export-Import Bank. Despite the fact that the bank has an incredibly low default rate—less than 2 percent—this bill takes additional steps to protect taxpayers and reduce export subsidies over time.

I commend Majority Leader CANTOR for creating a bill that simultaneously helps to create jobs and mandates reform, and I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2072, the Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act.

The Export-Import Bank creates jobs, reduces our trade deficit, and helps to lower our national debt. It's a tool that our manufacturers—both large and small—use to expand their sales to customers around the world so they can keep creating jobs here at home.

In Washington State's Second Congressional District, the Ex-Im Bank has helped finance the sale of more than $22 billion in exports from 13 companies, including, importantly, seven small businesses.

Last week, I sat down with three businesses in my district that have used the bank. The CEO of one of these companies told me the bank has been indispensable in allowing their business to grow and support 25 full-time employees.

I was very pleased to introduce a bipartisan bill earlier this year with Congressman MANZULLO to reauthorize and expand the Ex-Im Bank and am very happy that Whip HOYER and Leader CANTOR were able to work out this sensible, bipartisan agreement that is largely in line with the bill I introduced, H.R. 4302.

I call on my colleagues to pass this bill so we can keep America open for business.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2072, the Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act.

The Export-Import Bank creates jobs.

It reduces our trade deficit.

And helps to lower our national debt.

It is a tool that our manufacturers, both large and small, use to expand their sales to customers around the world so they can keep creating jobs here at home.

In Washington's 2nd Congressional District, the Ex-Im Bank has helped finance the sale of more than $22 billion in exports from 13 companies, including 7 small businesses.

Last week I sat down with three businesses in Whatcom County that have used the Bank.

They told me the Bank is a critical tool, without which they would not be able to sell overseas.

The CEO of one of those companies, Western Chemical in Ferndale, Wash., which makes fish health products, told me the Bank has been, quote, ''indispensable in allowing our business to grow to $2M in annual Washington State exports this year and $5 million next year and supports 25 full-time employees.''

The Bank also supports our much larger exporters.

Hundreds of the women and men who make the Boeing 767, 777, and new 787 aircraft in Everett, Wash., recently wrote me urging Congress to reauthorize the Bank because their jobs and our local economy rely on it.

The Ex-Im Bank has been so successful in recent years in boosting our exports that its lending authority needs to be expanded to keep up with our growing manufacturers.

I was proud to introduce a bipartisan bill earlier this year with Congressman MANZULLO to reauthorize and expand the Ex-Im Bank.

I am pleased that Whip HOYER and Leader CANTOR were able to work out this sensible, bipartisan agreement that is largely in line with the bill I introduced, H.R. 4302.

I know some of the critics of this bill will call this corporate welfare and say it is government manipulating in the market.

The fact of the matter is every other major economy has a similar export-promotion program, and if we were to let the Ex-Im Bank expire, it would only help foreign companies at the expense of American exports and American jobs.

Not only that, but the Ex-Im Bank is an investment that pays dividends back to the U.S. taxpayer, helping to reduce our deficit by $1.9 billion in the last five years alone.

Thousands of workers in my district and around the country depend on the Ex-Im Bank for their jobs.

I thank Whip HOYER and Leader CANTOR for their work on this bill, as well as Congressman MANZULLO for his work with me on this issue.

I call on my colleagues to pass this bill so we can keep America open for business.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, the vice chair of the subcommittee, Mr. DOLD.

Mr. DOLD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I certainly think this is an important topic because we talk about jobs and the economy as the number one issue that we face in this country.

Today I'm pleased to come down and rise in support of the Ex-Im Bank, as it is something that I think is vital, something that we worked on in a bipartisan fashion through the committee, and something that I think all of our colleagues should be supporting.

When we look at what the Ex-Im Bank does, most of us think oftentimes about large businesses, whether it be Boeing or others. The fact still remains that certainly across the country—and I know in my district, the 10th District of Illinois—83 percent of all the loans actually go to small business, but it does help big businesses.

Back in my district, we have one of the largest manufacturing districts in the country. Over 93,000 employees are in manufacturing, and well over 50,000 of those employees rely upon exports. The world today is flatter than it's ever been, and we need to make sure that our companies are competitive in the global marketplace. Again, I want to emphasize, 83 percent of those loans go to small businesses. But we can take a look at the big businesses, and we can take a look at Boeing. When a Boeing Jetliner 777 lands anywhere in the world, it lands with the help of 22,000 small businesses. Most of them are right here at home.

So when the minority whip talks about making it here in America, we do want to make it here in America. We want to make sure that American workers have a level playing field, and we want to sell American all over the globe. We want to make sure that we are giving them the opportunity. The Ex-Im Bank is going to be done at no cost to the taxpayer. We're going to bring dollars actually into the Federal Treasury. We want to make sure that we're giving our businesses an opportunity to compete, because what this is about is making sure we can sell American all over the globe. So I want to urge my colleagues to support this bill.

In 2011 alone, the bank supported over 288,000 American jobs and helped finance over 3,600 American companies. This is an important piece of legislation, and one that we should all be able to get behind. With every $1 billion of exports, they say 7,200 jobs are created. This is a jobs bill. When we talk about jobs and the economy, this is the time. I urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 1300

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

The Wall Street Journal calls support for the Export-Import Bank ''job creation, French style.'' I'm not sure why they pick on the French.

While the House Republicans have been agonizing about acting, export powerhouses like China have been dramatically increasing their export financing programs. Over the past year, China issued four times the amount invested by the U.S. And China is not alone. Germany, France, and India all provided at least seven times more export assistance, as a share of GDP, than the U.S.

The rigid attitude of The Wall Street Journal is that, if the other side rigs the field of competition, you should do nothing. They believe that those nations will only hurt themselves if they act and that it will all work out in the wash in the end. The problem is that, in the meanwhile, you drown.

I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank my good friend for yielding, Mr. Speaker.

It seems that, oftentimes around here, there are some people who believe that all government programs are good and are not to be expanded and are to be kept, and there are some who believe that all government programs are bad and that they all ought to be terminated. But you know what? Neither one of those extremes are right. You should look at a program and determine: Is it constitutional? Is it cost-effective? And does it work? The Ex-Im Bank is all three, and I would like to make five points on that.

First of all, it is clearly a Federal responsibility to facilitate exports, something clearly enumerated in the Federalist Papers by Alexander Hamilton.

Second of all, in the perfect world, perhaps we wouldn't have to do this. In a perfect world, we wouldn't have to have airport security; but we do, for obvious reasons. And we have to have this because lots of other countries do, and we will not be competing on a level playing field and we will lose exports if we don't have this facility available for American companies exporting goods.

Third, it hasn't cost the taxpayer any money. It's actually made $3.7 billion for the taxpayer. We're always talking about programs here that cost the taxpayer money. This hasn't, it doesn't, and it won't. And that is something that should be clear.

Fourth, there's nothing wrong with big businesses. In America, we normally reward success. We celebrate success. And a big business is successful. But the fact is that 87 percent of the transactions from Ex-Im Bank are to small businesses. If you were to see the roughly dozen businesses in my district that have accessed Ex-Im Bank loans for exports, none of you would have heard of any of them—and I haven't heard of most of them—because they are very small businesses, and those people are benefiting from this.

And fifth, Ex-Im Bank loans support roughly 300,000 U.S. jobs that produce those goods that are exported under these loans. On this day, when we are looking for jobs in this country, these are 300,000 jobs supported by a bank that doesn't cost the taxpayer any money, that returns money to the taxpayer, and it is clearly part of the original intent.

We should vote for this bill.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. DICKS. I thank my friend for yielding to me.

I want to associate myself with Mr. CAMPBELL's very accurate comments.

Let me begin by extending my deepest thanks to one of my best friends, the minority whip, Mr. HOYER, for his tireless efforts to reach an agreement with the majority on this bill. And I also appreciate the work of the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, on this bill. Without their personal commitment, time, and effort to this bill, I do not believe that we would be here today to pass this important legislation, which would have been an absolute disaster for the economy of the United States.

I have been a supporter of the Export-Import Bank since I arrived in Congress in 1977.

Simply put, the Ex-Im Bank supports the sale of American-made products overseas when private financing is not available. According to the Ex-Im Bank's 2011 annual report, the bank supported $32.7 billion in exports last year and over 288,000 American jobs. Many of these jobs are in the Pacific Northwest and in my congressional district.

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

Mr. DICKS. The important point is, let's vote for this bill.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DICKS: I write to ask for your support for H.R. 2072, the Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011, which reauthorizes the U.S. Export-Import (EXIM) Bank. EXIM is the official export credit agency of the U.S. and assists U.S. businesses in financing the export of goods and services around the world. EXIM's charter expires on May 31, 2012 and failure to reauthorize its operations in the weeks ahead could put at risk billions of dollars in U.S. exports and tens of thousands of American jobs.

Thanks to the efforts of Congressman Cantor, Congressman Hoyer and numerous Members of the House, H.R. 2072 is bipartisan legislation authorizing EXIM to operate for the next three years and raising the Bank's lending authority to $140 billion. The legislation also contains a number of important initiatives and reforms that will strengthen Congress's ability to oversee the Bank's operations and improve the transparency of the Bank's transactions. Reauthorization of EXIM is backed by a wide range of associations and third parties including the National Association of Manufacturers, the IAM, the U.S. Chamber of Congress and the Business Roundtable.

Support for EXIM reauthorization translates into U.S. jobs. In Fiscal Year 2011, the Bank reports that it supported more than $40 billion in exports helping to create or sustain an estimated 290,000 direct and indirect U.S. jobs at more than 3,600 small and large companies. And more than 80% of the Bank's transactions support U.S. small businesses. In addition, EXIM is financially self-sustaining and actually contributes to reducing the Nation's deficit. Since the Bank was last reauthorized in 2006, it has returned more than $3 billion to the U.S. Treasury beyond the costs of its operations.

Reauthorization of the EXIM Bank is critical to the ability of U.S. exporters to compete on a level playing field in a commercial market where current and future competitors continue to enjoy aggressive support from their countries' export credit agencies.

I urge your strong support for H.R. 2072.

Sincerely,

TIM KEATING,
Senior Vice President, Government Operations, The Boeing Company.

The agreement announced last week on a long-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank ends uncertainty for businesses and provides the Export-Import Bank resources needed to keep American manufacturers competitive in a global market. This agreement is an important part of Democrats' Make It In America plan to create an encouraging environment for businesses to innovate and make products here in the U.S., and is supported by everyone from labor to business:

Thomas Buffenbarger, President of International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers: ''The bipartisan bill H.R. 2072 . . . represents a clear break from the Beltway politics that have failed to address the real struggles of ordinary Americans. During this time of intense global competition and persistent high unemployment, U.S. exporters need the critical resources of the Ex-Im Bank. I strongly urge you to support American jobs and to vote for this important legislation.''

Thomas J. Donohue, President and CEO of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce: ''This is great news for thousands of American workers, businesses of all sizes, and taxpayers, who can cheer the fact that this bill will reduce the deficit by hundreds of millions of dollars. When other countries are providing their own exporters with an estimated $1 trillion in export finance—often on terms more generous than Ex-Im can provide—failure to reauthorize Ex-Im would amount to unilateral disarmament and cost tens of thousands of American jobs. This bill will guarantee a level financial playing field in export markets and ensure transparency in Ex-Im's operations. For that reason, the Chamber urges Congress to swiftly pass this bill to reauthorize Ex-Im.''

R. Bruce Josten, Executive Vice President for Government Affairs of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce: ''Failure to enact this bill would put at risk the nearly 300,000 American jobs at 3,600 companies that depend on Ex-Im to compete in global markets. ExIm is especially important to small- and medium-sized businesses, which account for more than 85 percent of Ex-Im's transactions . . . The Chamber strongly supports H.R. 2072 and urges the House to consider this issue as expeditiously as possible. The Chamber will include votes on, or in relation to, this bill in our annual How They Voted scorecard.''

Jay Timmons, President and CEO of National Association of Manufacturers (NAM): ''The bill announced today to reauthorize the Bank and increase its lending cap brings us a step closer to protecting these jobs and will be a vital tool for small manufacturers exporting to new markets. It is essential to manufacturers' global competitiveness, and we are pleased that Majority Leader Cantor and Minority Whip Hoyer have come together on an authorization . . . We urge all members of the House to support this jobs legislation, and we hope the Senate will also move forward quickly. The Ex-Im Bank means jobs and increased exports, which will help us grow our economy and remain competitive.''

Doug Oberhelman, Chairman and CEO of Caterpillar Inc., and Chair of Business Roundtable's International Engagement Committee: ''The Ex-Im Bank is critical to the ability of U.S. companies—large and small—to compete on a level playing field against overseas competitors who have access to similar export credit programs . . . Failure to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank on a long-term basis and at appropriate credit levels would disadvantage U.S. businesses competing for sales in foreign markets, potentially putting thousands of U.S. jobs at risk.''

Tim Keating, Senior Vice President of Government Operations of The Boeing Company: ''. . . H.R. 2072 is bipartisan legislation authorizing EXIM to operate for the next three years and raising the Bank's lending authority to $140 billion. The legislation also contains a number of important initiatives and reforms that will strengthen Congress's ability to oversee the Bank's operations and improve the transparency of the Bank's transactions. . . Reauthorization of the EX-IM Bank is critical to the ability of U.S. exporters to compete on a level playing field in a commercial market where current and future competitors continue to enjoy aggressive support from their countries' export credit agencies. I urge your strong support for H.R. 2072.''

Andrew Liveris, Chairman and CEO of The Dow Chemical Company: ''I am writing to urge you to support the pending legislation to reauthorize the Export-Import (ExIm) Bank. The proposed draft three-year reauthorization with a graduated cap to $140 billion provides certainty and support for America's exporters. . . I urge your favorable vote to support and sustain American jobs, boost small businesses, and expand export opportunities for U.S. companies.''

Capt. Lee Moak, President of the Air Line Pilots Association, International: ''This is a positive move toward leveling the playing field for U.S. airlines and their workers in the global marketplace. The reauthorization bill will aid in ending subsidies for widebody airplanes. This action will help to level the playing field for U.S. airlines that compete with foreign airlines, including many that are state-sponsored, that buy U.S.- and European-manufactured planes at below-market rates unavailable to U.S. and many European airlines. This subsidized financing gives our foreign competitors a significant cost advantage, allowing them to drive U.S. airlines out of international routes and costing airline workers' jobs.''

Nicholas Calio, President and CEO of A4A: ''We appreciate the hard work of Republican House Majority Leader Eric Cantor and Democratic House Minority Whip Steny Hoyer, who negotiated a bipartisan agreement that ensures increased transparency in the Ex-Im bank's lending practices, calls for greater economic impact analysis of loans and would implement other important reforms, and we urge passage of the agreement.''

Pete Bunce, President and CEO of General Aviation Manufacturers Association: ''General aviation jobs will be put in jeopardy if the Export-Import Bank is not reauthorized. Furthermore, general aviation manufacturing is one of the few remaining industries that contribute positively to the U.S. balance of trade. Our member companies have dramatically increased their use of Export-Import Bank financing over the past several years. Continued lending authority is essential to the success of general aviation manufacturing to compete globally. . . We appreciate the bi-partisan effort in the House to move this legislation and we urge every House member to support it. We also call on the Senate to act quickly in order to avoid any lending disruption.''

Letter from Local Chambers of Commerce: ''Without Ex-Im reauthorization, our country's exporters won't be able to compete effectively in the global marketplace. We urge you to join us in supporting swift Ex-im Bank reauthorization.''

John Hardy, Jr., President of Coalition for Employment through Exports (CEE) and William Reinsch, President of National Foreign Trade Council (NFTC): ''[We] write in support of H.R. 2072, the Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011, and strongly [urge] your affirmative vote for reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank of the U.S. H.R. 2072's three year extension provides assurance of Ex-Im Bank's continued critical presence in the global export market, its lending limit provides adequate flexibility for the Bank to respond to market demands, and it contains increased taxpayer protections to ensure the continued viability of the Bank.''

Cass Johnson, President of National Council of Textile Organizations (NCTO) and Kevin Burke, President & CEO, American Apparel & Footwear Association (AAFA): ''[We] write in strong support of H.R. 2072—Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011. In addition to re-authorizing the Export-Import Bank . . . the legislation contains provisions that will create important new avenues of financing for the textile and apparel global supply chain.''

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of H.R. 2072, Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011.

Make no mistake, I am no fan of government subsidies. Export subsidies distort the free market and global trade. And in a perfect world, the Ex-Im Bank, along with its counterparts in Europe, Asia, and elsewhere, would not exist.

But like any other barrier to free trade, the best way to level the playing field and open up markets is through negotiation. Our country has long had a policy to negotiate an end to barriers which prevent the free flow of goods and services. And now, Mr. Speaker, for the first time, with this bill, it will be U.S. policy to initiate and pursue negotiations to end government export subsidies. This is not just a worthwhile goal; it is actually an achievable one.

Now, I know some suggest that we shouldn't negotiate and that we should just shutter the Export-Import Bank right now, that we shouldn't pass the bill, but I would tell my colleagues that I believe that amounts to unilateral disarmament. American businesses and American workers would suffer from unfair competition with subsidized foreign competitors. This bill, with these reforms, offers a better way.

As important as ensuring that we do not unilaterally disarm American business is, bringing strong, necessary reforms to the Export-Import Bank to protect American taxpayers is equally important. I am pleased to say that this bill accomplishes both.

The bill requires Ex-Im Bank to keep default rates below 2 percent. If the bank's default rate exceeds 2 percent, access to any additional capital is shut off while corrective action to bring the default rate below 2 percent would be instituted. If the Ex-Im Bank fails to fix the problem within 6 months, an audit will be conducted by an independent third party to recommend both to Congress and the Treasury Secretary necessary fixes.

The legislation, Mr. Speaker, includes numerous other reforms, including a risk management review, business plans, and an ''anti-Solyndra'' provision to protect taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, in urging support of this bipartisan legislation, I would like to recognize two colleagues in particular: GARY MILLER, the gentleman from California, and STENY HOYER, the Democratic whip from Maryland. Their hard work helped produce a bill that helps American business while also protecting American taxpayers.

I urge passage of this bill.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank my great friend and colleague from the great State of New York for yielding me time and for her leadership on so many important areas before this Congress.

I rise in strong support of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act. I would also like to commend the Democratic whip, the distinguished leader from Maryland, STENY HOYER, for working with the other side of the aisle to bring this bill to the floor today with a 3-year reauthorization and an increase in the Ex-Im Bank's exposure cap. I hope that we'll see more of this type of cooperation on important legislation from both sides of the aisle, as we have seen on this bill.

□ 1310

The Ex-Im Bank has provided $32.7 billion in financing and supported 290,000 jobs across our great country. Eighty percent of those companies that were supported were small businesses—and at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

It is critical to America and critical to districts such as mine in New York. The bank has financed $1.7 billion in export sales in my district alone and $4.4 billion in the State of New York over the past 5 years. And the bank supports 128 firms in my district, either directly or indirectly. These are jobs for my constituents, and it is critically important that we reauthorize this bank before its charter expires at the end of the month.

Some important changes and improvements have been made to the bill over the past few weeks that will strengthen taxpayer protection provisions and that will enhance transparency at the bank. So I commend my colleagues, and I urge support for this bill. I hope we see more examples of bipartisan support on important projects, as we're seeing today.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my good friend, a forceful conservative voice in Congress, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding to a dissenting point of view.

Mr. Speaker, this program dragoons American taxpayers into subsidizing loans to foreign companies, making it cheaper for them to buy products from politically favored companies, which in turn use those products to compete against less-favored American companies. Past beneficiaries include such upstanding enterprises as Solyndra and Enron.

Since 2007, almost half of its money goes to support that plucky little start-up called Boeing. Air India got $5 billion to purchase Boeing aircraft, allowing them to undercut American carriers like Delta with their own tax money.

We're told we need this to compete with other nations that do the same thing. Well, Mr. Speaker, if other nations want to impoverish themselves in this manner, we don't need to imitate them.

We're told this doesn't cost the taxpayers money, and the last few years this turned to profit. Well, that's what they told us about Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac—until they blew up in our face.

Legitimate companies have plenty of access to private capital. They don't need these subsidies. The illegitimate ones shouldn't be propped up with the hard-earned dollars of working taxpaying Americans.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentlelady.

I want to commend STENY HOYER and ERIC CANTOR, the majority leader, for their work on this.

I rise as a long-time supporter of the Ex-Im Bank, and particularly in the last few months they've done over $17 billion in sales, financed with some $14 billion. And no tax dollars involved. I would like to commend the work particularly of the first vice president, Wanda Felton, who is a graduate of my alma mater, the University of Pennsylvania, and also a graduate of Harvard Business School, helping to lead this agency.

They're doing tens of millions of transactions with companies in my district and they're doing billions throughout the country, with 129,000 jobs just in the last 11 months supported through this agency.

This is an important vote. I thank the bipartisan leadership of the Congress for bringing this agreement to move forward and reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY. I thank the gentleman.

In a perfect world we wouldn't be having this discussion. And in my office, I have a really attractive little snow globe that is very nice. You turn it upside down and the snow drifts down on this beautiful little scene in Washington. It would be nice if the global economy worked that way. But actually, we're in a global economy that you'd better be able to swim with the sharks, and you better have the same set of teeth that they have.

So when we talk about the Ex-Im Bank and the advantages of what we're trying to put together for our companies, we're asking these people, we're urging them, and we're encouraging them to make capital investments to go out and hire people and expand their markets. And we're saying, We're going to send you into battle, but by the way, you're not going to have the same tools and the same weapons that other people have.

So this is such a commonsense approach to what we're facing. Again, I say in a snow-globe world it would be wonderful to sit back, where everybody played by the rules, everybody played fair, and we could compete on an equal basis without everybody getting gamed. That's not the way it works. We know what we need to do. If we're really going to create jobs, if we're going to move this economy, if we're going to do the things that we need to do to create the revenues that we need to create to fund this wonderful government of ours, then we've got to look at this Ex-Im bill and pass it.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind everybody that in the Fourth Congressional District in California, $752 million in financing support came from the Export-Import Bank.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. We have the right to close, I believe. I would be happy to reserve so the gentlelady could close.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Number one, I want to say how wonderful it has been working with you, and certainly your staff. Over the last past year we have worked together, and I think that's a great example for the rest of this Chamber, to be very honest with you.

We certainly care about this bill passionately. I think it's important for the American people. It comes back to American jobs. And that's what it is. I think the majority of our Members here in Congress will see that. This is something that's important for our workers and our companies—to be able to have the ability to compete with those countries that are doing exporting. We need to stand behind our businesses. We need to stand behind, certainly, our workers.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank, again, everybody that has been involved in this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

THE SMALL BUSINESS EXPORTERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: NSBA and its international trade arm—the Small Business Exporters Association—has been outspoken advocates for a long-term reauthorization and increased exposure cap for the U.S. Export-Import (ExIm) Bank. On behalf of the small businesses that rely on Ex-Im for much-needed financing and credit insurance, I urge members to support the bi-partisan bill, H.R. 2072, the Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011, when it is considered under the suspension calendar later this week.

Ex-Im Bank is an independent federal agency that helps create and maintain U.S. jobs by filling gaps in private export financing at no cost to American taxpayers. The Bank provides a variety of financing mechanisms, including working capital financing, export-credit insurance and financial guarantees to help foreign buyers purchase U.S. goods and services.

We applaud House Majority Leader Eric Cantor and House Minority Whip Steny Hoyer for their dedication and bipartisan efforts to settle on a compromise to reauthorize Ex-Im's charter to 2014 and raise its loan exposure cap incrementally to $140 billion. The three-year extension cap gradually increases from $120 billion for the remainder of 2012, to $130 billion in 2013 and ultimately reaches $140 billion for 2014, provided certain default requirements are met.

Ex-Im Bank remains a catalyst for the expansion of small-business exports while continuing to support businesses confronting aggressive foreign competition. In fact, for FY 2011, Ex-Im Bank set a record in its support of small business at $6 billion—an increase of more than 20 percent since 2010. Furthermore, in 2011 alone, Ex-Im Bank supported 290,000 jobs and $41 billion in exports.

Absent Congressional action, the Bank's authorization will not only expire at the end of this month but it will have bumped up against its $100 billion cap and be unable to take on further transactions in the pipeline. Any uncertainty could have a devastating effect on small businesses' ability to follow through on sales even though there are buyers who want their products.

Ex-Im Bank enables U.S. companies—large and small—to turn export opportunities into real sales, thus maintaining and creating U.S. jobs and contributing to a stronger national economy. We strongly urge you to support H.R. 2072 and approve this compromise legislation without further delay.

Sincerely,

TODD MCCRACKEN,
President and CEO.

MAY 8, 2012.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOYER: The Coalition for Employment through Exports (CEE) and National Foreign Trade Council (NFTC) write in support of H.R. 2072, the Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011, and strongly urges your affirmative vote for reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank of the U.S. H.R 2072's three year extension provides assurance of Ex-Im Bank's continued critical presence in the global export market, its lending limit provides adequate flexibility for the Bank to respond to market demands, and it contains increased taxpayer protections to ensure the continued viability of the Bank.

This revenue generating agency provides critical support for American exporters seeking a level playing field against global competitors which have the aggressive support of their own export credit agencies. Ex-Im Bank provides financing to prospective foreign buyers of U.S goods and services who also have the option of purchasing foreign goods backed by other export credit agencies (ECAs). Instead of providing subsides and corporate welfare, Ex-Im charges fees and interest to the users of these programs, resulting in a net profit for the U.S. Treasury.

Over 86% of the transactions Ex-Im supported in 2011 helped small businesses. Ex-Im Bank is uniquely able to provide support for small business owners who are less familiar with the global economy. The Bank is able to ensure that these companies have access to foreign markets and thus can grow their businesses and support jobs in their local communities. In 2011, Ex-Im Bank supported over $6 billion in small business exports and they are on track to grow that number in 2012.

Ex-Im Bank is a demand driven institution that responds to the needs of American exporters. Other governments are now expanding their own ECAs to help stimulate their economies and H.R. 2072 will enable Ex-Im Bank to ensure that American companies have similar support. As long as a company—regardless of size or type of product—fits the Bank's requirements, such as reasonable assurance of repayment, the Bank will provide financing support to that company.

The Bank does not compete with the private sector, but fills needed gaps in private sector financing to increase U.S. companies' ability to export.

H.R. 2072 also encourage the Bank to take into account the reality of our innovative economy by increasing support for services and high-tech jobs while continuing its strong support for manufacturing jobs.

CEE and NFTC urge your vote in support of H.R. 2072, a critical jobs bill that will strengthen the U.S. economy.

Sincerely,

JOHN HARDY JR.,
President, Coalition for Employment through Exports.
WILLIAM A. REINSCH,
President, National Foreign Trade Council.

MAY 8, 2012.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. ERIC CANTOR,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. STENY HOYER,
Minority Whip, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, MAJORITY LEADER CANTOR, MINORITY LEADER PELOSI, AND MINORITY WHIP HOYER: We are writing to express our support for the Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011 (H.R. 2072), which reauthorizes the U.S. Export-Import Bank (Ex-Im Bank). H.R. 2072 will ensure Ex-Im Bank's continued support of U.S. export sales as well as high value manufacturing and service jobs. We urge the House to act quickly and affirmatively on this essential piece of legislation.

We applaud House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R VA) and Minority Whip Steny Hoyer (D MD) for their hard work and bipartisan effort. This legislation provides Ex-Im Bank with a three-year reauthorization and lending authority which recognizes the important role Ex-Im plays for U.S. exporters at a time when exports are increasingly critical to the economy and job recovery. Additionally, their efforts to include financial reforms in H.R. 2072 will ensure that the Bank remains fiscally sound and continues to provide revenue to the U.S. Treasury.

With Ex-Im's charter expiring at the end of May, we urge both the House and Senate to act quickly to pass reauthorization legislation that can be sent to the President for his signature. H.R. 2072 sends the right message: American exporters have the support of the United States government to level the playing field in global markets and create jobs at home.

Sincerely,

Aerospace Industry Association; American Association of Exporters and Importers; Business Roundtable; Chamber of Commerce; Coalition for Employment through Exports; Emergency Committee for American Trade; Financial Services Roundtable; General Aviation Manufacturers Association; National Association of Manufacturers; National Foreign Trade Council; National Small Business Association; Nuclear Energy Institute; Satellite Industry Association; Small Business Exporters Association; TechAmerica; Water and Wastewater Equipment Manufacturers Association, Inc.

THE DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY,
Midland, MI, May 7, 2012.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CAMP: I am writing to urge you to support the pending legislation

to reauthorize the Export-Import (Exim) Bank. The proposed draft three-year reauthorization with a graduated cap to $140 billion provides certainty and support for America's exporters. The draft further includes more details on transparency and reporting provisions that will demonstrate Exim's value to the broader American public.

For Dow, the Exim Bank is a crucial component to our Sadara joint venture to build a world-scale, fully integrated chemicals complex in Saudi Arabia. Set to open in 2015, the Sadara Chemical Company is expected to generate thousands of direct and indirect jobs in the United States. The venture has already created several hundred American jobs in our project team, and over $1 billion In supplier contracts to U.S.-based companies. With Wm Bank funding, the project is set to create another $2 billion in project orders and long-term contracts with American manufacturers.

Attached is Dow's fact sheet as well as an analysis chart highlighting the necessary role Exim Bank plays in leveling the playing field against foreign competition. Other countries significantly outspend the U.S. in supporting exports and promoting their local companies in large projects. If Exim Bank cannot fund projects—if we unilaterally disarm—American companies will operate at a serious disadvantage in relation to their foreign counterparts.

I urge your favorable vote to support and sustain American jobs, boost small businesses and expand export opportunities for U.S. companies.

My office will follow up with your staff to ensure you have all the details necessary.

Sincerely,

ANDREW N. LIVERIS.

Attachments (2).

FACT SHEET, EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE US

Creating and Sustaining American Jobs

Export-Import Bank Reauthorization is critical to America's export competitiveness: The Export-Import Bank of the US (ExIm) is currently operating under a series of temporary extensions to its charter, with the same $100B lending cap that is now more than four years old. Export financing is a critical component of investing for growth and accessing new customers in emerging markets, for both small and large companies. ExIm financing supports these projects while also turning a profit for the US Treasury—as defined in ExIm's annual report to Congress—which is to the benefit of companies, their workers and US taxpayers. ExIm financing is critical to help level the playing field for American exporters who compete against the more significant export financing practices of other countries. ExIm needs to be reauthorized for a full four-year mandate and its lending cap needs to be increased to $135B to continue to grow American export opportunities.

ExIm enables projects that create American exports and sustain US jobs—The Sadara Chemical Company: In July 2011, Dow announced the formation of Sadara, a joint venture with Saudi Aramco to build a world-scale, fully integrated chemicals complex in Saudi Arabia. The complex, to open in 2015, will be one of the world's largest integrated chemical facilities. Sadara Chemical Company is expected to generate thousands of direct and indirect jobs.

Full reauthorization of ExIm is crucial to sustaining and growing jobs in the United States through projects such as Sadara

Job Creation Facts

Sadara sustains jobs in the US by establishing a presence in this growing region which secures access to competitive feedstocks that help Dow serve the fast growing markets of Asia Pacific.

The project is already responsible for employing upwards of 400 workers on the Dow joint venture project team in the Houston and California areas.

Since 2007, the Dow-Saudi Aramco Joint Venture has generated over $1B in contracts working with 18 different US-based companies for engineering, design and other high-value contributions.

In August 2011, US-based Fluor Corporation was awarded a substantial engineering, procurement and construction management (EPCM) services contract to manage ongoing activities at the site.

With ExIm funding, the project is set to create another $2B in project orders and long-term contracts.

Long-term, the project will help sustain American jobs through contracts to Dow staff to manage Product Marketing and Lifting Agreements (PMLAs). These jobs will be based at Dow in the US and in other Dow locations globally, supporting the management and marketing of our joint venture's products around the world.

ExIm Background

Nationwide, ExIm has supported nearly 11,000 transactions with $65.5B in authorized financing over the past five years. This support has directly benefitted more than 2,000 communities across the United States. The financing that ExIm provides to small businesses is contributing to a significant increase in exports—in FY 2011 the Bank increased small business transactions to a record $6B, up $1B from the previous year. Eighty-seven percent of total ExIm transactions benefit small business. In Michigan, the bank has supported 70 separate communities, 119 companies and financed a total of $2.1B in exports during the last five years. All the while, the Ex-Im Bank has generated almost $2B in revenue for the US Treasury, $400 million in FY 2011 alone.

If you have any additional questions, please contact: Lisa Schroeter, Global Director of Trade & Investment Policy, Dow Chemical @ lmschroeter@dow.com; or +12024293407.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I write to ask for your support for H.R. 2072, the Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011, which reauthorizes the U.S. Export-Import (EXIM) Bank. EXIM is the official export credit agency of the U.S. and assists U.S. businesses in financing the export of goods and services around the world. EXIM's charter expires on May 31, 2012 and failure to reauthorize its operations in the weeks ahead could put at risk billions of dollars in U.S. exports and tens of thousands of American jobs.

Thanks to the efforts of Congressman Cantor, Congressman Hoyer and numerous Members of the House, H.R. 2072 is bipartisan legislation authorizing EXIM to operate for the next three years and raising the Bank's lending authority to $140 billion. The legislation also contains a number of important initiatives and reforms that will strengthen Congress's ability to oversee the Bank's operations and improve the transparency of the Bank's transactions. Reauthorization of EXIM is backed by a wide range of associations and third parties including the National Association of Manufacturers, the IAM, the U.S. Chamber of Congress and the Business Roundtable.

Support for EX-IM reauthorization translates into U.S. jobs. In Fiscal Year 2011, the Bank reports that it supported more than $40 billion in exports helping to create or sustain an estimated 290,000 direct and indirect U.S. jobs at more than 3,600 small and large companies. And more than 80% of the Bank's transactions support U.S. small businesses. In addition, EXIM is financially self-sustaining and actually contributes to reducing the Nation's deficit. Since the Bank was last reauthorized in 2006, it has returned more than $3 billion to the U.S. Treasury beyond the costs of its operations.

Reauthorization of the EX-IM Bank is critical to the ability of U.S. exporters to compete on a level playing field in a commercial market where current and future competitors continue to enjoy aggressive support from their countries' export credit agencies.

I urge your strong support for H.R. 2072.

Sincerely,

TIM KEATING,
Senior Vice President, Government Operations, The Boeing Company.

AMERICAN APPAREL & FOOTWEAR ASSOCIATION AND NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEXTILE ORGANIZATIONS,
May 8, 2012.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned organizations write in strong support of H.R. 2072—Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011. In addition to re-authorizing the Export-Import Bank (Bank), the legislation contains provisions that will create important new avenues of financing for the textile and apparel global supply chain.

The Bank performs an important function for U.S. companies seeking markets for U.S.-made products. The Bank enables U.S. companies to turn export opportunities into real sales by providing export-financing products that fill gaps in trade financing and does not compete with private sector lenders. However, the Bank today does not offer meaningful Supply Chain Financing to the global textile and apparel industry supply chain.

This legislation includes key provisions that support the textile and apparel global supply chain by adding textile industry representation on the Bank's Advisory Committee and through the execution of two reports to Congress. First, the Advisory Committee will be required to consider ways to promote the financing of Bank transactions for the textile industry and determine ways to increase Bank support for exports of textile components or inputs. These findings will be included in the Bank's Annual Report to Congress. Second, the Bank will be required to conduct a separate analysis of the textile and apparel industry's use of current Bank products and the impediments to use of those products. The analysis will include proposals for how the Bank could provide more financing as well as proposals for new products.

We strongly believe that this language takes an important step in establishing sound financing options for the textile and apparel global supply chain by creating sorely needed liquidity for the textile and apparel supply chain in the Western Hemisphere, which has become an important export market for U.S. textile companies and an important sourcing location for major apparel brands and retailers.

We again urge you to vote yes on H.R. 2072—Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011.

Sincerely,

CASS JOHNSON,
National Council of Textile Organizations (NCTO).

KEVIN BURKE,
President & CEO, American Apparel & Footwear Association (AAFA).

AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION, INTERNATIONAL,
Washington, DC, May 4, 2012.

ALPA HAILS AGREEMENT ON EX-IM BANK REAUTHORIZATION

WASHINGTON.—The following statement is from Capt. Lee Moak, president of the Air Line Pilots Association, Int'l, on today's bipartisan agreement on the Export-Import Bank's reauthorization.

''The bipartisan reforms announced today to aircraft financing by the Export-Import Bank are a first step toward ending worldwide subsidies of widebody aircraft and will help to protect U.S. airline workers from unmerited, subsidized foreign competition. The reforms will also shine some desperately needed light on the Bank's financing processes.

''By directing the United States to negotiate with the four European countries that finance Airbus, the reauthorization will help bring about a necessary end to worldwide subsidies of widebody aircraft. There is no justifiable reason why U.S. taxpayer money should be used to put one sector of jobs at a disadvantage while helping another.

''Getting things done in Washington, D.C., is about compromise, and I am pleased that all parties were able to come together to agree to this reasonable settlement. I applaud the leadership of Majority Leader Cantor and Minority Whip Hoyer for their diligent work to bring this compromise together in a way that protects U.S. manufacturing and airline jobs. I am encouraged that the House intends to take up this legislation next week, and I hope that the Senate will follow this action with haste.

''It is important to ensure that U.S. taxpayer dollars are not used in a way that potentially has a net detrimental effect on U.S. employment. This agreement today recognizes this fact and is designed to correct an emerging and egregious problem with Ex-Im Bank aircraft financing. This is a positive move toward leveling the playing field for U.S. airlines and their workers in the global marketplace.

''The reauthorization bill will aid in ending subsidies for widebody airplanes. This action will help to level the playing field for U.S. airlines that compete with foreign airlines, including many that are state-sponsored, that buy U.S.- and European-manufactured planes at below-market rates unavailable to U.S. and many European airlines. This subsidized financing gives our foreign competitors a significant cost advantage, allowing them to drive U.S. airlines out of international routes and costing airline workers' jobs. More work needs to be done, and ALPA will remain vigorously engaged in this fight.''

Founded in 1931, ALPA is the world's largest pilot union, representing more than 53,000 pilots at 37 airlines in the United States and Canada. Visit the ALPA website at www.alpa.org.

MAY 7, 2012.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world' largest business federation, representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, strongly supports H.R. 2072, the ''Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012,'' a compromise bill which would reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States (Ex-Im) set to expire on May 31, 2012.

Failure to enact this bill would put at risk the nearly 300,000 American jobs at 3,600 companies that depend on Ex-Im to compete in global markets. Ex-Im is especially important to small- and medium-sized businesses, which account for more than 85 percent of Ex-Im's transactions. Tens of thousands of smaller companies that supply goods and services to large exporters also benefit from Ex-Im's activities.

Because other countries are providing their own exporters with an estimated $1 trillion in export finance—often on terms more generous than Ex-Im can provide—failure to reauthorize Ex-Im would amount to unilateral disarmament and cost tens of thousands of American jobs. China, for instance, has three export credit agencies that last year provided $300 billion in export finance to its exporters—10 times more than Ex-Im provided. This bill would help level the financial playing field in export markets and ensure transparency in Ex-Im's operations.

American taxpayers can cheer the fact that this bill would reduce the federal deficit by hundreds of millions of dollars. Far from being a subsidy for corporations, Ex-Im charges fees for its services that have generated more than $4 billion in revenue for the U.S. Treasury over the past six years. Further, Ex-Im loans expose the U.S. taxpayer to little risk because they are backed by the collateral of the goods being exported. Borrowers have defaulted on less than 2 percent of all loans backed by Ex-Im over the past eight decades, a default rate lower than commercial banks.

The Chamber strongly supports H.R. 2072 and urges the House to consider this issue as expeditiously as possible. The Chamber will include votes on, or in relation to, this bill in our annual How They Voted scorecard.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

MANUFACTS: EX-IM BANK AND EXPORT FINANCE

REAUTHORIZATION WILL HELP MANUFACTURERS GROW U.S. EXPORTS AND CREATE JOBS

For the United States to grow manufacturing jobs, we must rely on exports to faster-growing markets around the world. The Commerce Department estimates that every $1 billion increase in exports would create or support 6,250 additional manufacturing jobs.

Last year, the U.S. Export-Import (Ex-Im) Bank provided $32 billion in export financing. That financing supported more than $41 billion in exports from more than 3,600 U.S. companies. Those exports, in turn, support approximately 290,000 export-related American jobs.

Ex-Im Bank also set a record in its support of small business. More than 85 percent of Ex-Im Bank's transactions were in direct support of small business last year—a total of $6 billion in fiscal year 2011.

Ex-Im Bank boosts U.S. manufacturing competitiveness at no cost to the taxpayer. In fact, Ex-Im has helped reduce the U.S. budget deficit. Over the past five years, Ex-Im Bank has returned more than $3.4 billion to the U.S. Treasury. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the latest version of the House reauthorization bill (H.R. 2072) will return $900 million to the U.S. Treasury. Ex-Im Bank helps U.S. manufacturers compete on a level playing field in a tough global market. The U.S. trails countries like Brazil, Canada, China, Germany, France, India and Italy in official export credit volumes as a share of the national economy. Germany, France and India all provided at least seven times more export assistance as a share of GDP than the United States did in 2010.

HOW CONGRESS CAN HELP

Provide Ex-Im Bank with a stable, long-term reauthorization and a significant increase in its lending authority. Voting for reauthorization legislation—whether the House version, the Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011 (H.R. 2072), or the Senate version, the Ex-Im Bank Reauthorization Act (S. 1547)—will help grow U.S. exports and create American jobs.

MORE INFORMATION

The U.S. Export-Import (Ex-Im) Bank is a vital tool to help grow U.S. exports and increase American jobs. Ex-Im Bank's charter expired on September 30, 2011, and the Bank is currently operating under an extension that expires on May 31, 2012. It is imperative that Congress approve legislation as soon as possible to reauthorize the Bank for four years.

The House Financial Services Committee passed the Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011 (H.R. 2072) to reauthorize the bank in June 2011. The Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee passed its version of a reauthorization bill, the Ex-Im Bank Reauthorization Act (S. 1547), in September 2011. The two bills were similar, but not identical.

In December 2011, the two authorizing committees reached an agreement that would gradually increase the Bank's lending cap to $135 billion and reauthorize the Bank through fiscal year 2015, but the bill failed to move with the year-end legislative packages. A stop-gap action passed Congress in late December that included an extension of Ex-Im Bank's authorization through May 31, 2012. The bill, though, does not increase the lending cap or provide for a stable, long-term reauthorization. Without a higher lending limit, the bank will run out of funding ability in the coming months.

As the official export credit agency of the United States, Ex-Im Bank assists in financing the export of U.S. goods and services from thousands of American companies. It operates at no cost to the taxpayer, and it has a track record of returning money to the U.S. Treasury.

Ex-Im Bank is currently authorized to provide up to $100 billion in loans, guarantees and insurance to support U.S. exports. The Bank closed fiscal year 2011 at $89 billion, and the Bank will likely hit its $100 billion cap early this spring. Any company that needs Ex-Im Bank's support after that will be turned away, and American companies will lose those export sales to foreign companies who are receiving aggressive financing support from their governments.

Over the past five years, Ex-Im Bank has returned more than $3.4 billion to the U.S. Treasury. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the latest version of the House reauthorization bill (H.R. 2072) will return $900 million to the U.S. Treasury.

Ex-Im is considered the ''lender of last resort'' for U.S. exporters. As we continue to emerge from the financial crisis, Ex-Im Bank can help ensure that U.S. companies—especially small businesses—have access to the financing they need to make international sales.

A TOUGH GLOBAL MARKET FOR MANUFACTURERS

The U.S. trails countries like Brazil, Canada, China, Germany, France, India and Italy in official export credit volumes as a share of the national economy. Germany, France and India all provided at least seven times more export assistance as a share of GDP than the United States did in 2010.

In 2010, export credit agencies in Brazil and China (which are not members of the OECD) provided 10 times more financing to their exporters, as a share of GDP, than the Ex-Im Bank did for American exporters. In 2010, China issued $45 billion in new export credit compared to the United States' $13 billion.

Export Development Canada (EDC) facilitated more than $84 billion in business in 2010. Canada's credit volume is almost the

same as America's, even though its economy is about ⅛th the size of ours.

Ex-Im Bank levels the playing field for U.S. exporters by matching credit support other nations provide, ensuring U.S. exporters are able to compete based upon the price and performance features of their products. Denying Ex-Im Bank support to U.S. manufacturers is tantamount to ''unilateral disarmament'' in the marketplace.

EXPORTS ARE VITAL TO THE U.S. ECONOMY

The mature domestic U.S. market for manufactured goods is not growing as rapidly as our manufacturing productivity. For the U.S. to grow manufacturing jobs, we must rely on exports to faster-growing markets around the world.

The United States has fallen behind its competitors on the export front. In 2000, the U.S. share of global exports of manufactured goods was 13.8 percent. By 2009, our share had fallen to 8.6 percent. If we had maintained our market share, U.S. exports in 2009 would have been $435 billion higher.

The Commerce Department estimates that every $1 billion increase in exports would create or support 6,250 additional manufacturing jobs, so that $435 billion jump translates to more than 2.7 million jobs.

[From General Aviation Manufacturers Association, May 7, 2012]

GAMA URGES SWIFT ACTION ON EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

WASHINGTON, DC.—GAMA hailed the bipartisan agreement between Majority Leader Eric Cantor and Minority Whip Steny Hoyer to end an impasse over the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. The agreement extends the bank's charter for three years and increases its lending authority to $140 billion.

The General Aviation Manufacturers Association (GAMA) has supported the bank's reauthorization because this lending is vital to the industry's ability to grow and maintain exports as general aviation manufacturing recovers from the economic downturn. Additionally, the exports generated are key for job creation and for the Obama Administration's efforts to double exports by the end of 2014.

''General aviation jobs will be put in jeopardy if the Export-Import Bank is not reauthorized,'' said Pete Bunce, GAMA's president and CEO. ''Furthermore, general aviation manufacturing is one of the few remaining industries that contributes positively to the U.S. balance of trade. Our member companies have dramatically increased their use of Export-Import Bank financing over the past several years. Continued lending authority is essential to the success of general aviation manufacturing to compete globally.''

The Export-Import Bank's charter lapses on May 31 and is expected to reach its current lending limit by the end of May, if not earlier.

''We appreciate the bi-partisan effort in the House to move this legislation and we urge every House member to support it. We also call on the Senate to act quickly in order to avoid any lending disruption,'' added Bunce.

U.S. CHAMBER'S DONOHUE PRAISES HOUSE LEADERS FOR REACHING DEAL ON EX-IM

WASHINGTON, DC.—U.S. Chamber of Commerce President and CEO Thomas J. Donohue issued the following statement on the compromise legislation offered by House Majority Leader Eric Cantor and Democratic Whip Steny Hoyer to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States (Ex-Im):

''This is great news for thousands of American workers, businesses of all sizes, and taxpayers, who can cheer the fact that this bill will reduce the deficit by hundreds of millions of dollars.

''When other countries are providing their own exporters with an estimated $1 trillion in export finance—often on terms more generous than Ex-Im can provide—failure to reauthorize Ex-Im would amount to unilateral disarmament and cost tens of thousands of American jobs.

''This bill will guarantee a level financial playing field in export markets and ensure transparency in Ex-Im's operations. For that reason, the Chamber urges Congress to swiftly pass this bill to reauthorize Ex-Im.''

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS,

Washington, DC, May 7, 2012.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As President of the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE), I am writing in support of H.R. 2072, legislation to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. IFPTE, which represents over 25,000 engineering and technical workers employed in the aerospace industry, urges you to vote in support of this legislation.

H.R. 2072 will reauthorize the Export-Import Bank's lending authority to $140 billion, starting at $120 billion in 2012 and increasing by $10 billion in 2013, and again in 2014. By guaranteeing loans to foreign corporations wishing to purchase U.S. made goods, the funding increase for the Export-Import Bank will help in opening the door to increased domestic exports, including American made airplanes by Boeing workers. This is essential in sustaining America's number one export, commercial aircraft, while bolstering good paying and highly skilled U.S. jobs here at home. In addition to aerospace manufacturing, many other American industries will also benefit from this reauthorization.

IFPTE is pleased that Minority Leader Hoyer and Majority Leader Cantor were able to come to an acceptable compromise when it comes to the scope of the underwriting authority of the Export-Import Bank. This compromise will help to preserve our flourishing domestic aerospace industry and its highly skilled workforce.

Extending the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank is a responsible and sound reinvestment in the American workforce. When it comes to the House floor this week, IFPTE urges you to vote in support of H.R. 2072.

Thank you for your consideration. Should you have any questions please contact IFPTE Legislative Director, Matt Biggs, at (202) 239 4880.

Sincerely,

GREGORY J. JUNEMANN,
President.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS AND AEROSPACE WORKERS,

Upper Marlboro, MD, May 7, 2012.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am writing to urge your support for the Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011, H.R. 2072, which reauthorizes the U.S. Export-Import (Ex-Im) Bank for three years and raises its lending authority to $140 billion. This bipartisan legislation represents a substantial improvement from previous House versions and will provide the necessary resources and oversight to allow the Ex-Im Bank to fulfill its vital role in promoting U.S. exports and creating American jobs.

Since first established in the 1930s, the Ex-Im Bank's mission has been to the support the U.S. economy by providing financing for U.S. exporters. In today's highly competitive global marketplace where our global competitors provide a variety of export support for their domestic industries, the Ex-Im Bank is one of the few resources that the U.S. offers to American exporters. This support is needed now more than ever.

According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, small businesses make up 87 percent of Ex-Im Bank transactions. If the Ex-Im Bank is not reauthorized, thousands of American jobs will be lost as U.S. companies ship more production work abroad where they can take advantage of the financing provided by other countries' export credit agencies—financing that they would have preferred to obtain from the Ex-Im Bank.

Without Ex-Im financing the U.S. aerospace industry, which is one of the few American industries with a positive balance of trade with the rest of world, will be at a severe disadvantage. European competitors will be free to support their companies through their comprehensive industrial policies. As China's export credit agency continues to grow dramatically, we need to support the only tool the U.S. has to effectively compete with China.

The bipartisan bill H.R. 2072, which will be voted on this week under the suspension calendar, represents a clear break from the Beltway politics that have failed to address the real struggles of ordinary Americans. During this time of intense global competition and persistent high unemployment, U.S. exporters need the critical resources of the Ex-Im Bank. I strongly urge you to support American jobs and to vote for this important legislation.

If you have any questions, please contact Legislative and Political Director Matthew McKinnon at (301) 967 4575.

Sincerely,

R. THOMAS BUFFENBARGER,
International President.

[May 5, 2012]

A4A COMMENDS IMPORTANT REFORMS IN BIPARTISAN EX-IM BANK REAUTHORIZATION AGREEMENT

WASHINGTON, DC.—Airlines for America (A4A), the industry trade organization for the leading U.S. airlines, today issued the following statement on the U.S. Export-Import Bank reauthorization agreement:

''We appreciate the hard work of Republican House Majority Leader Eric Cantor and Democratic House Minority Whip Steny Hoyer, who negotiated a bipartisan agreement that ensures increased transparency in the Ex-Im Bank's lending practices, calls for greater economic impact analysis of loans and would implement other important reforms, and we urge passage of the agreement,'' said A4A President and CEO Nicholas E. Calio.

ABOUT A4A

Annually, commercial aviation helps drive more than $1 trillion in U.S. economic activity and nearly 10 million U.S. jobs. A4A airline members and their affiliates transport more than 90 percent of all U.S. airline passenger and y cargo traffic. For more information about the airline industry, visit www.airlines.org and follow us on Twitter @airlinesdotorg.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

There are a lot of people on our staffs that have done a great job. You've mentioned Lesli McCollum Gooch. She's been the senior policy director of the subcommittee. She's done a great job. Also, Randy Ross and Aaron Ranck. On the majority side here, Susan Blavin, Alex Teel, and Neil Bradley have all worked very, very hard. On

the minority side, I would like to just thank Georgette Sierra. She's been incredible in this whole process, working with our side. Also, Daniel McGlinchey, Kirk Schwarzbach, Kelly Larkin, John Hughes, and legislative counsel, Jim Grossman.

There's been a lot said about this bill here. Let me make it very clear: Ex-Im Bank's default rate is less than 1.5 percent. There's no lender out there that has that stellar of a record. We've put additional funds in here for green technology because Ex-Im underwrites all their own loans. That's why they're performing so well. So we've created additional funds for them so they can increase their underwriting ability to make sure they're making good, safe loans.

Ex-Im Bank makes money for the taxpayers. And they've done a great job. We have an opportunity in this country to create jobs. We can yield those jobs to China, we can yield those jobs to Germany, to France, to other countries who want to take jobs from this country, or we can make sure that American companies, large and small, have an opportunity to compete. When they compete, they create jobs. And, guess what? They make money for the taxpayers because they give it back to the Treasury. That's a win-win for everybody.

The oversight we placed in this bill—and I want to thank Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR for working with me on this—when it came out of subcommittee and an addendum added to that have created a very, very safe institution.

With that, I ask for an ''aye'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of today's legislation to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank and appreciate the work done by Leaders HOYER and CANTOR to bring this bill to the floor today.

As amended, the Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act will reauthorize the Export-Import Bank for three years and incrementally increase the assistance it provides foreign buyers of American products to $140 billion by fiscal year 2014, which is roughly in line with projected demand. This bipartisan agreement is good for manufacturers, good for jobs and good for taxpayers. It enjoys broad backing from industry and labor, and it deserves our support.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2072, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012, the long term bipartisan reauthorization agreement announced last week.

As a senior member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I believe that by passing this bill, Congress will give U.S. business the tools they need to compete in the global market place and create jobs for workers here in the United States.

H.R. 2072 reauthorizes the Export-Import Bank (Ex-Im) for three years, giving U.S. businesses the certainty they need, and incrementally increases the exposure limit to $140 billion by fiscal year 2014 in response to the growing demand for Ex-Im financing.

I am pleased to say that this legislation is widely supported by Labor and business groups—such as the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, NAM, Chamber of Commerce and Business Roundtable.

This wide array of organizations is well aware of the critical role the Bank plays in supporting American workers by providing credit where it's prohibitively expensive or by neutralizing official foreign credit competition.

Just last year, the Bank provided $32 billion in financing to thousands of companies, which supported nearly 290,000 American jobs.

However, it is important to note that the work of the Bank is done at no cost to the taxpayer, as it is self-sustaining: the Bank covers all of its operating expenses and loan loss reserves through the fees it charges users of the Bank.

In fact, the Bank returns money to the Treasury, and since 2008 it has returned almost $2 billion.

I, therefore, urge you to support job creation and vote for the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, Congress should reject H.R. 2072, the Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011, for economic, moral, and constitutional reasons. The Export-Import Bank is a prime example of corporate welfare, taking money from American taxpayers to prop up the export businesses of large corporations. Companies such as Boeing should be able to make sales based solely on the quality of their products and the willingness of the market to purchase those products. Instead, these companies rely on their political connections to subsidize their businesses. Ex-Im even provided Enron with hundreds of millions of dollars of assistance before that company's ignominious collapse. Do we really want to continue funding the Enrons of the world?

Not only is it bad economics to force working Americans, small businesses, and entrepreneurs to subsidize the exports of large corporations, it is also immoral. Redistribution from the poor and middle class to the wealthy is the most indefensible aspect of the welfare state, yet it is the most accepted form of welfare. At a time when the Federal government is running unprecedentedly large budget deficits why are we reauthorizing subsidies for large corporations? I hope that my colleagues who criticize welfare for the poor on moral and constitutional grounds will vote against this program that provides welfare for the rich.

Proponents of continued American support for Ex-Im claim that the bank ''creates jobs'' and promotes economic growth. However, this claim rests on a version of what the great economist Henry Hazlitt called the ''broken window'' fallacy. When a hoodlum throws a rock through a store window, it can be said he has contributed to the economy, as the store owner will have to spend money having the window fixed. The benefits to those who repaired the window are visible for all to see, therefore it is easy to see the broken window as economically beneficial. However, the ''benefits'' of the broken window are revealed as an illusion when one takes into account what is not seen: the businesses and workers who would have benefited had the store owner not spent money repairing a window, but rather been free to spend his money as he chose.

Similarly, the beneficiaries of Ex-Im are visible to all. What is not seen is the products that would have been built, the businesses that would have been started, and the jobs that would have been created had the funds used for Ex-Im been left in the hands of consumers. Leaving those funds in the private sector ensures that those resources will be put to the use most highly valued by individual consumers. In contrast, when the government diverts resources into the public sector via programs such as Ex-Im, their use is determined by bureaucrats and politically powerful special interests, resulting in a distorted market and a misallocation of resources. By distorting the market and preventing resources from achieving their highest valued use, Ex-Im actually costs Americans jobs and reduces America's standard of living!

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues that there is simply no constitutional justification for the expenditure of funds on programs such as Ex-Im. In fact, the framers of the Constitution would be horrified to know that the Federal Government was taking hard-earned money from the American people in order to benefit the politically powerful.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, Ex-Im distorts the market by allowing government bureaucrats to make economic decisions instead of individual consumers. Ex-Im also violates basic principles of morality, by forcing American taxpayers to subsidize the operations of wealthy companies that could easily afford to engage in international trade without government assistance. Ex-Im also violates the limitations on congressional power to take the property of individual citizens and use it to benefit powerful special interests. It is for these reasons that I strongly urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 2072.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following materials in support of H.R. 2072, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act, as amended.

SUPPORT AMERICAN JOBS: PASS H.R. 2072 THE EXPORT-IMPORT REAUTHORIZATION ACT

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Tomorrow the House will take up H.R. 2072, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012, the long term bipartisan reauthorization agreement announced last week. By passing H.R. 2072, Congress will give U.S. business the tools they need to compete in the global market place and create jobs for workers here in the United States.

H.R. 2072 reauthorizes the Export-Import Bank (Ex-Im) for three years, giving U.S. businesses the certainty they need, and incrementally increases the exposure limit to $140 billion by fiscal year 2014 in response to the growing demand for Ex-Im financing. The bill includes a number of provisions that will make Ex-Im more effective and accountable. These provisions include funding for technology upgrades and requirements that the Bank submit a business plan to justify the increased exposure, and periodic monitoring and reporting to Congress on the Bank's default rate.

The legislation is widely supported by Labor and business groups—such as International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, NAM, Chamber of Commerce and Business Roundtable. These groups understand the critical role the Bank plays in supporting American workers by providing credit where it's prohibitively expensive or by neutralizing official foreign credit competition.

Just last year, the Bank provided $32 billion in financing to thousands of companies,

which supported nearly 290,000 American jobs. Over 80 percent of those transactions directly supported small businesses. You can see for yourself the work the Bank has done in your district, by visiting their website http://www.exim.gov/congmap/#/us.

It is important to note that the work of the Bank is done at no cost to the taxpayer, as they are self-sustaining: the Bank covers all of its operating expenses and loan loss reserves through the fees it charges users of the Bank. In fact, the Bank returns money to the Treasury, and since 2008 they have returned almost $2 billion.

I urge you to support this job creating legislation, which gives American companies the tools they need to grow and create local jobs in communities across the country, while making money for American taxpayers.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN MCCARTHY,
Member of Congress.

NEW DEMS SUPPORT MULTI-YEAR EX-IM REAUTHORIZATION

WASHINGTON, DC.—Today, leaders of the New Democrat Coalition, chaired by Rep. Joseph Crowley (NY 7), released the following statement on reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

''Thanks to House Minority Whip Steny Hoyer's vigilance, we finally reached an agreement for a multi-year reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank. While this agreement is not perfect, it will give American businesses much-needed certainty to sell their products abroad and create jobs here at home. The New Dems stand behind the House's reauthorization, and we encourage our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this agreement.''

The current legislation authorizes the Export-Import Bank for another three years and gradually increases the bank's lending authority over that timeframe to $140 billion. Last year alone, Ex-Im financing helped more than 3,000 companies add almost 300,000 jobs across America.

Statement supported by New Dem Leadership Members, led by Chair Representative Joseph Crowley (NY 7), and Vice-Chairs Representative Jim Himes (CT 4), Representative Ron Kind (WI 3), Representative Rick Larsen (WA 2), and Representative Allyson Schwartz (PA 13).

The New Democrat Coalition is dedicated to maintaining America's standing as the world's strongest, most successful nation. Founded in 1997, the New Dems believe firmly in the power of American ingenuity and innovation, and are focused on finding ways to foster and harness this creativity to grow our economy, create new American jobs, and ensure a safer and more secure future for our country. For more information on the 42 member Coalition, visit the New Dems website at http://ndc.crowley.house.gov.

LEVIN, MCDERMOTT URGE REAUTHORIZATION OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

WASHINGTON.—Ways and Means Committee Ranking Member Sander Levin (D MI) and Trade Subcommittee Ranking Member Jim McDermott (D WA) today made the following statements regarding the agreement to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank:

Levin: ''Congress needs to act immediately with the Export-Import Bank reauthorization. The United States needs to dramatically increase its exports and reduce our trade deficit to strengthen the economy and create jobs and Export-Import Bank financing will help us do that. As Republicans wring their hands in a stale ideological debate over whether to support American exports, China and other countries are significantly increasing their assistance to help their domestic companies compete abroad.''

McDermott: ''The Export-Import Bank is a perfect example of a simple, free way that Congress can help U.S. businesses export U.S.-made products, but Republican radical ideology has gotten in the way again of Congress acting to help the economy—this time they're refusing to give the Bank the tools it needs to keep helping U.S. businesses remain competitive. The Bank has a proven track record—in 2010 alone, it supported $34 billion worth of U.S. exports and 227,000 U.S. jobs at more than 3,300 U.S. companies. We should be working on a long-term reauthorization of the Bank that gives businesses the certainty that the U.S. government is committed to promoting U.S.-made exports. And, we should also dramatically increase its lending authority so the Bank can keep up with our increased exports—and keep up with our trading partners who give their exporters much more in export financing than we give to American exporters.''

BACKGROUND

The mandate of the Export-Import Bank is to support U.S. exports and the employment of U.S. workers. The Bank uses its authority and resources to finance U.S. exports primarily in circumstances when alternative, private sector export financing may not be available or is prohibitively expensive or risky.

Under the current law, the U.S. Export-Import Bank may not provide loans, guarantees or insurance at any one time in excess of $100 billion. The Bank is expected to reach that limit before the Bank's authorization expires on May 31. The Bank operates on a self-sustaining basis, using offsetting collections to fund administrative and program expenses.

The Bank seeks to level the playing field for U.S. exporters by matching credit support that other nations provide to their exporters. But the United States is ''clearly outgunned when it comes to foreign [export credit] competition,'' Bank Chairman Fred Hochberg said in testimony before the Senate earlier this year. For example, from 2006 2010, China issued over $203 billion in new medium- and long-term export credit financing, an amount four times invested by the United States in absolute dollars, and ten times more as a share of GDP. (Stephen J. Ezell, The Information Technology & Innovation Foundation, ''Understanding the Importance of Export Credit Financing to U.S. Competitiveness, June 2011)

Countries like China do not always comply with international guidelines relating to export financing, and the Bank is developing new tools to confront this challenge. The President of the Bank recently described how Ex-Im is using these tools to ensure U.S. companies can compete against Chinese financing, using as an illustrative example a competition to sell 150 locomotives to Pakistan Rail. The Chinese Development Bank offered its locomotive manufacturer very generous export financing:

''To remedy this, the Obama Administration put together a competitive financing package. And for the first time, we went to the OECD to share with them our decision to offer financing outside of internationally agreed upon terms and conditions. That's how we can level the playing field for American businesses[.] . . . [W]hen we see a clear example that state-directed capital is impeding a sale for an American company, we will go the extra step to offset the market distortion.

HOUSE REACHES AGREEMENT ON EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION TO STRENGTHEN AMERICAN MANUFACTURING, SPUR JOB CREATION

Today, House Democratic and Republican leadership have reached an agreement on a long-term reauthorization the U.S. Export-Import Bank, ending uncertainty for businesses and providing the resources needed to keep American exporters competitive. To meet expected financing demands, the bill increases the Bank's exposure limit to $120 billion through September 30, and increases the limit to $130 billion in Fiscal Year 2013 and $140 billion in Fiscal Year 2014.

Reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank is part of the Make It In America plan, as it provides financing to U.S. businesses to help them sell their products around the world and create jobs here at home. Last year, financing from the Export-Import Bank helped 3,600 private companies add almost 300,000 jobs across the country.

With other nations aggressively supporting in their businesses' exports, it is critical that the Bank continue to provide assistance to American businesses in order to stay competitive. Prominent business organizations agree:

National Association of Manufacturers: ''The Ex-Im Bank plays a critical role in manufacturers' ability to export to new markets and keep up with growing global competition . . . It's imperative that Congress reauthorize Ex-Im and increase the Bank's lending limit for the sake of jobs and the competitiveness of manufacturers in the United States. Should Congress fail to act, it will give our competitors an advantage, harm job growth and create a large speed bump in our path to doubling exports.'' [3/15/12]

Chamber of Commerce: ''Failure to reauthorize Ex-Im would amount to America's unilateral disarmament in the face of other nations' aggressive trade finance programs . . . With other countries' export credit agencies providing an estimated $1 trillion in export finance—often on terms more generous than Ex-Im can provide—failure to approve this reauthorization legislation would put U.S. exporters at a sharper competitive disadvantage.'' [3/19/12]

Business Roundtable: ''Ex-Im's positive contributions to the international competitiveness of American companies and workers and to the U.S. economy overall are well documented. In FY2011, Ex-Im facilitated roughly $41 billion in U.S. export sales by more than 3,600 U.S. small and large companies, supporting nearly 290,000 U.S. jobs . . . It is also important to recognize that Ex-Im has made these positive contributions while returning revenue to the U.S. Treasury.'' [3/18/12]

Congress must act quickly before the Export-Import Bank's authority expires on May 31 so that businesses have the certainty they need to boost exports and create jobs here at home.

REAUTHORIZING THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As Congress considers H.R. 2072, Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011, which reauthorizes the Export-Import bank, I urge you read the following article that highlights how this legislation will assist American manufacturers increase exports. Since 1934, the bank has served as the principal government agency responsible for aiding the export of American goods and services, thereby creating and sustaining U.S. jobs.

Sincerely,

KEVIN YODER,
Member of Congress.

FEBRUARY 21, 2012: A CONSERVATIVE'S TAKE ON THE EX-IM BANK

I support the entrepreneurial dynamism of free markets. I believe entrepreneurs are more likely than government bureaucrats to build successful businesses and provide stable, good-paying jobs. I oppose government

interference in the marketplace. I want government to spend less, interfere less, do less, and tax less.

So when a few fellow conservatives criticize plans to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank on grounds that it is just another costly government corporate welfare program, why do I strongly disagree? The answer is simple—the Ex-Im Bank is none of the things some of my fellow conservatives claim.

The Ex-Im Bank assists U.S. manufacturers—small and large—to export their goods to foreign buyers. Typically it facilitates loan guarantees for foreign buyers who want to buy U.S. goods. Whether it is big names like General Electric, Caterpillar and Boeing, or small companies (which comprise 87% of the bank's transactions), the Ex-Im Bank helps their foreign buyers obtain financing so that American goods are sold and shipped abroad. This means more American employment and more exports.

The Ex-Im Bank does not compete with private financial institutions, but rather fills-in banking gaps so that U.S. goods can be exported to nations where commercial financing is insufficient. The Ex-Im Bank doesn't cost taxpayers a dime. Rather, it makes money from the fees charged to foreign buyers which get pumped back into the U.S. Treasury and helps reduce the deficit.

The Ex-Im Bank has a 75 year track-record and the Congressional Budget Office projects in the coming years, the Ex-Im Bank will pump $900 million into the U.S. Treasury—not to mention the hundreds of billions of dollars of U.S. made goods that will be exported and the hundreds of thousands of American jobs that will be supported. In 2011 alone, the bank facilitated sales abroad that supported 290,000 American jobs.

Some conservatives incorrectly argue that the Ex-Im Bank is similar to the Solyndra scandal where government bureaucrats gave about $500 million to a business headed by Obama fundraisers. To make matters worse, Solyndra's own business plan showed that it could not turn a profit. Solyndra represents what is deeply wrong with government attempts to manipulate the marketplace.

But the Ex-Im Bank and Solyndra have nothing in common. Solyndra involved government awarding taxpayer funded cash grants to failing businesses owned by political allies. The money was completely wasted, the business failed, and no jobs were created.

The Ex-Im Bank is entirely different. It doesn't hand out cash grants. It facilitates financing for foreign buyers who want to purchase American manufactured goods. The foreign buyer must qualify for the loans. Since its inception, less than 2% of the Bank's loans have ever defaulted. Even then, the manufactured goods are part of the collateral for the loan. This is one of the reasons why the Ex-Im Bank returns money to the U.S. Treasury, rather than takes money from the taxpayer.

Some conservatives oppose reauthorization of the Ex-Inn Bank because they see it as an interference with the free market. On a purely theoretical level, I can see their point. But the problem with this analysis is that the international marketplace isn't a free market.

Virtually every other nation offers export loan assistance. In fact, China and many other nations actually offer aggressive, below market loans to induce foreign buyers to purchase their goods. When the U.S. competes on quality and price, it wins the competition. That is precisely why nations like China intervene and offer cut rate financing with very generous terms so that they can undercut U.S. firms. Europe does this as well.

As a conservative, I would like to see free markets expanded. We should enter into more free market reform agreements with our trading partners. We should reform our tax code and our regulatory regime to ensure we are competitive.

But nixing the Ex-Im Bank now without international financing reform agreements does nothing to promote free markets. It merely undermines U.S. manufacturing, kills high-paying American jobs, and erodes our ability to compete in a worldwide marketplace. Until we can expand our trade agreements to include more free market principles, refusing to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank is essentially unilateral disarmament.

That is foolhardy.

GEORGE LANDRITH.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following materials in support of H.R. 2072, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act, as amended.

MAY 4, 2012.

TO MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS: We are writing to urge your support for reauthorization of the Export-Import (Ex-Im) Bank of the United States, and a simultaneous increase in its lending cap. Ex-Im Bank—which is set to expire on May 31—is a vital resource in helping U.S. companies both large and small to successfully engage in international trade.

The Ex-Im Bank is a self-sustaining federal agency that assists In financing the export of U.S. goods and services to international markets. In the five years since Congress last reauthorized the Bank's operations, it has returned about $3.4 billion to the U.S. Treasury above and beyond the cost of its operations. For the fiscal year ending on September 30, 2011, Ex-Im Bank supported $40.6 billion worth of U.S. exports at more than 3,600 U.S. companies, helping to create or sustain 290,000 export-related U.S. jobs.

This past December, Congress extended Ex-Im Bank's authorization until May 31 at its current lending ceiling of $100 billion. Due to unprecedented demand for export financing over the last few years, Ex-Im Bank estimates that it will reach this limit well before May. As a result, unless Ex-Im Bank is reauthorized quickly and at an increased lending cap, it will be forced to halt new transactions—depriving U.S. businesses of a vital financing source at a time when exports are becoming an increasingly vital part of our nation's economic recovery.

Ex-Im Bank is particularly critical for small businesses, where—in 2011 alone—Ex-Im Bank lent more than $6 billion to almost 2,000 such companies. In many cases, the trade finance supplied was essential for the completion of the export transaction, and would not have been available from the private sector. Ex-Im Bank's support extended to exporters in industries as diverse as aerospace, wine, global health, clean technology and agriculture.

Ex-Im Bank is also critical to the ability of U.S. exporters to compete on a level international playing field, where competitors receive aggressive support from their own countries' export credit agencies. The U.S. trails countries like Brazil, Canada, China, Germany, France, India, and Italy in official export credit volumes as a share of each country's national economy. According to the Information Technology & Innovation Foundation, export credit banks in Brazil and China provided 10 times more financing to their exporters as a share of GDP in 2010 than the Ex-Im Bank did for American exporters. Even the export credit agency of Canada—which has an economy about one-eighth our size—does more lending volume.

Without Ex-Im Bank reauthorization, our country's exporters won't be able to compete effectively in the global marketplace. We urge you to join us in supporting swift Ex-Im Bank reauthorization.

Yours truly,

Birmingham Business Alliance (AL), Business Council of Alabama (AL), South Shelby County Chamber of Commerce (AL), Arkansas State Chamber of Commerce/Associated Industries of Arkansas (AR), Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry (AZ), Buckeye Valley Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce (AZ), North Scottsdale Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Tucson Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Alliance of Chambers of Commerce of Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties (CA), California Chamber of Commerce (CA), Greater Fresno Chamber of Commerce (CA), Greater Oxnard Chamber of Commerce (CA), Huntington Beach Chamber of Commerce (CA), Irvine Chamber of Commerce (CA), Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce (CA), Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce (CA), Orange County Business Council (CA), Palm Desert Chamber of Commerce (CA), Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce (CA), San Francisco Chamber of Commerce (CA), Santa Clara Chamber of Commerce and Visitors Bureau (CA);

Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce (AL), Shoals Chamber of Commerce (AL), San Jose Silicon Valley Chamber of Commerce (CA), Simi Valley Chamber of Commerce (CA), South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce (CA), Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce (CA), Colorado Association of Commerce and Industry (CO), Crested Butte/Mt Crested Butte Chamber of Commerce (CO), Denver Metro Chamber of Commerce (CO), Greater Colorado Springs Chamber of Commerce and EDC (CO), Connecticut Business & Industry Association (CT), Fairfield Chamber of Commerce (CT), Delaware State Chamber of Commerce (DE), Florida Chamber of Commerce (FL), Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce (FL), Barrow County Chamber of Commerce (GA), Georgia Chamber of Commerce (GA), Greater Rome Georgia Chamber of Commerce (GA), Gwinnett Chamber of Commerce (GA), Chamber of Commerce of Hawaii (HI), Hong Kong.China.Hawaii Chamber of Commerce (HI), Kauai Chamber of Commerce (HI), Kona-Kohala Chamber of Commerce (HI), Maui Chamber of Commerce (HI), Molokai Chamber of Commerce (HI), Greater Craigmont Area Chamber of Commerce (ID), Greater Pocatello Chamber of Commerce (ID), Batavia Chamber of Commerce (IL), Chicagoland Chamber of Commerce (IL), Downers Grove Area Chamber of Commerce & Industry (IL), GOA Regional Business Association (IL), Illinois Chamber of Commerce (IL), Joliet Regional Chamber of Commerce & Industry (IL), Kankakee Regional Chamber of Commerce (IL), Mendota Area Chamber of Commerce (IL), Mendota Area Chamber of Commerce (IL);

Naperville Area Chamber of Commerce (IL), Peoria Area Chamber of Commerce (IL), Rockford Chamber of Commerce (IL), Rolling Meadows Chamber of Commerce (IL), Western DuPage Chamber of Commerce (IL), Quad Cities Chamber of Commerce (IL/IA), Greater Fort Wayne Chamber of Commerce (IN), Warsaw/Kosciusko County Chamber of Commerce (IN), Fredonia Area Chamber of Commerce (KS),

Greater Topeka Chamber of Commerce (KS), Wichita Metro Chamber of Commerce (KS), Greater Louisville Inc—The Metro Chamber of Commerce (KY), Kentucky Chamber of Commerce (KY), Northern Kentucky Chamber of Commerce (KY), World Trade Center Kentucky (KY), Baton Rouge Area Chamber (LA), Central Louisiana Chamber of Commerce (LA), East St. Tammany Chamber of Commerce (LA), Greater New Orleans, Inc. (LA), New Orleans Chamber of Commerce (LA), Southwest Louisiana Economic Development Alliance (LA), The Southwest Louisiana Economic Development Alliance (LA), Chambers Southwest Louisiana (LA), Associated Industries of Massachusetts (MA), Carroll County Chamber (MD);

Salisbury Area Chamber of Commerce (MD), Auburn Hills Chamber of Commerce (MI), Detroit Regional Chamber of Commerce (MI), Traverse City Area Chamber of Commerce (MI), River Heights Chamber of Commerce (MN), Missouri Chamber of Commerce (MO), St. Louis Regional Chamber & Growth Association (MO), Covington County Chamber of Commerce (MS), Montana Chamber of Commerce (MT), Ahoskie Chamber of Commerce (NC), Cabarrus Regional Chamber of Commerce (NC), Charlotte Chamber of Commerce (NC), Fayetteville-Cumberland County Chamber of Commerce (NC), Greater Raleigh Chamber of Commerce (NC), Greater Wilmington Chamber of Commerce (NC), Laurinburg/Scotland County Area Chamber of Commerce (NC), North Carolina Chamber of Commerce (NC), Rowan County Chamber of Commerce (NC), North Dakota Chamber of Commerce (ND), New Hampshire Business & Industry Association (NH), Gateway Regional Chamber of Commerce (NJ), Mercer Regional Chamber of Commerce (NJ), New Jersey Chamber of Commerce (NJ), Boulder City Chamber of Commerce (NV), Carson Valley Chamber of Commerce and Visitors Authority (NV), Henderson Chamber of Commerce (NV), North Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce (NV);

White Pine Chamber of Commerce (NV), Adirondack Regional Chamber of Commerce (NY), Albany-Colonie Regional Chamber of Commerce (NY), Buffalo-Niagara Partnership (NY), Business Council of New York State, Inc. (NY), Chamber of Schenectady County (NY), Long Island Association (NY), Manhattan Chamber of Commerce (NY), North Country Chamber of Commerce (NY), Rochester Business Alliance (NY), Ashland Area Chamber of Commerce (OH), Chamber of Commerce Serving Middletown, Monroe & Trenton (OH), Cincinnati USA Regional Chamber of Commerce (OH), Clermont Chamber of Commerce (OH), Lima/Allen County Chamber of Commerce (OH), Waterville Area Chamber of Commerce (OH), Westerville Area Chamber of Commerce (OH), Youngstown/Warren Regional Chamber (OH);

Cushing Chamber of Commerce (OK), Tulsa Metro Chamber (OK), Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce (OR), Lebanon Chamber of Commerce (OR), Portland Business Alliance (OR), Wilsonville Area Chamber of Commerce (OR), Erie Regional Chamber & Growth Partnership (PA), Greater Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce (PA), Pennsylvania Chamber of Business and Industry (PA), Schuylkill Chamber of Commerce (PA), Northern Rhode Island Chamber of Commerce (RI), Charleston Metro Chamber of Commerce (SC), Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce (SC), Greater Summerville/Dorchester County Chamber of Commerce (SC).

ALABAMA, ARIZONA, ARKANSAS, CALIFORNIA, CONNECTICUT, GUAM, HAWAI'I, ILLINOIS, IOWA, KENTUCKY, MARYLAND, MASSACHUSETTS, MINNESOTA, NEVADA, NORTH CAROLINA, OKLAHOMA, OREGON, PUERTO RICO, SOUTH DAKOTA, U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS, VERMONT, WASHINGTON.

March 19, 2012.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Capitol Building, Washington, DC.
Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Capitol Building Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, U.S. House of Representatives, Capitol Building, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Capitol Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, LEADER REID, LEADER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCONNELL: As governors of states and territories across the nation whose economies, communities and families benefit from exports, we urge you to pass a four-year reauthorization of the U.S. Export-Import Bank (Ex-Im) and raise the limit on Ex-Im's loan portfolio to no less than $135 billion. As the official export credit agency of the United States, Ex-Im is a critical tool for U.S. exporters in our states and a money-maker for American taxpayers.

At a time of high unemployment, Ex-Im is an important source of job creation and sustainment. Last year alone, Ex-Im supported $34 billion in exports which in turn supported the creation or sustainment of an estimated 230,000 jobs at more than 3,300 companies across the country. In addition, approximately 80 percent of the Ex-Im's transactions are in support of small US. businesses. Ex-Im works for American companies and taxpayers—it is good business and good government.

Ex-Im also is financially self-sustaining. In the five years since Congress last reauthorized Ex-Im, it has returned more than $3 billion to the U.S. Treasury above and beyond the cost of its operations.

Ex-Im is critical to the ability of exporters in our states to compete on a level international playing field where competitors receive aggressive support from their own countries' export credit agencies. At a time of significant economic challenge here at home, support for Ex-Im means support for U.S. exports and U.S. jobs.

Ex-Im's temporary reauthorization will expire on May 31, and failure to reauthorize its operations at an internationally competitive level will seriously disadvantage U.S. companies—small and large—potentially resulting in the loss of thousands of jobs in our states.

We strongly urge you to approve legislation before June 1, 2012 to reauthorize Ex-Im with a higher lending cap to support surging U.S. exports and American jobs. It is the right thing to do for our states, our economy and our nation.

Sincerely,

Governor Chris Gregoire, Washington; Governor Bev Perdue, North Carolina; Governor Mike Beebe, Arkansas; Governor Dannel P. Malloy, Connecticut; Governor Peter Shumlin, Vermont; Governor Deval Patrick, Massachusetts; Governor Robert Bentley, Alabama; Governor Pat Quinn, Illinois; Governor Steven L. Beshear, Kentucky; Governor Eddie Baza Calvo, Guam; Governor Brian Sandoval, Nevada; Governor Dennis Daugaard, South Dakota; Governor John A. Kitzhaber, Oregon; Governor Terry E. Branstad, Iowa; Governor John deJongh, Jr., Virgin Islands; Governor Luis G. Fortuño, Puerto Rico; Governor Martin O'Malley, Maryland; Governor Mark Dayton, Minnesota; Governor Edmond G. Brown, Jr., California; Governor Mary Fallin, Oklahoma; Governor Neil Abercrombie, Hawaii; Governor Jan Brewer, Arizona.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Springfield, IL, December 6, 2011.

DEAR ILLINOIS REPRESENTATIVE: I write to urge your strong support for reauthorization of the U.S. Export-Import Bank (Ex-Im). Ex-Im is the official export credit agency of the U.S. and assists in financing the export of American goods and services from many industries at no cost to the American taxpayer. Ex-Im's charter expired on September 30, 2011, and the Bank is currently operating under authority provided in the current short-term Continuing Resolution.

Global trade is an integral part of our nation's economic recovery. In 2010, Illinois exports totaled $50 billion, up 20 percent from 2009. Through the first half of 2011, exports are up another 30 percent over the same time period in 2010. The Ex-Im Bank has provided significant support towards our momentum. Over the last five years, Ex-Im has assisted more than 280 Illinois companies export their products and services around the world, including 114 firms in 2011.

At a time of high unemployment, the Ex-Im Bank is an important source of job creation and sustainment. Last year alone, Ex-Im supported $34 billion in exports, which in turn supported the creation or sustainment of an estimated 230,000 jobs at more than 3,300 companies across the country. In addition, approximately 80 percent of the Ex-Im Bank's transactions are in support of small businesses.

The Ex-Im Bank is financially self-sustaining. In the five years since Congress last reauthorized the Bank's operations, Ex-Im has returned more than $3 billion to the U.S. Treasury. In this period of deficit reduction, the Bank makes money for the U.S. Government Ex-Im works for American companies and taxpayers—it is good business and good government.

Ex-Im is critical to the ability of many U.S. exporters to compete on a level international playing field where competitors receive aggressive support from their own countries' export credit agencies. At a time of significant economic challenge here at home, support for the Ex-Im Bank means support for U.S. exports and U.S. jobs.

I urge your strong support for the timely reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank.

Regards,

PAT QUINN,
Governor.

FLORIDA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Tallahassee, FL. Nov. 22, 2011.

Hon. BILL NELSON,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington DC.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: I am writing to urge your support for reauthorization of the U.S. Export-Import Bank (Ex-Im). Ex-Im is the official export credit agency of the United States and assists in financing the export of U.S. goods and services from many U.S. industries at no cost to the American taxpayer. Ex-Im's charter expired on September 30, 2011 and is operating under authorities provided in the current short-term Continuing Resolution.

Ex-Im provides significant support to many Florida companies. Over the last five years, EX-IM has assisted more than 600 Florida companies export their products and

services around the world. And more than 470 of these companies are small businesses. Just this year alone, Ex-Im has assisted 259 Florida companies, including 205 small businesses. Ex-Im plays an important role in supporting Florida exports and jobs.

The Ex-Im Bank is financially self-sustaining. In the five years since Congress last reauthorized the Bank's operations, Ex-Im has returned more than $3 billion to the U.S. Treasury above and beyond the cost of its operations. In this period of deficit reduction, the Bank makes money for the U.S. Government. And at a time of high unemployment, the Ex-Im Bank is an important source of job creation and sustainment. Last year alone, Ex-Im supported $34 billion in exports, which in turn supported the creation or sustainment of an estimated 230,000 jobs at more than 3,300 companies across the country. In addition, approximately 80 percent of the Ex-Im Bank's transactions are in support of U.S. small businesses. Ex-Im works for American companies and taxpayers—it is good business and good government.

Ex-Im is critical to the ability of many U.S. exporters to compete on a level international playing field where competitors receive aggressive support from their own countries' export credit agencies. At a time of significant economic challenge here at home, support for the Ex-Im Bank means support for U.S. exports and U.S. jobs!

I urge your strong support for the timely reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank.

Sincerely,

DAVID A. HART,
Executive Vice President.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Olympia, WA, November 2, 2011.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE WASHINGTON CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION: I urge your strong support for the reauthorization of the U.S. Export-Import Bank (Ex-Im Bank), which is the official export credit agency of the United States. Ex-Im Bank assists in financing the export of American goods and services from many industries at no cost to the American taxpayer. The bank is currently operating under authorities provided in the short-term Continuing Resolution because its charter expired on September 30, 2011.

Ex-Im Bank provides critical support to many Washington State companies, and over the last five years, has assisted more than 160 companies in exporting tens of billions of dollars worth of products and services. Over 100 of these companies are small businesses. Just this year alone, Ex-Im Bank assisted 74 Washington companies, including 57 small businesses. In many cases, the trade finance it supplied was an essential ingredient for the completion of the export transaction. In most cases this type of financial assistance would not have been available from the private sector. As a result, Ex-Im Bank plays a very important role in supporting Washington State exports and much-needed jobs.

Last summer, I announced a Washington State export initiative to complement President Obama's National Export Initiative which had a goal of doubling exports in five years. These initiatives were launched recognizing that increasing exports will play an important role in speeding our economic recovery and growing jobs our state. At a time of high unemployment, Ex-Im Bank's trade finance is an important source of job creation and retention. Last year alone, it supported $34 billion in exports which in turn helped to create or sustain an estimated 230,000 jobs at more than 3,300 companies across the country. In addition, approximately 80 percent of the bank's transactions are in support of U.S. small businesses. Ex-Im Bank works for American companies and taxpayers—it is good business and good government.

Moreover, Ex-Im Bank is financially self-sustaining. In the five years since Congress last reauthorized the bank's operations, it has returned more than $3 billion to the U.S. Treasury above and beyond the cost of its operations. During a time when there is a lot of concern about the deficit, the bank makes money for the U.S. Government.

Ex-Im Bank is critical to the ability of many U.S. exporters to compete on a level international playing field where competitors receive aggressive support from their own countries' export credit agencies. At a time of significant economic challenge here at home, support for the Ex-Im Bank means support for American exports and jobs.

I urge your strong support for the timely reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

CHRISTINE O. GREGOIRE,
Governor.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, April 26, 2012.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. ERIC CANTOR,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADER CANTOR: As you know, authorization for the U.S. Export-Import Bank (Ex-Im) is set to expire on May 31, 2012, and it is expected that the Bank will hit its $100 billion lending cap in the coming weeks. As conservatives, we believe it is imperative that Congress move forward with a multi-year reauthorization of Ex-Im that provides certainty and stability for U.S. manufacturers and exporters as soon as possible.

Ex-Im plays an important role in supporting U.S. exports and creating and maintaining U.S. jobs. In Fiscal Year 2011 (FY11), for instance, Ex-Im provided more than $32 billion in direct export financing and supported more than $40 billion in export sales and 290,000 American jobs, all at no cost to taxpayers. More than 700 first-time small businesses were among the companies that used Ex-Im in FY11. Additionally, Ex-Im consistently returns money to the U.S. Treasury, contributing $3.7 billion in the last seven years alone.

Let us be clear: in a perfect world there would be no need for this type of export financing, and we applaud efforts to reform Ex-Im and engage with our trading partners to promote equal trading platforms on both a bilateral and multilateral basis. At the same time, it seems counterproductive to unilaterally disengage. Foreign export banks continue to lend at low rates and have used the uncertainty surrounding Ex-Im reauthorization to their advantage. We have heard from U.S. businesses that have already lost sales to foreign competitors based not on product differentials but, rather, on lack of clarity on Congress's intentions with our export bank. We fear that this will continue and could ultimately lead to a significant decline in U.S. exports, in turn having a profoundly negative impact on domestic employment.

As you consider Ex-Im reauthorization, we encourage you to give serious consideration to a multi-year authorization over one for a shorter period of time. The marketplace certainty that comes with a longer-term authorization not only makes bank activity easier to facilitate, but also will allow our U.S. manufacturers and exporters to enter into longer-term contracts with their customers. We also believe it is imperative that all appropriate steps be taken in Ex-Im reauthorization legislation, consistent with the need to protect competition and business sensitive information, to increase the transparency of Ex-Im transactions.

Given our nation's economic climate, it is important to do what we can to promote U.S. exports and create American jobs. This is a program that generates not only exports and jobs, but also much-needed revenue for the federal government. We thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Blaine Luetkemeyer, Member of Congress; James B. Renacci, Member of Congress; Adam Kinzinger, Member of Congress; Gregg Harper, Member of Congress; Tom Latham, Member of Congress; Bobby Schilling, Member of Congress; John Campbell, Member of Congress; Mac Thornberry, Member of Congress; Billy Long, Member of Congress; Randy Hultgren, Member of Congress; John Carter, Member of Congress; Tom Cole, Member of Congress; Bill Johnson, Member of Congress; Michael G. Grimm, Member of Congress; Nan A.S. Hayworth, Member of Congress; Rick Crawford, Member of Congress; Larry Bucshon, Member of Congress; Rick Berg, Member of Congress; Aaron Schock, Member of Congress; Don Manzullo, Member of Congress; Steve Stivers, Member of Congress; David Rivera, Member of Congress; Cynthia Lummis, Member of Congress; Vicky Hartzler, Member of Congress; Richard Nugent, Member of Congress; Chris Gibson, Member of Congress; Robert J. Wittman, Member of Congress; Joe Wilson, Member of Congress; Bob Gibbs, Member of Congress; Jeff Fortenberry, Member of Congress.

[Republican Main Street Partnership, May 7, 2012]

RE-AUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(By former U.S. Rep. Amory F, Houghton and former U.S. Rep. Tom Davis)

As former Republican members of the House who served during the 1990s, it is not often that we agree with former President Bill Clinton. On the re-authorization of the Export-Import Bank, however, the former President is absolutely right. Recently, Clinton urged reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, ''Whether you are Republicans, Democrats or Independents, I urge you to ask the Congress to reauthorize.''

President Clinton is spot on when he says that re-authorization of the bank will, ''help to create a stronger America.''

The truth is that our economy continues to struggle and that our national unemployment rate continues to be far too high. For too many in our country, the American dream is becoming harder to realize.

Republicans have rightfully said for years that the last thing we need to do is to raise taxes in the teeth of a recession. Republicans have also been leading the fight on regulatory reform because they understand the burden placed on businesses by unnecessary and overly complex bureaucratic red tape.

Republicans have fought tax increases and fought for regulatory reform because they understand the importance of creating jobs—particularly in this fragile economy. It is for that reason that the Export-Import Bank should be re-authorized.

Last year alone, the Export-Import Bank supported more than $40 billion in export sales from American companies. These sales, from 3,600 companies, supported almost 300,000 jobs.

Lawmakers have a daunting task in front of them today—not only must they find ways to spur economic growth and create jobs, they must do so in the context of a looming

unprecedented fiscal crisis as a result of deficit spending and mountains of federal debt. The good news is that the Export-Import Bank not only creates jobs, it does so without adding the federal debt.

Unlike the failed ''stimulus'' spending, which cost taxpayers trillions of dollars, the cost to the American taxpayers for the Export-Import Bank's job creation is nothing. The Bank generates enough fees to offsets its costs and actually contributes the remaining surpluses to the United States Treasury. Indeed, over the last five years, the Bank has returned $3.4 billion to the United States Treasury.

The Export-Import Bank has been an important tool for global competitiveness, especially for small businesses. Small businesses are the engines that drive job creation in the American economy, and more than 85 percent of the Export-Import Bank's transactions directly supported small businesses.

The Export-Import Bank does not compete with private lenders. Instead the Bank is a ''lender of last resort.'' The Bank helps to level the playing field for U.S. exporters by matching the financing that other governments provide to their exporters. The Export-Import Bank also fills important gaps in trade financing by assuming credit risks and country risks that other private sector actors are unable or unwilling to do. They have done so with amazing success—supporting more than $456 billion of United States exports of the last 77 years.

The Export-Import Bank's charter expired in 2011 and it is currently operating on an extension that is set to expire on May 31st of this year.

On Friday night, a compromise was reached in the House. Under the bipartisan agreement the Export-Import Bank's charter will be extended through September 2014 and its loan exposure cap will be raised 40 percent to $140 billion.

The bank will be required to keep default rates below 2 percent. Additionally, the Treasury Department would be required to initiate talks with U.S. trading partners toward ''substantially reducing'' and ultimately ending the practice of export financing subsidies.

Despite the bipartisan agreement, some are still opposed to re-authorization.

Opponents of re-authorization have called the Export-Import Bank ''corporate welfare.'' While such accusations may make for good talk radio fodder, they do not represent the reality of the long and successful history of the Export-Import Bank. The Bank has a 77 year track of making investments in American companies that have created millions of jobs.

Failure to re-authorize the bank has rightfully been compared to ''unilateral surrender''—American companies and manufacturers will immediately be placed at a strategic disadvantage in the global marketplace.

Re-authorization should be passed with wide bipartisan majorities—indeed, when we were in Congress that is exactly what happened. The American people want their representatives in Washington to get this economy moving again, they want to see economic growth that creates much needed jobs. Members on both sides of the aisle should have job creation as their number one priority and re-authorizing the Export-Import Bank is an important part of any job creation effort.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 2072, the ''Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011'' which reauthorizes the Export-Import (Ex-Im) Bank for three years. Last year the Export-Import Bank supported nearly 300,000 American jobs; 300,000 American jobs. This reauthorization is a no brainer.

The Export-Import Bank provided $32 billion in financing last year—all at no cost to the taxpayer. More than 80% of those transactions directly supported small businesses in 2011. The Ex-Im Bank provides support for small business owners who may be less familiar with the global economy, but want to grow their business, create jobs, support their community, and make it in America.

In my home state of South Carolina, the first Boeing 787 Dreamliner rolled out of the production facility at the Charleston Airport just two weeks ago. The Export-Import Bank fills an important financing gap for Boeing that helps level the global playing field and encourages foreign companies to buy American-made products like the Dreamliner. Reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank will protect jobs in South Carolina and all around the country.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of our Nation's small businesses and manufacturers, and call on this House to vote in favor of H.R. 2072, the Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011.

This legislation will reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, or Ex-Im Bank, for three years and raise its lending authority to $140 billion.

Founded during the Great Depression, the Ex-Im Bank, has served American businesses for nearly 80 years through its financial support of our Nation's exporters—both large and small. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has found that small businesses make up 87 percent of Ex-Im Bank transactions.

In Fiscal Year 2011, the Ex-Im Bank supported 290,000 export-related American jobs by providing more than $32 billion in financing to more than 3,600 U.S. companies nationwide.

Since 1934, Ex-Im Bank has provided assistance to more than $474 billion of U.S. exports. Over the past five years, the Ex-Im Bank has provided businesses in the 29th District of Texas with over $407 million in export financing alone.

It is important to note that the work of the Bank is done at no cost to the taxpayer. It is self-sustaining and covers all of its operating expenses and loan loss reserves through fees the Bank charges users. In fact, the Bank normally makes a profit and has returned nearly $2 billion to the Treasury since 2008.

During this time of economic uncertainty and growing international competition, it is imperative that Congress pass H.R. 2072 and reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank. To do otherwise would unnecessarily endanger tens of thousands of American jobs.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2072, the bipartisan Securing Jobs Through Exports Act.

Other nations are aggressively supporting their businesses' exports, making it more important than ever to help American manufacturers secure the financing they need to compete in foreign markets.

The Export-Import Bank helps make this happen, creating middle class jobs here at home and boosting our economic competitiveness by investing in a strong manufacturing sector that builds and exports products around the world.

Just last year, the Bank provided $32 billion in financing to thousands of companies, which supported nearly 290,000 American jobs. Over 80 percent of those transactions directly supported small businesses.

In my district alone, the Bank supported over $36 million in sales over the last five years, helping innovative Central Coast businesses like Mafi-Trench and CoreSulpher grow and hire.

The Securing Jobs Through Exports Act will provide the necessary tools and resources for the Bank to continue this important work.

It reauthorizes the Bank for three years, giving U.S. businesses the certainty they need, and incrementally increases the exposure limit to $140 billion by fiscal year 2014 in response to the growing demand for Ex-Im financing.

The bill will also make Ex-Im more effective and accountable by funding technology upgrades and requiring additional reporting to Congress.

This bipartisan legislation has broad, bipartisan support from both labor and business groups, including the Chamber of Commerce, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, NAM, and Business Roundtable.

Mr. Speaker, as our fragile economy continues to recover, we must ensure American businesses have the tools they need to compete in the global market place and create jobs for workers here at home.

This bipartisan legislation will help do exactly that.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2072.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2072, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1320

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ENHANCED SECURITY COOPERATION ACT OF 2012

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4133) to express the sense of Congress regarding the United States-Israel strategic relationship, to direct the President to submit to Congress reports on United States actions to enhance this relationship and to assist in the defense of Israel, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4133

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 ''United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Since 1948, United States Presidents and both houses of Congress, on a bipartisan basis and supported by the American people, have repeatedly reaffirmed the special bond between the United States and Israel, based on shared values and shared interests.

(2) The Middle East is undergoing rapid change, bringing with it hope for an expansion of democracy but also great challenges to the national security of the United States and our allies in the region, particularly our most important ally in the region, Israel. Over the past year, the Middle East has witnessed the fall of some regimes long considered to be stabilizing forces and a rise in the influence of radical Islamists.

(3) Iran, which has long sought to foment instability and promote extremism in the Middle East, is now seeking to exploit the dramatic political transition underway in the region to undermine governments traditionally aligned with the United States and support extremist political movements in these countries.

(4) At the same time, Iran may soon attain a nuclear weapons capability, a development that would fundamentally threaten vital American interests, destabilize the region, encourage regional nuclear proliferation, further empower and embolden Iran, the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, and provide it the tools to threaten its neighbors, including Israel.

(5) Over the past several years, with the assistance of Iran and Syria, Hizballah and Hamas have increased their stockpiles of rockets, with more than 60,000 rockets now ready to be fired at Israel. Iran continues to add to its arsenal of ballistic missiles and cruise missiles, which threaten Iran's neighbors, Israel, and United States military forces in the region.

(6) As a result, the strategic environment that has kept Israel secure and safeguarded United States national interests for the past 35 years has eroded.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States:

(1) To reaffirm the enduring commitment of the United States to the security of the State of Israel as a Jewish state. As President Obama stated on December 16, 2011, ''America's commitment and my commitment to Israel and Israel's security is unshakeable.''. And as President Bush stated before the Knesset on the 60th anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel on May 15, 2008, ''The alliance between our governments is unbreakable, yet the source of our friendship runs deeper than any treaty.''.

(2) To provide Israel the military capabilities necessary to deter and defend itself by itself against any threats.

(3) To veto any one-sided anti-Israel resolutions at the United Nations Security Council.

(4) To support Israel's inherent right to self-defense.

(5) To pursue avenues to expand cooperation with Israel in both defense and across the spectrum of civilian sectors, including high technology, agriculture, medicine, health, pharmaceuticals, and energy.

(6) To assist Israel with its on-going efforts to forge a peaceful, negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict that results in two states living side by side in peace and security, and to encourage Israel's neighbors to recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state.

SEC. 4. UNITED STATES ACTIONS TO ASSIST IN THE DEFENSE OF ISRAEL AND PROTECT AMERICAN INTERESTS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should take the following actions to assist in the defense of Israel:

(1) Provide Israel such support as may be necessary to increase development and production of joint missile defense systems, particularly such systems that defend the urgent threat posed to Israel and United States forces in the region.

(2) Provide Israel assistance specifically for the production and procurement of the Iron Dome defense system for purposes of intercepting short-range missiles, rockets, and projectiles launched against Israel.

(3) Provide Israel defense articles and defense services through such mechanisms as appropriate, to include air refueling tankers, missile defense capabilities, and specialized munitions.

(4) Allocate additional weaponry and munitions for the forward-deployed United States stockpile in Israel.

(5) Provide Israel additional surplus defense articles and defense services, as appropriate, in the wake of the withdrawal of United States forces from Iraq.

(6) Strengthen efforts to prevent weapons smuggling into Gaza pursuant to the 2005 Agreement on Movement and Access following the Israeli withdrawal from Gaza and to protect against weapons smuggling and terrorist threats from the Sinai Peninsula.

(7) Offer the Israeli Air Force additional training and exercise opportunities in the United States to compensate for Israel's limited air space.

(8) Expand Israel's authority to make purchases under the Foreign Military Financing program on a commercial basis.

(9) Seek to enhance the capabilities of the United States and Israel to address emerging common threats, increase security cooperation, and expand joint military exercises.

(10) Encourage an expanded role for Israel within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), including an enhanced presence at NATO headquarters and exercises.

(11) Support extension of the long-standing loan guarantee program for Israel, recognizing Israel's unbroken record of repaying its loans on time and in full.

(12) Expand already-close intelligence cooperation, including satellite intelligence, with Israel.

(b) REPORT ON ISRAEL'S QUALITATIVE MILITARY EDGE.—

(1) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(A) to help Israel preserve its qualitative military edge amid rapid and uncertain regional political transformation; and

(B) to encourage further development of advanced technology programs between the United States and Israel given current trends and instability in the region.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report on the status of Israel's qualitative military edge in light of current trends and instability in the region.

(c) REPORTS ON OTHER MATTERS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on each of the following:

(1) Taking into account Israel's urgent requirement for F 35 aircraft, actions to improve the process relating to Israel's purchase of F 35 aircraft to improve cost efficiency and timely delivery.

(2) Efforts to expand cooperation between the United States and Israel in homeland security, counter-terrorism, maritime security, energy, cybersecurity, and other appropriate areas.

(3) Actions to integrate Israel into the defense of the Eastern Mediterranean.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(2) QUALITATIVE MILITARY EDGE.—The term ''qualitative military edge'' has the meaning given the term in section 36(h)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(h)(2)).

SEC. 5. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE LOAN GUARANTEES TO ISRAEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title I of the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 108 11), as amended, is further amended in the item relating to ''Loan Guarantees to Israel''—

(1) in the matter preceding the first proviso, by striking ''September 30, 2011'' and inserting ''September 30, 2015''; and

(2) in the second proviso, by striking ''September 30, 2011'' and inserting ''September 30, 2015''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012, of which I am an original cosponsor; and I thank the distinguished majority leader and minority whip for sponsoring this important legislation.

The democratic Jewish State of Israel is our closest and most important ally. We share the same interests. We share the same values. And, lamentably, we share the same threats.

Today, 64 years after Israel's founding, these same shared threats to both of our nations are stark and they are growing—particularly the threat posed by the Iranian regime, which continues racing towards nuclear-weapons capabilities, and by Iran's partner in crime, the Assad regime in Syria. Israel continues to face the danger of Iranian-sponsored violent extremists, including Hamas and Hezbollah, which continue to expand their capabilities to threaten Israeli civilians and its infrastructure with tens of thousands of rockets, mortars, and missiles.

As a result of our shared commitments, the United States and Israel have worked together to advance technologies and policies to keep both of our countries safe and secure. Israel's proximity to the Iran-Syria-Hamas-Hezbollah nexus eliminates any room for error in Israel's defense capabilities.

We are here today to reaffirm our unequivocal support for Israel's right to

defend herself. And even beyond affirming Israel's right to defend herself, we aim to expand Israel's ability to protect her citizens against the dangers which they are subjected to day after day.

This bill expresses the sense of Congress that our country should support an increase to the totality of our bilateral security relations—from joint missile defense systems, intelligence cooperation, military exercises between the United States and Israel, to increasing Air Force training as well as providing increased excess defense articles and munitions to Israel.

This legislation also seeks to counter the Israel bashing that has become commonplace in international forums such as the United Nations. The United States must not allow Israel to be isolated and demonized in international organizations and must work together to withdraw U.S. participation in and funding from organizations that do so.

This legislation also extends the authority to provide loan guarantees to the Israeli Government that provide the Jewish state with a cushion of support in times of need at no cost to the American taxpayer.

As the United States and Israel work together to stop the challenges posed by the Iranian and Syrian regimes, and by violent extremists like Hezbollah and Hamas, the U.S.-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act, the bill before us today, marks the triumph that we have achieved through our existing cooperation and advances our alliance to new levels.

I want to again thank my colleagues from both sides of the aisle for their strong support for this measure.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4133, the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012, and I yield myself 3 minutes.

I would like to thank my friends, the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, and minority whip, Mr. HOYER, for bringing this important bill to the floor. Their cooperation on this legislation is an outstanding example of Congress' bipartisan support for the United States-Israel relationship.

Mr. Speaker, since its founding, Israel has faced innumerable challenges to its survival, but the serious threats it faces today are unprecedented. Only weeks ago, a massive barrage of rockets was fired from Gaza at Israeli population centers by Islamic jihad and other terrorists. But unlike previous incidents where terrorists targeted Israel, the Iron Dome anti-missile system—funded in part by the United States—changed the rules of the game. In fact, Iron Dome intercepted a remarkable 90 percent of the incoming rockets aimed at once-defenseless population centers.

Currently, there are only three Iron Dome batteries operational in Israel, with two more on the way, but more are needed in order to protect all of Israel's 8 million citizens.

I'm pleased to say that H.R. 4133 incorporates language from the Iron Dome Support Act, bipartisan legislation that the chair and I recently introduced and which now has nearly 90 cosponsors, expressing support for providing Israel assistance to produce additional Iron Dome batteries.

The bill also pledges to assist Israel with its ongoing efforts to forge a peaceful, negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict that results in two states living side by side in peace and security. Despite all of the obstacles to achieving this goal, we can't give up trying, as peace is profoundly in Israel's strategic interest. I applaud Prime Minister Netanyahu's willingness to negotiate anywhere, anytime. The Palestinians should take him up on that offer instead of pursuing a campaign to delegitimize Israel at the U.N. and elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the greatest threat to both American and Israeli security today is that posed by Iran's nuclear weapons program. I hope fervently that this can be solved diplomatically. But as we all know, only massive pressure from the United States and our allies has any chance of persuading Iran to give up its quest for nuclear arms. This bill makes clear that the U.S. Congress will continue to help Israel meet the Iranian threat.

Gaza-based terrorism, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and the Iranian nuclear problem are not the only threats faced by Israel. Recent events in Egypt and Syria, along with the presence of Hamas in Gaza and Hezbollah in Lebanon, require Israeli vigilance against danger from all directions. To that end, this bill reaffirms our determination to support Israel's qualitative military edge against any possible combination of regional threats.

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

Mr. BERMAN. I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

And reinforcing that commitment to Israel's security, this bill extends for 4 years a loan guarantee program for Israel that was initiated in 2003, an extension based on legislation that Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN and I introduced in March.

Our relationship with our ally Israel is one of the most important, and closest, that we have with any nation in the world. We face many of the same threats, and we share the same values.

Israel's Defense Minister Ehud Barak recently said that he can hardly remember a better period of U.S. support and cooperation and common U.S.-Israel strategic understanding than the current one. Passage of this bill will help ensure that this cooperation continues into the future. I encourage all of my colleagues to support the legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to submit remarks and include extraneous material on the legislation under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who has the honor of chairing our Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the chair for yielding time to me. She is doing an exemplary job as chairman of the very important Foreign Affairs Committee, and we thank her for that.

I rise in strong support of this resolution. As we approach the 64th anniversary of Israel's declaration of independence, we must confront the unfortunate reality that all is not well in the Middle East. Just over a year and a half ago, a street vendor set off a wave of popular revolution which continues to shake the region's core foundations. And although I hope that the so-called Arab Spring will usher democracy and human rights into a region where both have been exceptions rather than the rule, and a year and a half in, the picture is starting to look—let's face it—bleak.

Times like this make us especially aware of who our friends are, and I am proud to support this and any resolution which strengthens the United States-Israel relationship.

□ 1330

For 64 years, the bonds of friendship between our two countries, reinforced by both shared interests and shared values, have remained strong and continue to grow stronger. Today, Israel faces unprecedented threats to its security, some of which, like the Iranian nuclear program, have loomed on the horizon for some time; and some, like the current regional instability that we've seen, are relatively new. At this time of heightened danger and profound change, it is incumbent on us to do everything in our power to help to secure Israel. It's our strongest ally in the region, has been for many years, and will continue to be in the future.

The administration is fond of trumpeting its undying support for Israel, as Vice President BIDEN did just yesterday, but the proof of the pudding is in the eating. If the administration is truly serious about Israel's security, it can start by stating loudly and clearly that it will not allow Iran to acquire a nuclear weapons capability—not just the weapon, but the capability to produce one. That would be far more meaningful than another of the dozens of generic statements we frequently read about in the newspapers.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members not to traffic the well while a Member is under recognition.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank my friend from California.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to have worked on both sides of the aisle in the leadership of advancing U.S.-Israeli relations; proud of what I have done on a bipartisan basis to maintain Israel's qualitative military edge; proud of taking a tough line on Iran; proud of the meeting that I convened with the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida just several weeks ago with United Against a Nuclear Iran, a bipartisan meeting with the group United Against Nuclear Iran to make sure that we're taking the toughest actions possible with all the tools in our toolbox against a nuclear Iran; proud to have called publicly for the arrest of the madman Ahmadinejad on charges of inciting genocide; proud yesterday to have joined with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) in calling for an investigation of whether U.S. taxpayer dollars have been used towards the Palestinian Investment Fund; and today I'm very proud to rise in support of the U.S.-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes certain fundamentals get lost in the shuffle. Here are the fundamentals:

Israel is the most important ally that we have in the world. Israel is the most important ally that we have in the world in the most dangerous region of the world. The bonds between Israel and the United States are unshakeable, can never be minimized, and will never be weakened for as long as both sides of the aisle continue to work side by side to advance that partnership.

Of all the things we do here, one of the things I'm most proud of is our bipartisan support for Israel. And we will continue in that spirit—not only because a strong Israel is critical, but because a strong Israel means a more secure America.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), a member of our Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Judiciary.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, America's support for Israel is not new. Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin both wanted the likeness of Moses leading the children of Israel to serve as the Great Seal of the newly independent United States of America. In fact, in the center of this Chamber, in the relief portrait that is directly in front of me looking down on this House, is the portrait of the great lawgiver Moses. John Adams wrote that he really wished the Jews had in Judea an independent nation.

So in 1948, when Israel finally became a modern, independent Jewish state, the United States recognized Israel in just 11 minutes. Today, our support for Israel cannot waiver, it cannot wane, and we cannot grow weary in proclaiming the absolute right of Israel to defend itself.

Israel's interests are America's interests. They are on the front lines against terrorists like Hezbollah and Hamas. They are surrounded by nations that do not like them. And Israel is opposed to the tiny tyrant from the desert—Ahmadinejad—in his pursuit of nuclear destruction of Israel.

Our troops train together, and our cooperation in developing military technology has saved Israeli and American lives.

The United States has no greater ally in the Middle East than the nation of Israel. The United States must let the world know that Israel has the absolute right to be left alone.

So I support this suspension and urge its passage, and that's just the way it is.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the ranking member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, on a resolution that does not affect—well, it does affect the Western Hemisphere because it affects us, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman from California, and I rise in strong support of this resolution.

I want our colleagues to hear what's been going on here on the House floor. At a time when Congress has been derided as not being able to get its act together, when people say Democrats and Republicans cannot agree on anything, when people say that Congress doesn't know how to work together and meet in the middle, what are we hearing? We're hearing Democrats and Republicans alike expressing strong bipartisan support for Israel, expressing strong bipartisan support for the U.S.-Israel relationship.

We know that the United States and Israel have so much in common. We have common feelings of democracy. We have common mores. We have common people who understand what democracy is all about.

Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East and faces threats from terrorist groups like Hezbollah and Hamas. Israel is willing to sit down and negotiate with the Palestinians with no preconditions. Prime Minister Netanyahu has said that many, many times, and he has been rebuffed by the Palestinians, who want all kinds of preconditions before they will even sit down and talk with Israel.

And of course Iran looms large. Iran must never be allowed to have a nuclear weapon. Iran is not only a threat to wipe Israel off the face of the Earth, as that lunatic Ahmadinejad has said, but Iran is a threat to the West, to the United States, and to NATO as well.

So, what are we doing here this afternoon? We're rising in strong support of H.R. 4133, the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act. This important bill reaffirms that Congress stands shoulder to shoulder with Israel as it faces numerous challenges in the weeks and months ahead. It restates U.S. policy that America must provide Israel with the capability to defend itself and preserve its qualitative military edge. It increases military and civilian security cooperation between our two nations in order to prevent Iran from achieving nuclear weapons capability. It supports a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict based on a two-state solution. It encourages Israel's neighbors to recognize the Jewish state, and Israel must be recognized as a Jewish state.

As importantly, though, I think this bill also shows that, even as partisanship runs through Congress, support for Israel remains rock solid and bipartisan. Democrats and Republicans, as I said before, are here on the floor together saying that we need to support the U.S.-Israel relationship and defending Israel's inherent right to self-defense.

With more than two-thirds of Congress cosponsoring this legislation, I think the message to Israel's detractors is clear: The United States will stand with the Jewish state for now and forever.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, what an honor it is to yield 1 minute to our esteemed majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, the coauthor of this important legislation.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentlelady from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, today the House will vote on the bipartisan U.S.-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act. This bill reaffirms Israel's right to defend itself against threats and puts the Congress on record about America's longstanding commitment to the U.S.-Israel strategic relationship, a unique and special relationship founded on shared interests and shared democratic values.

□ 1340

My friend, Democratic Whip STENY HOYER, and I introduced this legislation to ensure that, during a time of such instability, threats to Israeli and American security will be answered with strength and resolve.

Unfortunately, even during periods of calm, Israel lives in a tough neighborhood; and because our national interests are so often linked, Israel is often at the front lines of responding to threats to both of our security. This is true when it comes to a shared fight against radical Islamist terrorism, and it is certainly true when it comes to Iran. This bill reiterates that our investment in Israel's security is an investment in our own security.

I want to thank Mr. HOYER as well as Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN and Ranking Member HOWARD BERMAN, who joined us in drafting this legislation. I thank them for their hard work and for their

steadfast leadership as defenders of our great ally in the Middle East.

The strong bipartisan support for this bill speaks to the importance and the urgency with which we must address and enhance Israel's ability to defend itself during a period of profound transition and instability.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 300 members of both parties have sponsored this bill, and we hope to have many more in the final count. The House has always demonstrated a bipartisan commitment to the U.S.-Israel relationship, and today we say again, we refuse to send mixed messages when it comes to America's support for Israel. Today we demonstrate congressional support for important steps to make Israel and America more secure.

Among other things, the bill encourages the President to provide additional assistance to support U.S.-Israel joint missile defense efforts, such as Iron Dome, David's Sling, and Arrow; allocate additional weaponry and munitions to the forward-deployed U.S. stockpile located in Israel; strengthen multilateral efforts to prevent weapons smuggling into Gaza and to protect against terrorism from the Sinai Peninsula; expand already close intelligence cooperation between the U.S. and Israel; protect Israel's Qualitative Military Edge and ensure that Israel remains the preeminent military power in the region; lobby against and veto the outrageous parade of one-sided, anti-Israel resolutions at the United Nations every year. The bill also extends the long-standing loan guarantee program for Israel, recognizing its perfect record of repaying its loans on time and in full.

Mr. Speaker, this could be a very hot summer in the Middle East:

Egypt is likely to elect an Islamist government. While we all hope Egypt's new government keeps the peace that has held for 30 years, the future is uncertain;

Syria is consumed by civil war, with a vicious dictator backed by Iran and Hezbollah, murdering his own citizens, fueling sectarian tensions, and giving rise to radicalism;

Iran continues its decades-long effort to acquire a nuclear weapons capability. Sanctions may be hurting Iran's economy, but Iran's leaders thus far remain wedded to pursue their dangerous goal. Iran continues to support terrorism, providing lethal support to Hezbollah, Hamas, and the Taliban.

The United States and Israel share an important strategic goal: preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability and combating its terrorist proxies.

Mr. Speaker, this bill recognizes the profound threats the U.S. and Israel face in the region and reiterates our commitment to standing side by side with Israel during this pivotal and dangerous period of transition and instability, and I urge its passage.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the other main cosponsor of this legislation, our Democratic whip, a leader for so many years on the issue of the U.S.-Israel relationship.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I've known Mr. BERMAN for almost half a century. He has been an extraordinary leader, as a young person, as chairman of this committee, as ranking member on this committee, and I want to thank him for his leadership on this issue. He has been instrumental.

I want to thank my dear friend in whose district I used to live so many years ago, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, thank her for her leadership and her commitment. She has been a stalwart.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when there is great disagreement on a number of important issues, we are reminded today that Democrats and Republicans stand together when it comes to supporting our friend and ally Israel.

I am proud to be a lead cosponsor of the U.S.-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act, along with my friend, the Republican leader, Mr. CANTOR, who just spoke.

This bill enshrines in law the deeper military and security cooperation that the Obama administration has forged with Israel and made a very high priority. President Obama's predecessor, President Bush, responsible for forging and continuing that relationship, as were his predecessors.

Today, with greater uncertainty in the Middle East and the continued pursuit of nuclear weapons by Iran, close security cooperation between the United States and Israel has never been more important.

I have visited Israel 12 times, and I've seen firsthand how Israelis have achieved so much with so little. Investment in Israel's security and Israel's success yield real benefits to the United States through shared intelligence, technological exchange, and trade. Investments in Israel also strengthen our security because our countries share, not just values, but strategic interests, including preventing Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

Iran, as we all know, has been a destabilizing force in a volatile part of the world so closely linked with global energy supplies and where American troops are stationed. In response, this administration has coordinated with our European allies to impose the strongest sanctions Iran has ever faced.

This bill will enable even closer military and security ties with Israel so we can further deter Iran from developing nuclear weapons capability and work together—work together—to recreate and to combat terrorism that threatens both of our countries.

I want to recognize, in particular, the hard work of my friend and colleague, as I said earlier, HOWARD BERMAN, the ranking Democrat on the Foreign Affairs Committee. He and ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN have been a real team, real partners in this effort, as I and Mr. CANTOR have been. Mr. BERMAN has been instrumental in securing funding for the Iron Dome antimissile defense system that was jointly developed and will be deployed on Israel's borders to protect against short-range missiles Iran provides to terrorist groups like Hamas and Hezbollah, thousands of those missiles.

As Israel continues its pursuit of secure peace, we in Congress will continue to stand together in support of Israel and in recognition of the values and ideas our countries share.

This resolution, in part, is so that there will be clarity, that there will be no confusion. There needs to be a clear understanding of all those who would threaten Israel, that the United States stands with her, because it is in our, the United States', security interest to do so, and because it is morally and ethically the right thing to do as well.

We all hope for two states, living side by side peacefully, with families secure, that they can raise their children in a future that will bring peace and prosperity and tranquillity in a troubled neighborhood of the world.

I urge my colleagues to enthusiastically support this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), an esteemed member of our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution. Having had the opportunity to visit Israel last summer, I think that Netanyahu put it best when he says: In this region of the world, we are you and you are us.

We not only share the same value systems, we share the same beliefs and the same threats that Israel faces, not just from time to time but every day. So it is absolutely critical for this partnership that we have, the relationship between the United States and Israel, to go forward.

And the message needs to come from this House that from today and forever more, the United States will always be standing strong with Israel, standing with Israel in every issue. And in the neighborhood which has been referred to by our colleagues that Israel exists in, the most dangerous and unstable area in the world today, it is absolutely critical that we reaffirm our relationship with Israel and our support for Israel.

□ 1350

The Iron Dome is actually the most critical piece of defense that Israel has. It protects it from a neighborhood that wishes to destroy it and annihilate it.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank my good friend from California. We just have a few more speakers.

Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MURPHY, a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Israel is our friend and our ally. Israel is an island of democracy that supports freedom and religious tolerance. It is where a Christian church, a mosque, and a synagogue will peacefully exist on the same street. In neighboring countries, Christians are prohibited from building churches or are prohibited from assembling to worship, and in some cases their churches are burned down.

Israel respects and preserves the rich history of many faiths and cultures. Israel promotes invention, creativity, and economic development. Neighboring countries, like Iran, are committed to developing nuclear weapons and the missiles to deliver them, and it avows to annihilate Israel and to commit genocide against its people. Israel is fighting terrorist groups, like Hamas and Hezbollah, and has suffered real attacks and the threats of future attacks of tens of thousands of rockets rained down upon its people. Israel needs and has every right to develop defenses such as the Iron Dome, David's Sling, and the Arrow missile to defend itself from these very real threats.

Israel has been there for us during times of threat and times of peace, and we will be there for them. Israel has been a partner in medical, scientific, and technological innovations. Israel has stood with us to fight terrorist threats against our Nation and other freedom-loving nations. For these reasons and more, there are several facts which we must recognize and support:

Israel has a right to defend itself. We will stand firm with them. We will not turn a deaf ear to the anti-Semitic language and to those nations who speak it. We cannot and will not be a part of the dangerous indifference of nations and people to say it is not our problem. We will not be a part of the denial among those who refuse to see the hatred and threat from Syria, Iran, Lebanon, and other nations. We will support Prime Minister Netanyahu's call for negotiated peace with the Palestinian Authority of a two-state solution.

So let us approve H.R. 4133, and let us show that when we say ''never again'' that we mean it, because the cost of passivity—the cost of doing nothing—is far too expensive in lives and money.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), who is a member of our Foreign Affairs Committee and also a member of the Homeland Security and Natural Resources Committees.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I thank the chairwoman for giving me this opportunity to talk about the reason the United States should stand with Israel.

I brought my oldest son with me. He is in the gallery today. His name is Graham. I wanted him to hear, and people of his generation to hear, and to understand that America stands with Israel, that we were there at the beginning of the foundation of that nation.

We understand the threats that exist in the world today and that, when you have an ally, you never abandon the ally, and you never try to change that ally to meet your vision of the world. You stand with them unconditionally. America stands with Israel in the defense of that nation. We stand with Israel in the prosperity of that nation. We stand with Israel in the good times and in the bad times. We've been there from the beginning. We will be there today, and we will be there tomorrow.

It is important for this generation to understand that America plays a very vital role in standing with someone who has stood with us time and time again.

May God continue to bless America, and may God continue to bless the State of Israel.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that they are not to refer to occupants of the gallery.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights.

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the distinguished gentlelady, the chairwoman of our committee, for her great leadership on all things related to the Middle East, especially in the defense of Israel. I thank my good friend and colleague Mr. BERMAN. These two individuals work so hard every day for the peace and security of Israel, and I congratulate them.

I also thank ERIC CANTOR, the author, along with the distinguished gentlelady and Mr. BERMAN and Mr. HOYER, for bringing before the House the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012. This bill reaffirms and modernizes the U.S. commitment to and cooperation with our great friend and ally Israel. This is a must-pass bill because our commitment is—and it must be perceived to be—unequivocal.

I would say to my friends and colleagues that, because of the dangerous and escalating threats, including genocide, that are facing Israel today, we must reiterate unanimously in this body today our support for the nation of Israel.

Freedom House's annual report on the world, which assesses the political and civil liberties of nearly every nation in the world, shows that Israel is surrounded by nations that profoundly disrespect the political and civil liberties of their own citizens, often using torture and all kinds of means of hate against their own people, and of course they foment that hate towards Israel. This includes Iran, Syria, and many in the Gaza that have human rights records that are among the worst in the world.

As we all know, some of Israel's neighbors openly question Israel's right to exist. Iran's anti-Semitic leader, Ahmadinejad, has repeatedly threatened to wipe Israel off the face of the Earth. I would note parenthetically that Iran is a signer of the Genocide Convention and that it has been since it ratified it back in 1956.

Where is the United Nations, especially with regard to those who enforce the Genocide Convention, when those kinds of barbaric statements are made by the likes of Ahmadinejad? With this bill, Mr. Speaker, the United States underscores and reiterates our unshakable commitment to Israel. With this bill, the U.S. reaffirms—in word and in deed—our commitment to the defense of the Jewish state. Specifically, the bill enhances Israel's ability to defend itself.

Superior deterrence remains among the best guarantors of peace, and that has certainly been the case in the Middle East. When Israel's military superiority was unclear in the eyes of its enemies soon after it was created, soon after Israel became a state, Israel was tested repeatedly with war. Of course, Israel won those wars decisively. Since then, Israel's military superiority has been clear and compelling. So in response, Israel's enemies have relied on the tactics of the bully and of the coward, especially with their use of terrorism. They have attacked with Gaza rockets, with the intifada, with the flotilla; and Israel's task has been to overcome those deadly aggressions.

Again, this bill provides a clear commitment by the United States to our great friend and ally, the State of Israel.

Overcoming aggression is a daunting task—particularly for a country so small and vastly outnumbered—but Israel has been up to the task. And it's our country's moral obligation to give them every assistance. With this bill, Israel will be better equipped for any scenario as it fulfills its solemn duty to protect its own people from harm.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4133 also specifies further assistance for several programs where it will be most effective in deterring attack and defending Israel, including for the Iron Dome, Israel's successful means of defending against missiles, rockets, and other projectiles targeting Israeli homes and businesses.

H.R. 4133 also expands U.S. military and civilian cooperation with Israel, including an offer to the Israeli Air Force for additional training opportunities in the United States to compensate for Israel's limited air space, and other enhanced cooperation on intelligence sharing.

Israel has shown itself to be a good friend to the United Sates, not only setting the standard for democracy and human rights in the region, but by being trustworthy with loans—always repaying loans on time and in full. This bill recognizes Israel's dependability with an extension of the long-standing loan guarantee program for Israel.

Finally, this bill reaffirms that the only viable option for peace and security in the region is an Israeli state and Palestinian state existing side-by-side. The Palestinian Authority and surrounding nations should take note. H.R. 4133 makes crystal clear the United States will not stand for terrorist threats or political shenanigans at the UN attacking Israel and attempting to bypass the hard work of forging a nation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4133 makes our country's alliance relationship an even more effective agent for deterring war and defending Israel in the tragic event of war. I am proud to support this bill, and thank my good friend Mr. CANTOR for introducing it.

Mr. BERMAN. I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to my friend from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank the chairman; I thank the ranking member; and I thank all who support this piece of legislation.

This is but a reaffirmation of our support to our ally Israel. I think that it gives us an opportunity to make it clear that Israel has the complete support of the United States of America.

Israel has been one of the beacons of democracy in the neighborhood. It does have elections, and it does have opportunities for government to change. These are the kinds of things that we value in this country: the rights of people to make a difference in their own lives.

Aside from this, we have a duty, when one country has been threatened with complete elimination, to do what we can to prevent this. I think that this is a part of that prevention that will help make a difference.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), a member of the Judiciary and Natural Resources Committees.

□ 1400

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I appreciate the wonderful work our chair has done to work with the ranking member on this issue.

It is critical that the world know how united this Congress is behind our ally Israel. It's a maxim in history, it's a truth that when a nation's enemies see their strongest ally turning against them, that is when their enemies move against that nation.

We saw a couple of years ago when this administration voted with Israel's enemies to require that Israel disclose certain of its weapons. It was shortly after that that a flotilla challenged the blockade at the Gaza Strip. That's how it works. When a nation's enemies see an ally that may be turning against a nation, they move against that nation.

This is what is so important, that we show the world that when it comes to this issue, we may bicker back and forth about all kinds of things, but when it comes to support for Israel—the analogy could be applicable here, that it is a miner's canary. When Israel is under attack, it's a potential attack on all of the rest of those who love liberty as well.

I agree with Mr. HOYER, our friend from Maryland, when he says that Israel's enemies need to know that when it comes to support for Israel, we have solidarity and complete support for our friend. Israel's enemies need to know that, and the world needs to know that. And I'm very grateful for leadership on both sides for making that clear to the world and to Israel's enemies.

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

We've had a group of speakers come down to the floor, including the majority leader, the Democratic whip, the chair of the committee, and a number of other Members to talk about our solidarity with Israel, the U.S.-Israel relationship, the bipartisan nature of it.

To the extent there was an implication—which I heard—from the last speaker that this is not a view shared by this administration, I just want to rise and indicate how wrong such an implication is. The President of the United States has indicated that these bonds are unbreakable. He has raised the level of security cooperation and intelligence sharing to unprecedentedly high levels between the United States and Israel. He is leading the international effort to get Iran to abandon its nuclear weapons program. He has stood with Israel in the wake of the Goldstone Report, in the wake of the efforts of the Human Rights Commission to demonize and delegitimize Israel, and in the context of vetoing resolutions which unfairly single out Israel on a number of issues. Any implication to the contrary is unfounded and seeks to undercut the very bipartisan nature of the support that is so essential to this relationship.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time, and I thank my good friend from California (Mr. BERMAN) for his leadership role in bringing this bill to the floor today. I thank our majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, as well as the minority whip, Mr. HOYER.

This bill before us, Madam Speaker, the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act, is an important one. It sends a clear signal and a clear message throughout the world, to our friends and to our enemies, that the United States stands foursquare with our indispensable ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel. This bill is a reaffirmation of our staunch commitment to Israel's security, its right to self-defense, and its right to exist. It is a testament to our friendship with Israel that has served us so well for the last 64 years, and will continue to serve us well for many generations to come. And it is a pledge that the United States and Israel, continuing to work together, will address the challenges to our common security so that we can ensure a safe, prosperous, and free future for both of our Nations.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, H.R. 4133, the United States-Israeli Security Cooperation Act expresses the sense of Congress that the U.S. take actions to maintain Israel's qualitative military edge with advanced missile defense systems and ''specialized munitions'' to protect Israel in a time of significant change in the region, as well as to respond to the threat posed by Iran. I strongly support Israel's security and believe that the United States has an important role to play in ensuring regional peace. I am concerned that the language in this bill could pave the path for war with Iran.

At a time when the United States and Iran are making significant progress in their first direct negotiations in years, legislation that draws the line at a nuclear capable Iran undermines the talks. Indeed, as Trita Parsi, a leading expert on Iran points out, it is likely that a negotiated deal with Iran under the framework of the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Treaty will allow for enrichment for peaceful purposes on Iranian soil under strict inspections. Preventing a disastrous war and a nuclear-weapons free Iran will require that the United States and the international community fully support such negotiations.

Many experts agree that a preemptive military strike on Iran would only delay their nuclear program. Top U.S. military officials such as Defense Secretary Leon Panetta have plainly stated that Iran has not acquired a nuclear weapon. Even former Israeli intelligence officials, including the former heads of the Shin Bet and the Mossad, have joined the chorus of top U.S. military brass in opposing a preemptive military strike against Iran.

Sustained, diplomatic engagement with Iran is the only way to achieve transparency and a nuclear-weapons free Iran. Any Congressional effort to limit or undermine the President's authority to pursue diplomacy with Iran and to encourage the use of military force against Iran must be opposed.

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, I rise to offer clarification of my views regarding H.R. 4133, the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012. I voted in favor of this legislation, but I feel it is important to note some specific points.

First, I agree with the finding that highlights recent instability in the Middle East-North Africa region in the wake of the Arab Spring. When protests started 14 months ago, I spoke about my hopes for peaceful transitions to democracy, but I also cautioned that history teaches it is often difficult to establish the rule of law and respect for human rights after authoritarian governments are overthrown. We all hoped that the desire for democracy would bring both peace and justice to a troubled region, and I am saddened to see that political instability and, too often, a lack of respect for the rights of individuals and of minorities, are beginning to have far-reaching effects.

That said, I must note that while I am a staunch supporter of Israel's right to defend itself, H.R. 4133 ought to be more precise in its statement that it is U.S. policy to ''provide Israel the military capabilities necessary to deter and defend itself by itself against any threats.'' The bill does not specify which party—the U.S. or Israel—makes the decision regarding which capabilities may be necessary. The United States should always

maintain the final say when considering sale or provision of its military capabilities. It is good that the bill states that Israel will ''defend itself by itself,'' which makes plain that no one is asking for U.S. troops to be committed to the region through this bill. Hopefully, the time will never come when that might be necessary. If it does, America will make that decision based on the situation at the time.

In addition, Sec. 4(a)(3) contains the Sense of Congress that the U.S. should ''allocate additional weaponry and munitions for the forward-deployed United States stockpile in Israel.'' I want to be clear that by no means do I interpret this as an endorsement of forward-deployed American nuclear weapons in Israel. Such an action would require the explicit authorization of Congress under separate legislation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4133, as a cosponsor of the bill and to encourage my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Since the Truman Administration, we as a Nation have worked with the people of Israel to establish and support a close economic, cultural and strategic partnership based on a common respect for democracy and a commitment to the goal of creating a lasting peace in the Middle East. Today, that partnership is among the strongest shared by any two countries.

Israel exists in a geographical region of paramount economic and strategic importance to the United States and the American people recognize that ensuring a safe and secure Israel is in the long-term national security interests of our country.

In support of the Israeli Government's efforts to protect its people, the U.S. has helped Israel develop a missile defense system; we have committed ourselves to the task of preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons; and the U.S. has led the way against attempts to use international forums to delegitimize the State of Israel.

It is in a similar vein that we consider H.R. 4133 today.

Among other things, this measure would allocate additional weaponry and munitions for Israel in the wake of the withdrawal of United States forces from Iraq; expand Israel's authority to make purchases under the Foreign Military Financing program on a commercial basis; encourage an expanded role for Israel within NATO; and require the President to submit a report on the status of Israel's qualitative military edge in light of current trends and instability in the region.

By expressing our support for the economic and strategic security of Israel at this critical time in its history, we send an unambiguous message about our unshakable commitment to the security of Israel.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4133, the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act, which unfortunately is another piece of one-sided and counterproductive foreign policy legislation. This bill's real intent seems to be more saber-rattling against Iran and Syria, and it undermines U.S. diplomatic efforts by making clear that the U.S. is not an honest broker seeking peace for the Middle East.

The bill calls for the United States to significantly increase our provision of sophisticated weaponry to Israel, and states that it is to be U.S. policy to ''help Israel preserve its qualitative military edge'' in the region.

While I absolutely believe that Israel—and any other nation—should be free to determine for itself what is necessary for its national security, I do not believe that those decisions should be underwritten by U.S. taxpayers and backed up by the U.S. military.

This bill states that it is the policy of the United States to ''reaffirm the enduring commitment of the United States to the security of the State of Israel as a Jewish state.'' However, according to our Constitution the policy of the United States Government should be to protect the security of the United States, not to guarantee the religious, ethnic, or cultural composition of a foreign country. In fact, our own Constitution prohibits the establishment of any particular religion in the U.S.

More than 20 years after the reason for NATO's existence—the Warsaw Pact—has disappeared, this legislation seeks to find a new mission for that anachronistic alliance: the defense of Israel. Calling for ''an expanded role for Israel within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), including an enhanced presence at NATO headquarters and exercises,'' it reads like a dream for interventionists and the military industrial complex. As I have said many times, NATO should be disbanded not expanded.

This bill will not help the United States, it will not help Israel, and it will not help the Middle East. It will implicitly authorize much more U.S. interventionism in the region at a time when we cannot afford the foreign commitments we already have. It more likely will lead to war against Syria, Iran, or both. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for H.R. 4133, a simple bill that will demonstrate our ongoing commitment to Israel, and will enhance our efforts to strengthen Israel's own defensive capabilities. Our goal, like Israel's own, is that Israel can defend itself, by itself. This objective of self-reliance is one of the elements that makes Israel stand out.

Israelis, from the very beginning, have understood that it is their own efforts that will ultimately determine the future of their state. It is this realization and an absolute determination to provide a better, safer future for their children that has enabled the Jewish state to succeed so magnificently in a region choked with hatred and violence reserved for them alone.

Israel's military superiority is a necessity because so many of Israel's neighbors still will not accept Israel's sovereignty and the right of the Jewish people to self-determination in their own historic homeland. Israel's security need not come at the expense of the Palestinian people's legitimate aspirations for independence and sovereignty. But those dreams of independence and sovereignty absolutely must not come at the expense of Israel's security.

As Iran continues to move toward a nuclear capability—that it must never, ever achieve—it is more critical than ever that we demonstrate our support and commitment to Israel's security, which this bill does.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

As a life-long supporter of our most important ally in the Middle East, Israel, I am pleased that the United States and Israel have built a strong, unique and special relationship. I have had the pleasure of traveling to Israel on many occasions, and I clearly understand Israeli concern about Iran's nuclear ambitions. These visits have only reinforced my strong conviction that the world needs Israel to survive and thrive for all that Israel represents and that Israel has the right to defend her citizens. The bill before us will do that by strengthening existing channels of security cooperation between America and Israel, as well as creating some new ones.

The political changes that are sweeping through North Africa and the Middle East are creating new uncertainties for the United States and Israel. The revolutions that are underway may not produce the much-hoped for democratic ''Arab Spring''. Even now in Egypt, extremists are fomenting inter-religious and ethnic hatreds that have sparked fresh violence. And we know that conventional weapons formerly in the late Colonel Qaddafi's arsenal have made their way into the hands of extremists in the region. H.R. 4133 is another reminder to the region and the world that America will stand by Israel during these increasingly chaotic and uncertain times.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, once again the U.S. House is acting on legislation, this time H.R. 4133, to restate what has been stated frequently in Congress, by President Obama, and by virtually every candidate running for federal office in the United States: that the U.S. and the State of Israel have a special bilateral and a very important strategic relationship. Congress strongly supports the State of Israel and we demonstrate our support annually by providing many billions of dollars in direct taxpayer funded assistance to ensure Israel's security. As a former member of the State and Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, I have helped to pass funding, often in excess of $3 billion in foreign aid, to ensure Israel's security.

While Congress is ever mindful of Israel's security, we have a Constitutional duty to first and foremost protect and defend the security of the United States. No one is more aware of this than President Obama. Over the past year, the Obama Administration has been leading a coalition of nations to peacefully prevent Iran—through tough economic sanctions—from starting down the path to developing a nuclear weapon. These sanctions are working and they must be allowed to continue to work. I fully support the efforts of the Obama Administration and our allies to keep the pressure on Iran.

The Government of Israel has also been focused on Iran and has articulated repeatedly that a unilateral military strike against Iran is a possibility. According to the Washington Post on February 2, 2012:

''U.S. officials fear being blindsided by an Israeli strike that could have widespread economic and security implications and might only delay, not end, Iran's nuclear pursuit.

'' 'The Obama administration is concerned that Israel could attack Iranian nuclear facilities this year, having given Washington little or no warning,' said Cliff Kupchan, a former State Department official who specialized in Iran policy during the Clinton administration and recently returned from meetings with Israeli officials. He said 'Israel has refused to assure Washington that prior notice would be provided.'

''Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta is one of several administration officials to express concern publicly that Israel is positioning itself for a surprise attack. Last month, the administration dispatched the Joint Chiefs chairman,

Gen. Martin E. Dempsey, to the Israeli capital for high level discussions about the possibility of a unilateral Israeli strike. 'Israel has indicated they're considering this, and we have indicated our concerns,' Panetta told reporters.''

While Israel's prime minister has not been shy about the possibility of an Israeli military strike, the consequences of such action would be significant for the U.S. According to the New York Times on February 29, 2012, ''American officials who have assessed the likely Iranian responses to any attack by Israel on its nuclear program believe that Iran would retaliate by launching missiles on Israel and terrorist-style attacks on United States civilian and military personnel overseas.''

Despite the strong belief that Israeli military action against Iran would result in direct attacks on Americans and American interests, many right-wing politicians seem to believe that Americans and members of our armed forces, after eleven years of war in Afghanistan and nine years of war in Iraq, are desirous of a war with Iran precipitated by unilateral Israeli military action. As one Middle East expert stated, ''Israel can commence a war with Iran, but it may well take U.S. involvement to conclude it.''

Let me be clear, I do not want U.S. forces engaged in a war with Iran. My constituents do not want a war with Iran. Clearly, I do not want to see Iran developing nuclear weapons, but the Obama Administration and the international community are working to keep the pressure on the leadership in Tehran.

In February and March of 2012, the neoconservative ''go to war with Iran'' echo chamber was appallingly reminiscent of 2002 when the Bush Administration (along with many of the same conservative pundits who are supportive of an Israeli attack on Iran today) declared the definitive presence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq a threat to U.S. national security. The result of their deception is now well known. We have seen this same march to war before, built on a foundation of half-truths, distorted intelligence, and politically motivated deceit.

President Obama has called out those who would send other peoples' sons and daughters to war, but never put themselves in harm's way. Addressing the annual AIPAC conference in Washington on March 4, 2012, the New York Times reported President Obama as saying, ''Already, there is too much loose talk of war. Over the last few weeks such talk has only benefited the Iranian government by driving up the price of oil, which they depend on to fund their nuclear program. For the sake of Israel's security, America's security and the peace and security of the world, now is not the time for bluster.''

To be clear, an Iran armed with nuclear weapons would be a serious threat to the stability of the Middle East and to the security of the United States and our allies. America's top intelligence analysts, however, have repeatedly stated that there is no concrete evidence that Iran has yet decided to build a nuclear bomb. In his January 2012 testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, Director of National Intelligence James Clapper stated that ''they are certainly moving on that path, but we don't believe they have actually made the decision to go ahead with a nuclear weapon.''

Yet today, the House of Representatives is voting on H.R. 4133 which calls upon the U.S. to provide Israel with ''defense articles and defense services through such mechanisms as appropriate, to include air refueling tankers, missile defense capabilities, and specialized munitions.' By providing this specialized military capacity—all required by Israel for an airstrike on Iran—the U.S. would be removing the very limiting factors that may be preventing Israel from launching an attack that could draw the U.S. into another war.

The Director of the Central Intelligence Agency from 2006 to 2009, Michael Hayden, has been quoted as saying that airstrikes capable of seriously setting back Iran's nuclear program were ''beyond the capacity'' of Israel, in part because of distance that aircraft would have to travel and the scale of the task, according to a February 19, 2012 New York Times article entitled, ''Iran Raid Seen as a Huge Task for Israeli Jets.''

The same Times article states, ''Israel has American-built F 15I and F 16I fighter jets that can carry bombs to the targets, but their range—depending on altitude, speed and payload—falls far short of the minimum 2,000 mile round trip. . .Israel would have to use airborne refueling planes, called tankers, but Israel is not thought to have enough.''

The same article identifies ''another major hurdle is Israel's inventory of bombs capable of penetrating the Natanz (nuclear) facility, believed to be buried under 30 feet of reinforced concrete, and the Fordo site, which is built into a mountain. Assuming it does not use a nuclear device, Israel has American-made GBU 28 5,000 pound 'bunker buster' bombs that could damage such hardened targets, although it is unclear how far down they can go.''

By supplying air refueling tanks and bunker buster bombs to Israel that would then be used in a military strike against Iran, the U.S, would be explicitly supporting the military action in the eyes of the Iranians and the world, even if Israel never notified the U.S. of its actual intent to strike. Such a level of vulnerability and exposure on the part of the U.S. is not tolerable. Israel is an ally, but their primary interest is their own national security, not the security of the U.S.

On a final note, the fact that the New York Times referenced that Israel has the option of using a ''nuclear device'' against the Iranian targets should be cause for tremendous alarm for Americans. Even the consideration of using a nuclear weapon against Iran to prevent it from pursuing a nuclear weapons program should be categorically rejected by Israel, the U.S., and all nations committed to nuclear non-proliferation. The worst kept secret in the world is that Israel possesses nuclear weapons. The U.S. and this Congress should be guaranteed that our ally, Israel, will never use those weapons as a first-strike capability.

Israel's security is important and I have voted dozens of times to provide funds, weapons, and support. H.R. 4133 is more than ''a sense of Congress,'' more than feelings. It sends a signal to the world that Israel should be provided with the military capacity by the U.S. to strike Iran. That I do not support.

Out of respect for the importance of the U.S.-Israel relationship I intend to vote ''present'' on H.R. 4133, but I must express my strong opposition to endorsing any actions by a foreign power that could potentially drag the U.S. into a military conflict with Iran.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I will be voting today for H.R. 4133 because I agree with its two basic premises. The alliance between the United States and Israel, including military support, is of critical importance. And we must prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons capability.

I cast this vote, however, with serious reservations about both the bill's timing and its content. There is no question that a nuclear-capable Iran poses a grave threat not only to Israel, but to the United States and other nations. We must ensure that we have every tool available at our disposal to dissuade if possible and prevent if necessary the Iranian regime from developing nuclear weapons or the capability to produce such weapons from stockpiled materials and components.

Among these vital tools are a combination of diplomatic and economic mechanisms of the sort that I have frequently supported in the past—including the Iran Threat Reduction Act, which also passed with overwhelming bipartisan support earlier in this Congress—that have often exerted effective pressures on Iran, hindering and deterring the development of nuclear capabilities. Military attacks on Iranian facilities by American or Israeli forces must be regarded as absolutely a last resort, fraught with potentially disastrous consequences, some quite predictable, some not yet imagined.

Yet this bill gives little weight or emphasis to critical diplomatic and economic measures and at points comes perilously close to signaling intent or support for the military option. In fact, the timing of this legislation risks being interpreted as a vote of ''no-confidence'' in our ongoing efforts to engage diplomatically with Iran. Developments such as the so-called ''P5+1'' meetings between the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, Germany, and Iran—the next meeting of which is scheduled to be held in Baghdad two weeks from today—are critically important steps toward renewed engagement, with a lengthened roster of partners and a tighter sanctions regime. One can hope that the resolve expressed in H.R. 4133 might strengthen these efforts, but I fear that the bill's timing and some of its provisions may also threaten their devaluation.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 4133.

I am a proud co-sponsor of the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act which states it is the policy of the United States to aid Israel, specifically with the preservation of Israel's qualitative military edge amid rapid and uncertain regional political transformation and the development of advanced technology programs between the United States and Israel. The bill expresses the sense of Congress that the United States should equip Israel with the necessary military capabilities, in order to deter and defend itself against any threats; veto any one-sided anti-Israel resolutions at the United Nations Council; support Israel's right to self-defense; and promote peaceful negotiations between Israel and Palestine.

Israel sets the example for the nations of the Middle East, as the only true democracy in that region. For the past 63 years, Israel has been a sanctuary of democracy and pluralism in a region dominated by authoritarian regimes. Israel is the only country in the Middle East with free elections, a free press, freedom of religion, protection for minority rights and other safeguards typical of a free society. The

Middle East is experiencing rapid changes. These rapid changes bring hope for the expansion of democracy but also great challenges to the national security of the United States and our allies in the region, particularly Israel. H.R. 4133 reaffirms the United States commitment to Israel and the establishment of a peaceful relationship between Israel and Palestine.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill, which expresses support for our strongest Middle Eastern ally and is a matter of national security for both Israel and the United States.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I am an unwavering supporter of Israel, therefore I speak today more in sorrow than in anger. I first want to express my esteem for my friend, the gentleman from Maryland Mr. HOYER. I would like to support his legislation, H.R. 4133, the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012, but it is impossible for me to do so. As one who has consistently supported the freedom, independence and security of the State of Israel since I was first sworn into this great body, I am deeply saddened at the way this matter is being handled.

There is much in this legislation which is good but there is much which is unwise and could lead us down a dark and difficult road. I fear this legislation is drawn so that it could be considered as a blueprint for going to war with Iran. What are the limits on U.S. commitments under this legislation? I can find none in H.R. 4133, and this troubles me greatly. How would this impact our diplomatic efforts, and our negotiations to halt Iran's nuclear program? Would this result in increased strife and instability in the Middle East?

The answers to these questions remain unclear because there have been no legislative hearings on this matter, no factual record, and no committee report to consider. Everyone in this chamber agrees that allowing Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon is unacceptable and that we should take every action to prevent such an outcome. However, this does not mean that we should rush to vote on this legislation, which has never been considered in committee and could have grave consequences for our national security, especially as our diplomats are engaged in the most delicate of negotiations.

Experience comes from learning from one's mistakes. I made a blunder when I voted for the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, which was hurried and rushed through the House, and I vowed never to make the same error again. Many members of this body also made a similar mistake when this Congress voted to go to war with Iraq based on faulty intelligence. The international community is scheduled to have direct discussions and negotiations with Iran on the nuclear issue at the end of the month. At the very least we should wait to see the progress of those talks before issuing the edicts contained in this legislation today.

Matters of war and national security should be considered in all due diligence, and not be rushed to the floor without the proper consideration. I urge everyone to take a step back and consider what we are voting on, hold the proper hearings, and have a truly deliberative process before we rush off to another war which our Nation can ill afford.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4133, the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act. This bipartisan resolution reaffirms the American people's enduring and close relationship with the State of Israel, our partner in peace and prosperity in the Middle East.

This bill performs three main functions:

One, expresses the sense of Congress that the U.S. should take actions to assist the defense of Israel with advanced missile defense systems and intelligence sharing to improve counterterrorism and to protect it against Iran's growing nuclear threat.

Two, requires the President to submit reports to Congress on the status of Israel's military edge in light of current trends and political instability in the region.

Three, extends the Administration's authority to provide loan guarantees to Israel through FY2015. The current loan guarantee program, begun in 2003, has served both nations well. Israel has never defaulted on its loans and the Congressional Budget Office has scored this provision at no cost.

Madam Speaker, I have been to Israel on many occasions, most recently last summer. Every time I have an opportunity to visit, I am reminded of the close ties between our two nations and the strong affinity and appreciation the Israeli people have towards the American people's friendship and support.

My time in Israel has also served as a reminder of the dangerous world that the people of Israel face on a daily basis, from rocket attacks from Hezbollah and Hamas, to threats of nuclear attack by Iran, to suicide bombings within their own cities and neighborhoods.

It is important that this Chamber say with a strong, unified voice that we stand with Israel during these difficult times.

As co-chair of the Democratic Israel Working Group, I call on Members from both sides of the aisle to vote in support of this bipartisan resolution.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act, embodied in H.R. 4133, is another expression of the American commitment to our friend and ally, Israel. This commitment is already clear and unequivocal. No ally receives stronger assurances of support or more money over a sustained period of time.

This resolution, however, is a missed opportunity for Congress to show support for a comprehensive and balanced approached to Middle East Peace and Israeli security. No amount of American military assistance will fully compensate for the lack of a productive and effective peace process.

A true statement of enhanced security and cooperation would at least reference the United States' long standing expectation that Israel commit to dealing with theit illegal settlements. Omissions such as these do no one a service because, ultimately, they will have to be a part of any lasting solution.

The Obama administration has succeeded in creating an unprecedented coalition to impose the most aggressive sanctions on Iran, ever. The increasing impact of these sanctions and the significance of this broad coalition is a critical development and is a critical part of our security endeavors on which H.R. 4133 is strangely silent.

This fixation on a military response, ignoring some serious deficiencies in the Israeli approach, and not recognizing the important developments on Iran has turned this bill into another missed opportunity.

As much as I agree with some of the resolution overall, I fear it was inadequate and not particularly helpful towards building a stronger and more secure Israel in the long-term. There is no excuse for Congress not doing better and as a result, I voted "present" on H.R. 4133.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4133, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2072, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 4133, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2072) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 330, nays 93, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

YEAS—330

Ackerman	Amodei	Bachus
Aderholt	Andrews	Baldwin
Alexander	Austria	Barletta
Altmire	Baca	Barrow

Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—93

Adams
Akin
Amash
Bass (NH)
Black
Blackburn
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Canseco
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Culberson
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Marchant
McClintock
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunnelee
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Petri
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Tipton
Upton
Walberg
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Woodall
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Bachmann
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Green, Gene
Kucinich
Scott, David
Slaughter
Sutton

□ 1430

Messrs. GINGREY of Georgia, HANNA, PALAZZO, and SULLIVAN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 224, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 224, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ENHANCED SECURITY COOPERATION ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4133) to express the sense of Congress regarding the United States-Israel strategic relationship, to direct the President to submit to Congress reports on United States actions to enhance this relationship and to assist in the defense of Israel, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 2, answered ''present'' 9, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 225]

YEAS—411

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
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)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo

Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—2

Dingell
Paul

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—9

Blumenauer
Carson (IN)
Edwards
Ellison
Jones
Lee (CA)
McCollum
Stark
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—9

Bachmann
Burton (IN)
Donnelly (IN)
Eshoo
Filner
Garamendi
Kucinich
Slaughter
Stivers

□ 1438

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 225, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I was present during rollcall vote 225 on May 9, 2012, but my vote was not recorded. I would have voted ''yea'' on passage of H.R. 4133, the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012.

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 225, I was unavoidably detained during the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

□ 1440

TEMPORARY BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIPS EXTENSION ACT OF 2012

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4967) to prevent the termination of the temporary office of bankruptcy judges in certain judicial districts, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REED). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4967

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 ''Temporary Bankruptcy Judgeships Extension Act of 2012''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY OFFICE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES IN CERTAIN JUDICIAL DISTRICTS.

(a) TEMPORARY OFFICE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES AUTHORIZED BY PUBLIC LAW 109 8.—

(1) EXTENSIONS.—The temporary office of bankruptcy judges authorized for the following districts by section 1223(b) of Public Law 109 8 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) are extended until the applicable vacancy specified in paragraph (2) in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the respective district occurs:

(A) The central district of California.
(B) The eastern district of California.
(C) The district of Delaware.
(D) The southern district of Florida.
(E) The southern district of Georgia.
(F) The district of Maryland.
(G) The eastern district of Michigan.
(H) The district of New Jersey.
(I) The northern district of New York.
(J) The eastern district of North Carolina.
(K) The eastern district of Pennsylvania.
(L) The middle district of Pennsylvania.
(M) The district of Puerto Rico.
(N) The district of South Carolina.
(O) The western district of Tennessee.
(P) The eastern district of Virginia.
(Q) The district of Nevada.

(2) VACANCIES.—

(A) SINGLE VACANCIES.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), and (E), the 1st vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for each district specified in paragraph (1)—

(i) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge,

shall not be filled.

(B) CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.—The 1st, 2d, and 3d vacancies in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the central district of California—

(i) occurring 5 years or more after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge,

shall not be filled.

(C) DISTRICT OF DELAWARE.—The 1st, 2d, 3d, and 4th vacancies in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Delaware—

(i) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge,

shall not be filled.

(D) SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.—The 1st and 2d vacancies in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the southern district of Florida—

(i) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge,

shall not be filled.

(E) DISTRICT OF MARYLAND.—The 1st, 2d, and 3d vacancies in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Maryland—

(i) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge,

shall not be filled.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2), all other provisions of section 1223(b) of Public Law 109 8 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) remain applicable to the temporary office of bankruptcy judges referred to in paragraph (1).

(b) TEMPORARY OFFICE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES EXTENDED BY PUBLIC LAW 109 8.—

(1) EXTENSIONS.—The temporary office of bankruptcy judges authorized by section 3 of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 1992 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) and extended by section 1223(c) of Public Law 109 8 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) for the district of Delaware, the district of Puerto Rico, and the eastern district of Tennessee are extended until the applicable vacancy specified in paragraph (2) in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the respective district occurs.

(2) VACANCIES.—

(A) DISTRICT OF DELAWARE.—The 5th vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Delaware—

(i) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge,

shall not be filled.

(B) DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO.—The 2d vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Puerto Rico—

(i) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge,

shall not be filled.

(C) EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE.—The 1st vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the eastern district of Tennessee—

(i) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge,

shall not be filled.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2), all other provisions of section 3 of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 1992 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) and section 1223(c) of Public Law 109 8 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) remain applicable to the temporary office of bankruptcy judges referred to in paragraph (1).

(c) TEMPORARY OFFICE OF THE BANKRUPTCY JUDGE AUTHORIZED BY PUBLIC LAW 102 361 FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA.—

(1) EXTENSION.—The temporary office of the bankruptcy judge authorized by section 3 of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 1992 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) for the middle district of North Carolina is extended until the vacancy specified in paragraph (2) occurs.

(2) VACANCY.—The 1st vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the middle district of North Carolina—

(A) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(B) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge,

shall not be filled.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2), all other provisions of section 3 of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 1992 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) remain applicable to the temporary office of the bankruptcy judge referred to in paragraph (1).

SEC. 3. BANKRUPTCY FILING FEE INCREASE.

(a) BANKRUPTCY FILING FEES.—Section 1930(a)(3) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking ''$1,000'' and inserting ''$1,167''.

(b) UNITED STATES TRUSTEE SYSTEM FUND.—Section 589a(b)(2) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking ''55'' and inserting ''48.89''.

(c) COLLECTION AND DEPOSIT OF MISCELLANEOUS BANKRUPTCY FEES.—Section 406(b) of the Judiciary Appropriations Act, 1990 (28 U.S.C. 1931 note) is amended by striking ''25'' and inserting ''33.33''.

(d) PAYGO OFFSET EXPENDITURE LIMITATION.—$42 of the incremental amounts collected by reason of the enactment of subsection (a) shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury to be established after the date of enactment of this Act. Such amounts shall be available for the purposes specified in section 1931(a) of title 28, United States Code, but only to the extent specifically appropriated by an Act of Congress enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. SUBSEQUENT REAUTHORIZATION.

Prior to further reauthorization of any judgeship authorized by this Act, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and House of Representatives shall conduct a review of the bankruptcy judgeships authorized by this Act to determine the need, if any, for continued reauthorization of each judgeship, to evaluate any changes in all bankruptcy case filings and their effect, if any, on filing fee revenue, and to require the Administrative Office of the Courts to submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and House of Representatives on bankruptcy case workload, bankruptcy judgeship costs, and filing fee revenue.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5326, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 643 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5326.

Will the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1442

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5326) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, with Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 101, line 10.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ___. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 1001(a) of title 18, United States Code.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Chair, one of the deep concerns that we have is the investigation of Fast and Furious. We have to remember that unfortunately we lost one of our Border Patrol agents who was out on patrol serving this Nation. He was killed with weapons that were distributed under a program called Fast and Furious.

This is a sad case of government gone amok, making terrible, awful, deadly decisions; the administration knowingly and willingly allowing guns to walk from gun shops—contrary to what U.S. law is—allowing nearly 2,000 weapons to be released out, knowing that these weapons would be given to the drug cartels, knowing that giving these guns to these very nefarious characters with the hope that maybe they would pop up and we would find out who's using these guns. Well, there are tragic, desperate consequences to what happened.

What should be totally unacceptable on both sides of the aisle is the idea and the notion that the Department of Justice would knowingly and willfully lie to Congress. Senator GRASSLEY had presented the Department of Justice a letter directly to Attorney General Holder. Senator GRASSLEY directly gave to Attorney General Holder a concern expressed in a letter that there were guns walking. It's a term, it's an expression that says we allow people to come in under straw purchasing—which is illegal—to buy guns and weapons for somebody else, and that despite what the ATF and the Department of Justice were doing, they weren't tracking these. They allowed these gun purchases to happen in these gun shops, and then they were let out in the greater Arizona area and allowed these guns to walk.

The consequences have been absolutely tragic. We have a dead Border Patrol agent, and the Mexican Government estimates nearly 300 people have died within Mexico. Very few of these weapons have been recovered. In fact, the Attorney General has testified that there will be crimes committed with these weapons in all likelihood for years to come.

What is totally and wholly unacceptable, I think, to this body and the integrity, despite Republicans and Democrats, is that the Department of Justice would knowingly and willfully present a letter back to Congress on February 4 that was so inaccurate, it was so wrong, and essentially they lied to Congress. It took months and months and months and months to get to the point where they finally had to rescind that letter, where they had to admit that this was a fundamentally flawed program at its very core.

Now, we've been seeking documents. We've been seeking information. We have issued subpoenas. We've been patient beyond belief, but we've mostly been stonewalled. That information has not been forthcoming. What this amendment simply says is that they will not be allowed to be able to use Federal funds—taxpayer dollars—to knowingly, willfully skirt the law and lie to Congress.

Now, on February 4, 2011, I want to remind Members, the Department of Justice lied to Congress about the taxes used in Fast and Furious by claiming Federal authorities make ''every effort to interdict weapons that have been purchased illegally and prevent their transportation to Mexico.'' They denied the allegations that the Department facilitated in the illegal sale of guns to Mexican drug cartels. But on December 2, 2011, the Department of Justice formally withdrew the February letter because it was filled with misleading, fictitious, and false statements. The December letter later went on to admit that Fast and Furious was ''a fundamentally flawed operation.''

What we're saying is you should not be able to use taxpayer funds to knowingly and willfully subvert Congress. You can't lie to Congress and use taxpayer dollars to do it. Surely that can be bipartisan in its approach.

All we ask is for the truth. In fact, there were more than a dozen—in fact,

more than two dozen Members of the Democratic Party serving in Congress who sent a letter to the White House expressing the idea and the notion that the administration should be open and forthright in providing this information to Congress, but it has not been forthcoming. It has not been accurate. In fact, it was a lie.

As we look to Brian Terry, who served this country, we owe it to him and to his family to get to the truth of what happened in Fast and Furious. And no taxpayer dollars should ever be used to knowingly and willfully lie to Congress.

We as a body, as an institution, deserve to get to the bottom of this. We have not had all these answers. On March 25, 2011, President Obama stood in an interview and told the world that they would hold somebody responsible, that Eric Holder wasn't responsible for this and that they would hold somebody responsible and make sure that it doesn't happen again. To date, Madam Chair, that has not happened. In fact, the senior management there at the Department of Justice got promotions; some of them got bonuses. Nobody's been fired at the senior levels over there. We're not just looking for somebody to get fired; we've got to make sure that it never, ever happens again.

So I would encourage Members to support this amendment. We should do so in a bipartisan way.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. There is nothing in the gentleman's amendment that I think anyone could disagree with. The amendment doesn't speak about Attorney General Holder. It doesn't speak about any particular matter that's been referenced in the comments on the floor.

□ 1450

It just says that you can't use dollars provided under this act to give misinformation to the Congress. I think every Member should support this.

I think, however, I want to, and I think many Members would separate themselves from these accusations that are baseless. In fact, they've been investigated, and there's no evidence that the Attorney General provided any misinformation to the Congress. In fact, he's testified seven times. He's provided thousands of documents.

And what we do know is that this Congress, under Republican control and a Republican administration, started endeavors to track illegal guns that were very similar to the operation that's been referred to, and some of those guns fell into the wrong hands.

But to attack Federal law enforcement that's trying to catch bad guys, who are operating sting operations, even when they go poorly, I think, is just the wrong place for Federal lawmakers to be. I'm in support of Federal law enforcement. And even if their policies in this particular way were wrong, and they've been corrected, that is, in fact, once the Attorney General knew about it, he stopped it. Everyone in the line of responsibility here, those have been removed. So when the gentleman suggests on the floor of the House that no one's lost their job, no one's been changed, that's entirely inaccurate.

But I do want to make this point. We should be in support of Federal law enforcement. We should support them. And to attack career ATF agents who are risking their lives trying to catch bad guys along the border, I think it's the wrong way for us to proceed just because we want to go at this administration.

Now, if there's an election in which there's a change in Presidency, the other side will get a chance to name an Attorney General. Under our Constitution, the Attorney General serves at the pleasure of the President. And the President has made it clear that Attorney General Holder, and I think in many people's minds, is one of the best that's ever served in this position.

Regardless of what you think about the political appointees in the Department, to attack career ATF agents for doing their job, while they risk their lives on behalf of the American citizens, I think, is the wrong thing to do.

But I support the amendment. There's nothing in this amendment at all connected to these baseless allegations, none of which have been proved. And I think it's wrong to come to the House, defame public servants, say that they've lied to the Congress, when, in fact, there's nothing in the record that suggests that whatsoever.

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

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

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

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

I think truthfulness and accuracy are essential components of any oversight process. And the amendment simply requires the Justice Department and all Federal agencies funded by this bill provide only forthright and truthful statements or representations.

With that, I ask for a ''yea'' vote, and yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOWDY. Madam Chair, I was not going to talk because I talked yesterday on Fast and Furious, and Representative CHAFFETZ did a wonderful job. But, Madam Chair, I cannot stand here while demonstrably false insinuations are leveled.

I worked for the Department of Justice for 6 years. I worked with ATF for 16 years. I'll put the respect that I have for Federal law enforcement and Federal prosecutor up against anybody in this body.

It may well be that the documents we haven't gotten clear all the senior DOJ officials. How will we possibly know that if he continues to withhold documents?

So, Madam Chair, let me just ask this. To the average citizen who gets a grand jury subpoena or a subpoena for documents or to compel their presence, what would happen if they ignored it? Madam Chair, what would happen if you got a jury summons and you just decided you weren't going to show up? What would happen to the average citizen if they got a subpoena from a congressional committee and they just decided to ignore it, and their defense was, We gave you some documents?

There are 70,000-something documents that the Inspector General has. We have 1/12 of that. There are entire categories of documents that we do not have.

We do not have a single email from the Attorney General of the United States after February 4, 2011. I want you to ask yourself how many emails you have sent and received today. And the number is zero from February 4, 2011, until present?

And Congressman CHAFFETZ is exactly right. There was a demonstrably false letter sent to a Member of Congress. And then the Department of Justice, that I actually value its reputation—we have to have a Department of Justice that people respect. But the Department of Justice took the unprecedented step of having to withdraw a letter sent to a Member of Congress because it was demonstrably false.

On February 4, 2011, the Department of Justice, on Department of Justice letterhead, mails a demonstrably false letter denying a tactic called ''gunwalking.'' On the very same day, the criminal chief of the Department of Justice of the United States of America is in Mexico advocating for the tactic of gunwalking. And somehow, we can't ask the Department of Justice to tell us who knew what when?

And the gentleman on the other side of the aisle, Madam Chair, said everyone has been punished. Madam Chair, no one has been punished. There hasn't been a demotion. There hasn't been a firing. There hasn't been a sanction. There hasn't been a frowny face on a performance evaluation. There's been nothing.

So I'm going to say what I said yesterday, Madam Chair. This is not just another Department in someone's Cabinet. This isn't just some other political appointee. This is the Attorney General for the United States of America. It is the Department of Justice. If they cannot comply with a lawfully-executed subpoena, then there should be sanctions, just like there would be for me or you.

So I urge support for Representative CHAFFETZ's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment because I'm seeing what I consider to be an alarming trend in government right now. We have Eric Holder in Fast and Furious, the Justice Department failing to cooperate with multiple committees of this Congress.

Right now, as we speak, there's a hearing going on in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee with the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, with the TSA potentially having misled Congress over the waste and abuse of dollars warehousing security equipment in Dallas, Texas.

We're standing here today while whistleblowers who are trying to do what's right for this government are being retaliated against. We're standing here today while families like those of Agent Brian Terry, who was a victim of the Fast and Furious scandal, Agent Jaime Zapata, a constituent of mine who was killed in the line of duty in Mexico, and the families of many Mexican citizens who were killed as a result of these gun-running operations with these weapons.

This is an alarming trend in government that we have got to put a stop to. We do not need to be financing government agencies. Our employees, the people's employees, we do not need to be paying them to stall, to lie, to mislead. It is absolutely unacceptable.

In the private sector, when an employee acts this way, we have a real quick solution. We quit paying them and we fire them. Unfortunately, it's a little more complicated here in the government, especially when you get to a Cabinet-level official.

Yes, we have our remedies. We have contempt of Congress. We have criminal prosecution. And in the case of a Cabinet-level official like Mr. Holder, it could eventually get to impeachment, depending what we find out. The Constitution provides the ultimate remedy there.

But the lifeblood of the Federal bureaucracy is money. We have got to cut off the money to the employees, like Eric Holder, who stonewall, at best, and lie, more likely. We need government officials who own up to their mistakes.

My colleague here, Mr. GOWDY, was talking about the fact there's not a single email after a certain date for Mr. Holder. I'd like to remind the Chair and the American people that what gets you in this country, 9 times out of 10, is the coverup. The American people are willing to live with a mistake, but they are not willing to live with a liar, and this amendment cuts off funding to the liars in our Federal Government. So I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. CAPITO). The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. I am from Arizona, and I am proud to rise in support of this amendment because no other State has suffered the consequences like we have in Arizona and will continue to.

Let's think of the ramifications of what transpired here. We did not follow proper protocol in allowing guns to walk. We didn't even know where they were—and we still don't know where they are—and yet Arizona will suffer the consequences of those guns on our side of the border. Let's take a look at the other aspect. What about the Mexican people? Where is the outcry? Where is the justice? Here we've had the Hispanic people who have lost over 300 people to this impropriety—and it was overseen by the Federal Government and the Department of Justice? This is outrageous.

I am glad that what we're doing is defunding this aspect in order to make sure that we know what's right and what's wrong and in order to hold people accountable for the cover-up that has occurred. But think about it. Have we ever seen something of this atrocity? We've actually overstepped the oversight and sovereignty of the Mexican Government.

What we need are answers. The American people need the answers, and the folks from Arizona need the answers. We want to make sure that those who are accountable are held perfectly to that standard like everybody else. Yes, we have not seen the documentation. The other side says that we have seen the documentation and that everybody has been held accountable. That's wrong. That's absolutely wrong. Take it from somebody from Arizona who has had to live under this Department of Justice. We want to make sure that we have accountability.

Last but not least, what about the Brian Terry family? When we look at the whole oversight of this egregious operation, did it have to take the life of a brave soldier, Brian Terry? That's what it took to even come to this situation. It cannot be repeated. Absolutely, it cannot be repeated.

I am glad that my colleague has offered this amendment to make sure that we do not give funding for those who are in the Department of Justice and, if they do, that they are held to the letter of the law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Chair, I want to quote President Obama in his first remarks as President of the United States:

> Transparency and the rule of law will be the touchstones of this Presidency . . . I will also hold myself as President to a new standard of openness . . . But the mere fact that you have the legal power to keep something secret does not mean you should always use it. The Freedom of Information Act is perhaps the most powerful instrument we have for making our government honest and transparent and of holding it accountable; and I expect members of my administration not simply to live up to the letter but also the spirit of this law . . . The government should not keep information confidential merely because public officials might be embarrassed by disclosure, because errors and failures might be revealed, or because of speculative or abstract fears.

This country should be embarrassed by what is happening in Fast and Furious. My challenge to Members on both sides of the aisle is to stand up and have the integrity to say that we have a dead U.S. agent and that we have a Department of Justice that lied to Congress. Where are the guts in this body to stand up and say we're not going to put up with that, that we're going to demand that these documents be provided to Congress? We know, because the inspector general within the Department of Justice has said, they have 80,000 documents. They've given Congress about 7,000 of those documents. This is the test of principle. This is the test of integrity. When you can't stand up and take on your own party, that's a lack of guts. This Congress has got to stand up for itself and demand that these documents be released.

I would encourage Members on both sides of the aisle, at the very least, to vote for this amendment. I can't imagine any reason why anybody would deny the passage of this amendment. We're not going to allow taxpayer dollars to be used to lie to Congress. Unfortunately, we have been lied to. That is the reason we have to offer this amendment. It's embarrassing that we have to even get to this point.

Madam Chair, Brian Terry's family expects it, and the integrity of this body demands it. Regardless of whether it's Republican or Democrat, we cannot rest until we get to the bottom of that.

You can make the case that part of this started with President Bush. We don't know what's in these documents; but with the separation of powers, it's imperative that we get to the bottom of this and that we hold people accountable—and not just the lowest level of people down at the ATF. They've been dismissed. They've been harassed. Thank goodness for those whistleblowers who stood up and did the right thing. But at the senior level, the senior people at the Department of Justice, they have not been held accountable. President Obama said in these remarks that he would. On March 25, he went on Univision and promised that they would. It has not happened.

If we get stonewalling on the other side of the aisle—without your support—we will do a disservice to this country; we will do a disservice to this body, and we will not get to the truth. I promise you, when there is a Republican President, I will stand with you

and will demand the openness and transparency that this body deserves. I've done it. I've challenged my own party. Have the guts, have the fortitude, to do the right thing.

I appreciate Chairman ISSA, Representative GOWDY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FARENTHOLD—there are so many people in this body—and I appreciate my colleague from South Carolina, who are passionate about this issue. I urge all Members to vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TIERNEY

Mr. TIERNEY. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. For ''Department of Justice, State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance'' for the John R. Justice Prosecutors and Defenders program, as authorized by the first section 3001 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797cc 21) (relating to loan repayment for prosecutors and public defenders), there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Science'' for Mars Next Decade is hereby reduced by, $10,000,000.

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

Mr. TIERNEY. Madam Chairwoman, this bipartisan amendment is offered with Mr. GOWDY of South Carolina. It provides very clearly $10 million for the John R. Justice Student Loan Repayment Program.

It is unfortunate that we know many law school student graduates accept jobs as prosecutors and as public defenders, but they don't stay on the jobs very long because the compensation is at such a low level, and their debt burdens from college and from law school are so high that they end up leaving and going on to more lucrative pastures because the private firms, obviously, have more resources with which to recruit and retain than do public defenders and district attorneys' offices around the country.

Oftentimes, the students tell me they would like to stay in these offices. Obviously, the district attorneys tell us on a regular basis that they have such a difficult time training people and getting them to stay so that they can do a good job. Both public defenders and district attorneys, people on both sides of any particular case, understand the importance of that judicial system work in that it's fair and in that everybody has the level of representation that makes our system work and be respected around the world on that.

This would allow the tool of loan forgiveness for those district attorneys on that and those public defenders so that they can get people to stay at least 3 years so that the training doesn't just get turned around and go to waste. It allows people to stay on and use their experience and make the system work better.

I believe that it's a good idea. It has worked in the past for the Federal agencies, for the executive branch attorneys. It has demonstrated great success in their recruitment and retention. When this aspect was funded just a couple of years ago, 1,647 prosecutors and 1,226 public defenders across the country received assistance under the program's 2010 allocation. That, in turn, is a claim by all of the people involved as having made a tremendous difference in their abilities to have their offices function at the high level that is necessary.

Now, it's a difficult time. If we're going to take this money and appropriate it in this fashion, we, unfortunately, have to find those resources somewhere else. We have recommended an offset with a modest reduction to the Mars Next Decade program. That Mars Next Decade program will still get over $100 million more in the bill than it otherwise would have gotten. The House report notes a concern that there is a question about whether or not the Mars Next Decade program has actually accomplished one of the requirements of getting a sample and reporting. There is even language in the bill that puts off any expenditure of these moneys until such a report is made to the National Research Council and they're allowed to move forward.

□ 1510

The $150 million that is in the Mars Next Decade budget is still sizeable and on board with what was in the President's request, and still allows the program to move forward. I think it is a tradeoff that's fair. And I think Mr. GOWDY agrees with me, that as painful as it may be to take from one area, that programs will still march on, we'll still have $78 million more than the President requested. But if we don't do anything, the John R. Justice program will have nothing. District attorneys and public defenders, our court systems across the Nation won't have the ability to have well-trained people being recruited and retained and making our system work. So that's the premise here.

Madam Chairwoman, we ask that our colleagues support this amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOWDY. Madam Chairwoman, my mother was a victims advocate in a prosecutor's office when I was growing up. She would come home and lament the fact that defendants could pick any lawyer they wanted to defend them, but the victims of crime were stuck with the district attorney. Her message to me, the lesson she was trying to impress on me, is that crime victims have a right to have a good attorney, too.

If you fast forward a couple of years, I went to law school, and I became a district attorney. I tried to hire people to come help me do a good job for crime victims. Madam Chairwoman, I was hiring primarily at that time young female prosecutors—Cindy Crick, Kim Leskanic, Jenny Wells, Susan Porter—many of whom had up to $70,000 in student loan debt, could have and should have gone into private practice and paid their loans back and made a lot of money. But something within them wanted to stand up for rape victims and criminal domestic violence victims and child sex assault victims. So they sacrificed the lure of private practice to come to public service.

Madam Chairwoman, it is not without irony that the program that my friend from Massachusetts speaks of is named after a man named John R. Justice, who was a solicitor district attorney in South Carolina. He represented the poorest solicitors judicial circuit in the State. They were understaffed and overworked. He used to tell me, Madam Chairwoman, that he was just sticking his fingers in the hole of the dam to try to keep the water from coming through. But the solicitor justice—God rest his soul—had a vision of trying to encourage people to want to do something as noble as be a prosecutor in South Carolina.

So whereas I usually stand off and I talk about cutting this and cutting that, law and order, prosecution, respect for the rule of law are core functions of government. And as much money as we spend on other programs, surely to goodness we can find a little bit of money to help relieve the student loan obligations of women and men who are prosecuting while they're sitting across the table from criminal offense attorneys who make 5 to 7 to 10 times their salary. Surely we can do that, and surely we can give the victims of crime as good a lawyer as the defendants of crime get.

I would urge my colleagues to give very serious consideration to the John R. Justice Scholarship program for public defenders and prosecutors.

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

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Maybe when we go to conference—last year this said $4 million. So in a tight budget year when the Ryan budget comes and the other budget comes, we're actually increasing this from $4 million to $10 million, which I think every other program would just say, I don't quite understand. Secondly, the Senate put in $4 million. Maybe we can talk as we move on.

I was looking to see if Mr. SCHIFF was here or Mr. CULBERSON was here. This was part of a delicate compromise with regard to the Mars program and the Europa program. The committee took great pains to ensure that NASA science funding reflected the planetary science priorities and goals of the National Academy of Science and included the development of sample return missions to Mars. It's the Decadal Survey. To take this out of that, when it was so difficult, I think would be a mistake.

Such a mission would represent an unprecedented scientific undertaking and enable the next fundamental advance of Mars science and ensure that America's undisputed leadership in Mars exploration remains unchanged. This is the imaginative part of the space program.

Two weeks ago, when the shuttle flew over Washington and this building, literally everyone went outside to look at it. This was one of the most imaginative and creative things for America to continue to be number one in space. I would tell the gentleman I would hope we would vote it down, particularly with $4 million last year and when the Senate is at $4 million. The Senate has $781 million more money in allocation than we had. And for us to jump this up when other programs have been severely hit—I don't know how Mr. FATTAH would feel. We could try to work as we go to conference and all, but I would hope that we could vote this down, particularly since it takes it from Mars. And I will give the gentleman my assurance to move ahead and see what we can do to it, but not take it from Mars.

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

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. I join my colleague, the chairman.

I appreciate the offering of the amendment; however, I'm opposed to the offset. We have a need to have loan forgiveness for public servants, both in terms of law enforcement and prosecutors, but teachers, police officers—you can go through a whole range. In fact, embodied in the reconciliation act that carried the Affordable Health Care Act, we created a loan-forgiveness program for public service that will start to take effect in 2014.

This is needed, but we can't use this offset. And I would hope that we'll have an opportunity to work together on this because I do think if we had $4 million last year, we can continue to find additional resources as we go to conference. We are hamstrung by a lower allocation, which means some of the things that Members may be interested in are going to have a lower funding level as this bill leaves the House but a higher funding level when it leaves conference. So it's part of the process, and I appreciate the amendment. I hope that the gentleman would consider working with me and the chairman as we go forward, if your desire is to actually find resources for this important endeavor.

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

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment and urge my colleague to withdraw the amendment and work with us on this issue.

As a former U.S. attorney, I have the greatest respect and support for loan-forgiveness programs of this nature. It is absolutely a worthwhile cause. But the Mars program was devastated by the administration's budget.

This is one of the crown jewels of planetary science. In fact, the whole planetary science budget was decimated by the administration in its proposal. Thankfully, through the work of the chairman and the ranking member, the planetary science budget has been restored, and part of what has been taken out of the Mars program has been restored. Nevertheless, the Mars program was cut by hundreds of millions, and we have a long way to go to have a healthy Mars program.

As we speak, one of the most difficult missions ever undertaken, the Mars Science Laboratory, is on its way to the Martian surface. This will be path-breaking in terms of its scientific return. This is an area where we are second to none in the world. No one else has the skills to enter the Martian atmosphere, descend, and land on Mars. That is an incredible talent pool that can make that possible. At a time when we have to go hat in hand to the Russians to get a ride to the space station, but we are still the unquestioned leader in planetary science, with the Mars program leading the way, we do not need to decimate the Mars program further.

Thanks to the work of Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member FATTAH, we are on the path to restoring this great program so that we can continue on the road that we're on where we are tantalizingly close now to finding the building blocks of life on another planet, and this is what is at stake.

□ 1520

So while I sympathize with the desire of the gentleman from Massachusetts to plus-up the program that he supports—and I support it, too—the offset would be devastating, devastating to the brilliant people that work in this area, devastating to all those around the country that love planetary science and that are going to be watching breathlessly on August 5 as Curiosity lands on the Martian surface and sends back new information about one of our neighbors in the solar system.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment. I urge us to continue to push the envelope of our understanding of the universe. And we just simply cannot choose this as an offset, such a valuable national treasure as the Mars program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. TIERNEY. I thank the gentleman.

I think it is reprehensible, actually, that the majority has chosen to go with the Ryan budget numbers over the agreement that was reached last August. I think it has put the chairman and ranking member and the members of that committee in a terrible position. We can see it just by the juxtaposition of two programs here that obviously people think have merit on this aspect.

As much as taking $10 million from the amount of money that otherwise would have gone to the Mars program would leave them $10 million less than they would have had, but $78 million more than otherwise was in there. Doing nothing with respect to this motion would lead to our Justice program with zero dollars in the House budget.

So I am thinking that we'll take a vote here; and if we pass, I hope that the committee is able to work with the Senate to bring the Mars program back to where people want it to be. I am hoping from what I have heard here that people think there is merit to our district attorneys and our public defenders as having some money in their accounts so that they can have good qualified people moving our justice system forward, and they will take care of that in conference.

But one way or the other, we need to know that taking a program and putting it down to zero at a time when our justice system is crying out for fairness and crying out for the tools to operate appropriately for our district attorneys throughout the country as well as public defenders who are saying that this is essential, that maybe at least having a debate on this issue and talking about it will make sure that we can get all the programs that we need funded to the level that we're able to do so that we can move both of those things.

So either way this motion goes, I hope that if we win on this case, that we argue strongly to hold that number in the conference and then work to do something with the Mars program.

People feel strongly about that. Should this motion not prevail, then I hope that our chairman and our ranking member and others will work hard in conference to make sure that the John R. Justice Program is not reduced to zero because I have heard everybody here talk now about how they think it is a good program and that we move forward and we fund it so that the system can work the way it was intended to work.

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. GOWDY. Madam Chairwoman, I would just say, again, that really in times of prosperity, we should be having conversations about the size and the scope of government. And of course you have to have it in times of austerity.

I just view the criminal justice system, law enforcement, prosecutors as a core function of government, whether it's State government or Federal Government. And we want to incentivize and encourage good people who are not hamstrung by debilitating student loans to go pursue that, as opposed to just going into private practice where they can make money.

I have lived it. I have seen what it can do for our office, and I would hope that my colleagues would give favorable consideration to it. And if not, I take the chairman and the ranking member at their word that they'll give it a look at the appropriate time.

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

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

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

Mr. TIERNEY. Madam Chairwoman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Chairman, I rise today to engage in a colloquy on NASA's Commercial Crew Program. The chairman has shown great leadership on space and science issues. He and I have often worked together on issues of shared interest, and he is a great friend.

The report of this bill contains some very strong language about NASA's Commercial Crew Program; and I, admittedly, have some concerns about that language. I believe it makes a flawed comparison between Commercial Crew Program partners and the energy firm Solyndra. In addition, it requires an immediate down-select to a single-program partner, which I do not believe is the best path to move forward.

That being said, I do understand and agree with many of the chairman's concerns that I know were underlying this language. For example, NASA has not shared a clear, comprehensive management plan for the program despite repeated requests. Instead, they have made inconsistent and confusing statements about the program's purpose, timeline, design, costs, and procurement benefits.

Although the committee has defined one possible management approach in response to these concerns, I hope that we will be able to discuss some alternative approaches that both address the management problems within NASA and allow the achievement of the agreed-upon goals of the program. With that in mind, I am willing to work with NASA to help come up with a new plan that will do just that. And I would be pleased to work with the chairman on these issues in order to go forward.

At this time, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the CJS Subcommittee.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for yielding and for outlining the concerns that a number of people have about this program.

I believe that, despite our differences—and it may not really be that much of a difference—we share a common goal of providing reliable domestic access to the space station in the fastest and most cost-effective manner. We are paying the Russians $60 million a seat to get there. So we want to get there as fast as we can for the lowest cost that we can so we can utilize that space station, which cost us $100 billion.

I know the gentleman is a staunch supporter of commercial spaceflight. And if the gentleman believes that he can get NASA to come up with a clearer and more reasonable plan, we want to work with him. We look forward to discussing results as we move forward with the process. And I will tell him that we will work together.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

And let me just note that both of us are committed to making sure this country is never dependent on a Chinese rocket system to launch either commercial or government satellites or to reach the space station.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ___. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to defend against any action challenging—

(1) any provision of Public Law 111 148 or any provision of title I or subtitle B of title II of Public Law 111 152; or

(2) any amendment to a provision of law made by any provision described in paragraph (1).

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, this is a very straightforward amendment. What it says is that you cannot use taxpayer funds to defend ObamaCare, PPACA, the Affordable Care Act. And there is a reason for doing this, for bringing this amendment forward.

If you will look at today's Gallup Poll, the May 9, 2012, Gallup Poll, this is what you would find in that poll: 72 percent of all Americans believe this law is unconstitutional. They want to see this law off the books. And that includes 56 percent of Democrats and 94 percent of Republicans that were polled.

So, Madam Chairwoman, what we find is individuals saying, We don't like this. We don't want it on the books. We hope the Supreme Court finds it unconstitutional.

□ 1530

Indeed, many of us feel it will be found to be unconstitutional. And what we're doing is saying to the Department of Justice, You cannot use taxpayer funds to defend this law. We know that that is the right step to take because it is important that we defend and prevent DOJ activism. Certainly, you have heard Members stand on this floor today and talk about the activism that exists in that Department. So taxpayer funds should not be used to defend this law.

Now, some of you may feel like you've heard this before, and, indeed, you have. The Republican Study Committee has brought this idea previously as we have had continuing resolutions.

We feel that it is appropriate. This is not a bill the American people have wanted. It is a law that is too expensive to afford. Indeed, we have seen that as we've reviewed appropriations, as we're looking at Health and Human Services, as we're looking at CMS. What we're staying to DOJ is, You cannot use taxpayer money to defend this law. We do not want our taxpayer funds to become a legal defense fund for ObamaCare.

So it is a very simple amendment. It is a total of eight lines long. I urge individuals to support the Blackburn amendment and to prohibit DOJ from using taxpayer funds.

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment and move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I'm not sure that I understand the basis of the amendment that we should defund the Justice Department from any effort to defend a law if the polling indicates

that it is unpopular at the moment. The polling on the health care reform law has varied since its enactment. At times it has enjoyed majority support; at times it has enjoyed minority support. Almost entirely throughout the period since its passage, if you ask people whether they support the components of the health care reform law, Americans overwhelmingly say that they do.

But, nonetheless, is this really the basis that we want to make whether we can defend the constitutionality of a law, and that is: What do the polls say? If so, then perhaps we ought to broaden the gentlewoman's amendment to say that, whenever a law is unpopular in the country, we should refuse to allow the Justice Department to support its constitutionality. In fact, many of the laws that we pass here are not always popular. Sometimes they're the right thing to do, and sometimes they're the hard thing to do. I would imagine that some of the decisions that we make on the debt ceiling and other things, if we put them to a poll, would be very unpopular but, nonetheless, necessary. Are we going to say that because they're unpopular at the moment that they're, therefore, for no other reason, unconstitutional? I don't think so.

We have a Justice Department that studies the constitutionality of laws to determine, in their best judgment, whether something is consistent with the Constitution, and I don't think we want to be in the business of telling the Justice Department not to defend a law because of what a particular poll might say.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Madam Chair.

In listening to the presentation by the gentlelady from Tennessee and the rebuttal by the gentleman from California, I'd make the point that it isn't only the Supreme Court that makes a decision on constitutionality. We all take an oath to uphold the Constitution here in this Congress, in the executive branch, and also in the Federal court system. And when you go through the process of a constitutional determination, we do allow the Supreme Court, as a public and a people, to make that decision. We do so under Marbury, which is something over a couple of centuries old.

But in the final analysis of the balance of powers, in the end, it's the people that decide what's constitutional, not the Supreme Court. And I say that because we have the authority here in this Congress to control funding, as the gentlelady from Tennessee has in her amendment that comes out. And there's a reason for that.

We have many debates on constitutionality here in this Congress on this floor. It's our obligation to do that. It's our constitutional obligation to do so. And this discussion about ObamaCare and its unconstitutionality has gone well beyond the Chambers here. Many of us raised these issues 2 years and a month or so ago about the unconstitutionality of ObamaCare. We now see that at least 26 States have brought suit. It is before the Supreme Court to be decided. Tens of billions of dollars of good money has already been thrown after a bad policy and an unconstitutional policy, and now we're on the cusp of getting word from the Supreme Court.

But whether or not the Supreme Court finds the ObamaCare unconstitutional—I believe they will, at least under the individual mandate. I do not think they will sever it. I think they will throw it all out. But in either case, this Congress will continue to weigh in on constitutionality, on viability, on affordability, and on the policy itself. And the things that we do as a majority of this House of Representatives are entirely within the province of the Constitution to cut off all funding, if we choose to do that.

This Congress could cut off all funding to implement or enforce ObamaCare. This amendment just cuts off the funding to enforce ObamaCare. There's much of that unfolding today. This is a strong message to send. And I'm not suggesting we send it to the Court. I want the Court to have an independent decision on the language in ObamaCare itself. But this is a message to the American people that this Congress also has a voice. We have a voice on constitutionality. We have a voice on policy. We have a voice on affordability. And it's unaffordable; it's unconstitutional, and it's bad policy. It's an unconstitutional taking of American liberty. And this amendment at least suspends good money going after bad policy.

I strongly endorse the gentlelady from Tennessee's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I'll be very brief.

I just want to say that I concur with my colleague's points, to a point. As my colleague acknowledges, we take an oath to defend the Constitution. The administration, the executive branch, also takes an oath to defend the Constitution.

Effectively, what this amendment would do is say we are going to defund the Justice Department's ability to undertake and fulfill its oath to defend the Constitution. If the Justice Department disagrees with some Members of Congress about what their oath to the Constitution requires, we are going to defund their ability to follow through.

I don't think that's really where we want to be because, plainly, the Justice Department feels the law is constitutional. They believe it's their obligation to uphold the Constitution. And to say that we're going to defund their ability to follow through on that, I don't think that is good policy.

On that basis as well, I would urge a ''no'' vote

Mr. KING of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just make a brief point that the executive branch has made a decision not to defend DOMA, which is the law of the land. So that's a discretion that apparently we would concede to the executive branch of government not to defend DOMA, but not accepting the antithesis of it, which I believe is the Blackburn amendment.

Mr. SCHIFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHIFF. I appreciate that.

And that's absolutely correct. If the Justice Department determines in its view, just as you and I must, that something is constitutional and must be defended or something is unconstitutional and cannot be defended, then we have to follow through with those obligations. But I don't think it's our position to defund the Justice Department when, in the good faith execution of its oath to uphold the Constitution, it is defending a law that this Congress has passed.

Mr. FARR. The worst form of democracy is to take away the ability for it to work. This is a bad amendment, and I hope we oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I just walked in in the middle of this amendment, but it's very similar to an amendment we took up last night, and it's equally wrongheaded.

Aside from the fact that it's almost irrelevant, this amendment, as I read it, says that none of the funds may be used to defend challenges to the Affordable Care Act by the Justice Department. Aside from the fact that none of the funds are going to be used because the argument has already been heard by the Supreme Court—it's past tense; the Court is going to decide one way or another—this seems to me a little late. All the arguments in Court have already been heard, and therefore, they're not going to spend anymore money doing that. The Court will decide it's constitutional or it's not constitutional. The argument already occurred. The money has already been spent. So I don't see the point of this.

□ 1540

But putting that aside, what this says in effect is Congress passed a law.

Any law that Congress passes has a presumption of constitutionality. And this says that the Justice Department shall not defend the Constitution or a law duly passed by Congress because a subsequent Congress doesn't agree. Well, if a subsequent Congress doesn't agree with what the previous Congress does, we should repeal the law, and then there would be nothing to defend. But if you don't have the votes to repeal the laws, and on the merits I would oppose repealing the law, obviously, but if you don't have the votes to repeal the law, don't say that the Justice Department shouldn't defend the constitutionality of a law passed by Congress if that law is challenged in court.

Now, in Marbury v. Madison, the Court said it is distinctly the job of the judiciary to decide what the law is. It's our job in Congress to decide to pass the law. It's the executive's duty to faithfully execute the law. And it's the judiciary's duty to say what the law is and whether it's constitutional because they have to defend the Constitution, and if we pass a law, they have to decide whether it meets the Constitution or not.

It's the executive's duty to execute the law, and part of executing the law is defending the Constitution as the executive sees it. So it is up to the Justice Department to argue in court to defend the constitutionality of a law if it thinks it is constitutional, and to oppose the constitutionality of a law if it thinks it's unconstitutional.

Now here you're saying that the Justice Department shouldn't argue and we shouldn't give it funds to argue to defend the constitutionality of the law. We are going to have another amendment in a little while by Mr. HUELSKAMP that says the Justice Department may not use any funds to oppose the constitutionality of a different law, the Defense of Marriage Act passed, what, 15 years ago.

It is up to the Justice Department and the executive to decide in their opinion what is their duty in terms of their duty to faithfully execute the law. That's their constitutional mandate. And if it's their duty to argue for the constitutionality of a law, they must. To argue against it, they must do that, too.

We can, and in fact the House has in the DOMA case—I didn't support this, I don't agree with it, but we were within our rights to hire outside counsel to argue against the Justice Department on the constitutionality of that law, and we have the right to do that.

But to attempt to use the power of the purse to deny the executive branch its ability to do its job, which is to defend the Constitution as it sees it by arguing for or against the constitutionality of a bill in court, is simply wrong. It's a violation of the separation of powers, and it's an abrogation of their responsibility.

It also hurts the function of the court to decide unconstitutionality because the court is owed and needs the opinion of the executive, and for that matter the opinion of Congress, if it differs.

So this amendment, regardless of the merits of the bill, which I supported and voted for, which I think is a good bill, regardless of the merits of DOMA, which I opposed and which I think is unconstitutional, the argument in both cases is the same. We shouldn't be telling and certainly not using the power of the purse to say that the Justice Department may not argue for this position because we don't agree with it or for that position because we don't agree with it. If we don't agree with it, change the law. That's our job. And the Justice Department should argue its opinion of constitutionality, and the court must decide in the end. In the end, that's our system, and we shouldn't tamper with it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. I just wanted to enlighten the House on one small matter. We've had a number of votes on repealing the Affordable Care Act and the like. There's no possibility that the President is going to sign this bill if this amendment was in there. So, you know, we're spending a lot of time, but the election will come in November. There will be an opportunity for the country to sort some of these issues out.

But as for this appropriations bill, what we're trying to do is fund needed law enforcement activities in relationship to the Justice Department, whose principal duty is to protect our country since post-9/11 in terms of terrorism. I was out at the Terrorist Screening Center. I met with the FBI director and other officials from the Department. It's important that we pass this appropriations bill on time, and I thank the House leadership for scheduling it. This amendment is not going to be a part of this law no matter the result of the vote here today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The amount made available by this Act for ''Department of Justice—Community Oriented Policing Services Programs'' (and the amount specified under such heading for grants under section 1701 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd) for the hiring and rehiring of additional career law enforcement officers under part Q of such title) is hereby increased by, and the aggregate total of other amounts made available by this Act that are not required to be made available by a provision of law are hereby reduced by, $177,087,000.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I intend to withdraw this amendment at the end of my presentation and the discussion.

I want to first thank Ranking Member FATTAH for his tremendous leadership on the subcommittee and talk about what this amendment would have done, which of course would have increased funding for the Community Oriented Policing Services program, better known as COPS, to the funding level in the President's fiscal year 2013 budget, which is $257 million. But I want to thank Congressman FATTAH for his leadership because we have talked, and hopefully as this bill moves forward, we can look at what we can do in conference to get closer to this level.

Unfortunately, the COPS hiring program was funded at only $40 million in the fiscal year 2013 bill, which is $217 million—76 percent actually—below the President's request. So while we were able to restore some of that critically needed funding with the amendment that was passed last night, it is totally insufficient. It is insufficient because of the fact that the highly successful COPS hiring program is vital to increasing the numbers of community police officers on our streets.

Not only will we have fewer officers protecting our citizens now, but these cuts will result in officers with less training who are less prepared to address the violent crimes threatening our community. We simply can't afford to let that happen.

Oakland, my hometown, and so many communities across this country are already struggling to contain violent crime. COPS has been a lifeline for public safety. It has worked.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I know that we are facing a challenging fiscal situation with the current allocations under the Republican budget. But slashing the COPS hiring program, even as State and local budgets struggle to make ends meet, is a perfect example of being penny-wise and pound-foolish.

We must support the safety of our communities. The COPS program is active in every one of our districts—Democratic and Republican districts.

So let me end by saying that supporting our law enforcement should not be a partisan issue. Our COPS deserve better. I look forward once again to working with Ranking Member FATTAH and others to increase funding to the COPS program as this bill moves to conference. We need to increase it at least to $257 million, which is what my amendment would have done. So thank you again to our ranking member and the members of the Appropriations Committee and the staff for their hard work in bringing this bill to the floor.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1550

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. Since President Clinton initiated the COPS program, there has been a tendency for there to be partisan fights around it. The truth of the matter is there is nothing partisan about cops in your community. Every community throughout our country, no matter the voting patterns or predictions of voting patterns, rely on police officers for public safety.

The Congress—this Congress, under a Republican President and Republicans in the House and Senate, has spent billions on policing in Iraq. We have just seen President Obama make commitments in Afghanistan for security services and resources well into the next decade. Here in America, we should be at least as willing to support police on our streets.

I want to assure the gentlelady from Oakland—her city I visited. I know many of the challenges in cities similarly situated, including my own. I know that the chairman of the subcommittee wants to see more cops on the beat, but we have a difficult allocation. We are hopeful, and I think with some degree of certainty that we will be able to increase the resources put into this area.

This is not partisan. This is a program that works. Ever since the COPS program was implemented, every single year the crime rate has gone down; violent crime has gone down in cities where this has been implemented. So I thank the gentlelady for her offering of the amendment and for her willingness to withdraw it. And I thank the chairman for reserving rather than acting on his point of order.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentlewoman from California seek to withdraw her amendment?

Ms. LEE of California. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Chairman, coral reefs are some of the most important ecosystems in the United States, providing environmental and economic benefits to our communities.

Coral reefs provide almost $2 billion in local income and over 70,000 jobs for neighboring communities. Coral reefs provide ecosystem services valued at over $8 billion. These vital natural resources, however, are facing a multitude of threats, the impacts of which are little understood.

NOAA works in partnership with external partners across the United States to provide the opportunity for scientists from academic institutions to work in collaboration with NOAA and other partners to address a wide variety of threats. Now, these partnerships allow for better understanding of local impacts, leading to local management decisions that account for unique socioeconomic and cultural priorities.

I do appreciate the committee's support for $24 million in funding for coral reef programs in NOAA, and I ask that you work with the Senate to maintain funding for NOAA's important coral reef programs, including coral research.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia for the purpose of continuing this colloquy.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentlelady from Guam for raising this important matter. We will work with the Senate to ensure that funding for these important programs, including coral research activities, is sufficiently maintained.

Ms. BORDALLO. I thank the gentleman.

Reclaiming my time, again, I thank the gentleman for deciding that he will work with the Senate to ensure that funding for these important programs will be sufficiently maintained.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (and before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. 542. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to litigate against any of the several States on behalf of the National Labor Relations Board pertaining to secret ballot union elections.

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Chairman, the right to a secret ballot should be sacred in America, and I stand in unison with my colleagues from South Dakota, Utah, and Arizona in defunding the NLRB's ability to sue States over the right to a secret ballot.

For decades, we have seen a sharp decline in private sector labor unions, while government employee labor unions have used the political process to expand. In an effort to curb the recent labor trends in the private sector, the administration's taxpayer-funded voice for labor—the National Labor Relations Board—has filed numerous suits against right-to-work States and enacted over-the-top, union-friendly policies simply because right-to-work States like South Carolina allow employees to decide for themselves whether or not they wish to join labor unions.

The NLRB's latest attempt to boost labor unions involves suing two States, Arizona and South Dakota, and intimidating several other States because of State laws protecting the secret-ballot process in labor union elections.

Just recently, 80 percent of South Carolinians voted overwhelmingly—80 percent—to enact secret-ballot protections in union certification elections. These are exactly the protections that NLRB bureaucrats are attacking today.

This is not only an attack on our states' rights, but also on the secret-ballot election process that allows workers to vote their conscience without fear of union retaliation.

My amendment does not eliminate the NLRB or strip away all of their funding—even though they probably deserve exactly that after 2 years of abusing businesses, including Boeing in my home State. Rather, my amendment simply protects the States whose citizens have spoken on this issue by stopping the NLRB lawsuits against those States.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for workers' rights, stand up for the rights of voters in our States who have spoken, and stand up for the rights of our States themselves and support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. I'm opposed to the idea that in a country of laws we want to deny the opportunity for our issues to be raised in a court of law. That's how we settle matters in our Nation, and I think it sets the example for the rest of the world.

So this consistent attempt that we see here now, whether on the Affordable Care Act or on other issues, to deny funds for the Department of Justice on behalf of the executive branch to bring issues before a court of law, I think, flies in the face of the American ideal.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUAYLE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. 542. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) Enforcement Guidance Number 915.002 concerning ''Consideration of arrest and conviction records in employment decisions''.

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

Mr. QUAYLE. Madam Chair, I'm offering this amendment with my good friends and colleagues, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. WOODALL. It would block the new EEOC enforcement guidance that limits employers' ability to look at criminal records in their hiring decisions by prohibiting the use of funds for the implementation of this guidance.

Now, Madam Chair, it seems like every day, whether it be an Agency or a Commission, they come out with some new rule or guidance that really puts burdens on our small businesses and companies that are actually trying to expand and hire new workers.

□ 1600

Now, this guidance is particularly troubling because it sets up a lose-lose situation for our small businesses in my home State of Arizona and across the country. You see, these businesses are going to have two choices.

One, they can either not actually go through with a criminal background check, which would open them up for a claim of negligent hiring if a worker actually goes and commits a crime on the premises; or they're going to open themselves up to litigation from the Federal Government, from the EEOC or the DOJ because they believe that their objective use of actual criminal background check is going to actually have a disparate impact.

Now, I don't think that that's the choice that our businesses should be given. They have to have a different choice, a choice that allows them to expand, allows them to hire more workers, and allows them to put forth the proper procedures so they know they're hiring people that are not going to have criminal activity.

The reason this one thing came to my attention was I spoke to a constituent of mine who owns a hotel in my district, and he says, Look, I have to have criminal background checks for my employees because some of them are going into rooms of the guests to clean, to check on things, and they have valuables there. Now, if I don't do a criminal background check and they actually go in and steal something and they did have a burglary rap against them or a robbery rap, these are the things that they would actually get sued for for negligent hiring.

So this amendment makes sure that no funds will be used to implement this new guidance. And it is especially important to do because the EEOC has recently been very, very litigious, and there have been two recent Federal court cases that actually smack down some of the EEOC's claims for a frivolous lawsuit and gave back millions of dollars to these companies who were charged by the EEOC. So this is why this amendment is important.

This is actually going to get rid of some of the burdens and some of the uncertainties that are placed upon our businesses, and I think this is the time to do it. We don't need to put any more burdens on companies that want to expand and hire because, if you're going to put this into place and enforce it, you're actually going to just lead to people not hiring because you're going to set them up for failure.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. As best as I'm able to determine, this is a bipartisan vote of the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission, just saying that there should be reasonableness in the process of looking at this question.

We have a lot of young people who get themselves involved in circumstances young, at early points in their lives, but we do want them to be gainfully employed and productive citizens in our various States. But, nonetheless, this is a matter that has been litigated in various courts and, to some degree, I think it's helped to bring a more commonsense approach to this process.

But here again, to deny funds for the lawyers of the Federal Government to be able to handle these matters in a court of law I don't believe is the appropriate way to go. So I stand in opposition to this amendment.

I stand for the notion that we should be trying to reengage people in productive lives, in employment, reunite them with their families and build stronger communities, and I think that's the purpose of much of the work that we're doing related to reentry.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARDNER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. QUAYLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we need to make sure that we are allowing people to get good jobs. And that's the biggest problem that I have with this guidance is that, when you're setting up other companies where they have a lose-lose proposition of whether they're going to either have the possibility of litigation from the Federal Government or the possibility of litigation because they have a negligent hiring, you're actually setting up a situation where they just won't hire. They won't hire anybody because they're not going to want to put themselves in that situation.

And the other thing that we've been seeing is that this got a lot of concern from the Appropriations Committee in the Senate as well, saying that we have to look and make sure that there are not these unintended consequences where we're going to be putting up businesses to fail, and that we're actually putting on these burdens that are not going to let companies expand, that are not going to let companies hire. And these are the sorts of things that continue to put this uncertainty in the private sector.

It seems day in and day out that the Federal Government does this, whether it's an Agency or Commission, and that's why I think this is a very important amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Chair, I rise today to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the Commerce, Justice, Science Committee regarding NASA's plans to consolidate its thermal protection systems and atmospheric reentry materials testing facilities, known as arcjet facilities.

In 2011, NASA made the decision to close the arcjet facility at the Johnson Space Center in order to consolidate testing in a single NASA location. However, serious concerns were raised at high levels within NASA and industry about the detrimental effects this consolidation will have on NASA's testing capabilities, its ability to maintain unique institutional assets, and its ability to successfully develop NASA's human and robotic space systems, including the Orion, commercial, and other important space vehicles, which all require arcjet certification of their thermal protection systems.

Madam Chair, NASA claims that the proposed consolidation will reduce costs while maintaining safety and mission assurance. However, I believe that NASA has unduly fast-tracked this decision and overlooked safety and mission concerns, cost issues, and program testing needs.

I've asked NASA to suspend its work on closing the arcjet, pending a thorough and independent review of those concerns, such as investigations by the NASA inspector general and the Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel. I hope

that such review will ensure that NASA does not make a shortsighted and regretful decision.

I thank Chairman WOLF for the opportunity to raise these concerns today and yield to my colleague from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I want to thank my colleague for yielding me time, and I want to thank Chairman WOLF for his tireless dedication to maintaining our Nation's manned space flight capabilities. For many years, we worked together.

I represent part of Houston and Pasadena, Texas, and we're proud of the Johnson Space Center. The work that is accomplished there advances our Nation in space through mission control, training, and testing. One such testing facility is arcjet. This facility ensures that the material on the outside of the vehicles reentering our atmosphere can withstand the heat that is created. It's a critical capability if we ever want to send humans in space again.

The Johnson Space Center arcjet facility is being closed by NASA. I believe the decision is premature. We've received documentation indicating the experts within NASA, from their own Office of Safety and Mission Assurance, believe that the closure would negatively impact the safety and diminish NASA's in-house protection capabilities.

Confronted with tough questions on this, NASA has decided to move ahead with their plans. They're unwilling to delay it, and they are even unwilling to further study it.

Chairman WOLF, I'm asking for your help as we're confronted with a NASA that is pushing ahead despite our inquiries and despite their own internal disagreements. This is not just a local issue, and I'm afraid that the closure of arcjet at Johnson Space Center would forever undermine our Nation's space program, and I appreciate any assistance you could provide us.

□ 1610

Mr. OLSON. In reclaiming my time, I yield to Mr. WOLF.

Mr. WOLF. I want to thank both of you for your commitment to safety and mission success at NASA. This is an issue that they have been active on for a while now, and they have raised a number of significant questions. We will be happy to work with both of your offices to ensure that those questions are answered and that the decision-making on NASA's facility promotes safe and effective management. So we'll work with both of you to do that.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ___. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Justice to be a party to a single or multi-state court settlement where funds are removed from any residential mortgage-backed securitization trust.

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

Mr. GARRETT. Earlier this year, the Obama administration and the State attorneys general across the country entered into a so-called multi-State mortgage settlement process, in a final settlement, with some of the Nation's largest servicers. What the administration stated at this time is that the settlement would require the servicers to use—this is important—their own money to help people, to help pay out overextended home buyers, basically. Unfortunately, this settlement went a lot further than that.

In that settlement, people who were purely investors in mortgage-backed securities were also negatively affected by it as well—you might say literally taking money from them, or stealing money from them, through this process. You see, these private investors, they did absolutely nothing wrong whatsoever, but now they also are on the hook for having to pay in upwards of billions of dollars to, again, bail out some people who made some bad decisions and wrong investments.

Now, I do very much sympathize with people, individuals—home buyers—who were hard-hit by the recession, and I understand what the intention of this settlement process was. But there is no reason whatsoever as to why private investors who fund our mortgage market in this country should have their private contracts broken and their money basically taken from them. See, they in this process were deliberately left out entirely of the administration's negotiations on the mortgage settlement. They did not have a proverbial seat at the table when the decision was made as to who would foot the bill. Basically, private contracts in the process were broken. People, investors, didn't have a chance to stop it. They didn't have a say.

Who are these investors I'm talking about here? They're State retirement systems. They're 401(k) plans. They're public pension plans. They're private pension plans. They're insurance company annuities. They're mutual funds. Basically, what I'm talking about is just regular, everyday people who comprise the majority of American retirees across this country. So, in addition to the DOJ's taking this action in this past settlement practice without the investors being present at the table, this is really, if you think about it, another example of private contract rights having been broken and about Fifth Amendment due process rights having been broken as well.

Now, this is all in the past—and what we're doing here in this legislation is going forward—but the past action, if it is able to be continued, would put in a hesitancy, if you will. It would encourage investors to step back from the mortgage market and say, you know, there is really a new political risk here if I'm going to invest in mortgages anymore, if I'm going to buy a mortgage, a bond, or what have you. And they will step back from doing so, and that will hurt everyone. That will hurt you, and that will hurt your neighbors who want to get a mortgage in the future because there will not be investors who will want to lend them money. Then what that will do, of course, is drive up the cost of borrowing, and that will drive up the cost of buying a new home. That, of course, is something that we do not want to do here.

So having the government basically taking money out of pension funds, taking money from retirees, is not something that we should allow to occur going forward, and that basically is what our amendment tries to do: prohibit the DOJ from keeping these people from being at the table in any further settlement negotiations like this.

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

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. I think it would be useful for the House to understand that dozens and dozens—in fact, the majority of bipartisan attorneys general across the country—filed litigation against mortgage investors who had, in their view, improperly led to millions of foreclosures throughout the country, which is what we saw with the housing market collapse. This was joined in by the Obama administration. A settlement emerged. That settlement this week led, for instance, to 200,000 homeowners having their principals reduced, but this is action that is taking place all across the country, over multiple steps, and millions of families will benefit.

The gentleman's amendment says that the people who invested in the mortgage-backed securities are the entities that then hire the servicers, the servicers who were found to have violated the law by improperly conducting their affairs. So they settled with Democrat and Republican attorneys general across the country in a $25 billion-plus settlement that is trying to right a wrong. This amendment says, well, somehow you can't hold the people who are the investors liable for their agent, the servicers, the agents who artificially signed people's names to documents, and on and on and on.

I won't recount the activities because I think they're known well. But more importantly, they've really harmed the entire housing market in our Nation. I think the attempt here to separate out those who are seeking a fortune off of the misfortune of others from those

who acted on their behalf is wrongheaded, and I think that the amendment should be voted down.

This, unlike many others, is not a partisan matter. This is something that was brought by Republican attorneys general across our States and by Democrat attorneys general, and the joining in of it by the Department of Justice and the administration was just icing on the cake. Yet I think that the point here is that this is an activity of our State governments and that there is no reason we should be using the process here on an appropriations bill to interfere with it.

I am not at all certain that this would not have an impact, because there are still other issues that are being proceeded on in terms of banks in this regard. This was just with the largest banks in the country. So I think this amendment could have an impact and could harm the efforts of homeowners in our States to seek redress.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MYRICK). The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I yield to the chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding. I will be very brief on this.

I very much appreciate the fact that the settlement was done in a bipartisan manner. I very much appreciate the fact as to what the overall intent of the settlement efforts were by the administration and the State attorneys general. We're not questioning that at all.

It's a very interesting analogy that you make as far as the servicers being the agent of the investors, but remember who you're talking about as to who those investors are. They are the pension funds in your districts; they are the unions in your districts who have their pension funds invested in mortgage-backed securities; they are the retirees in your districts who went and, through a mutual fund or some other sort of fund, bought an investment—a bond or what have you—that was in mortgage-backed securities.

Now, yes, a third party, if you will, another party—the servicers—made some bad decisions in this. But the way this works is that the State attorneys general and the DOJ went after—who? Basically the four or five largest banks, which is about 20 percent of the industry, figuring that they would be the best targets to go after. Fine. That narrows it down who you're going to go after. Now you give them the discretion as to which mortgages they're going to write down—I'm going to write down this one; I'm going to write down this one. Which ones am I going to basically help out through bailing out the home buyers? Yes, a large percentage of those are on their own books, but some of them are not on their own books. Some of them are the servicers for other investors that are out there.

So which ones do you think the banks are going to look at first as far as taking a haircut from something that's in their own portfolio? From something that is going to be a negative to them, or from something that is out there extraneous—out to maybe one of your own pension funds out there? I would gather that, most likely, they will go outside of their own business financial decisions and say, let's look at some of these other investors instead. So that's who we're trying to protect.

□ 1620

At the end of the day, it is a very simple thing. If this were to go forward, really all you want to make sure is that those people, innocent and otherwise, have a seat at the table and can make sure that their rights and interests are protected as well.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ___. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Justice to bring any action against any State for implemention of a State law requiring voter identification.

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Chairman, I think you, and probably all of us in the body are noticing a theme here on many of these limitation amendments. Being someone that comes from Arizona, there's a reason we've been actually applauding many of these amendments.

We feel, as a State—and now I'm realizing many other States have the same issue—we're at battle with our own Justice Department. How many times has Arizona now been sued by this Justice Department? This became one of those occasions where we understand Texas and other States are now being sued by the Justice Department because of voter ID laws.

I'm tired of this, and I think the American people are tired of there being this battle between the Federal Government suing our States and costing the residents, the citizens of these States, these litigation costs.

How do you stand up and create limitation? This became our opportunity to tell the Justice Department, No, go after bad guys and stop suing our State. If there is a bad act requiring an ID to vote in a State, fine. You still have private rights of action.

I had a staffer in the back telling me this story. I hope I don't screw this up too much. But apparently a couple of weeks ago, there was a young man who walked into a polling place and was able to get General Holder's—our Attorney General's—ballot by just saying, Hi, I'm Eric Holder. I'm here to vote.

Does anyone understand how absurdly ironic this is, when considering you can't go in and visit the Attorney General in his office without a photo ID? I can't go visit him in his office, but I can walk in and get his ballot?

If you believe in the sanctity of the voting box, if you want the American people to believe in your election and be willing to accept when there are changes of power, which happens all the time, you've got to also have that faith, the faith that those elections were clean and proper, but also that those who were supposed to vote were the ones who were allowed to vote. Madam Chairman, that's why I stand here and offer this amendment.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Schweikert amendment.

As I listened to his presentation, it rolls me back to the year 2000 when I watched the fiasco take place in Florida and the recount that took place there. At the time, I was the chairman of the Iowa Senate State Government Committee. It was my job to see to it that we made sure that Iowa wasn't a Florida in a recount like that. In that process, I went through 37 days where almost every waking minute I was looking into voter election fraud. It really brought my attention to it, to the point where every day I carried an acorn around in my pocket just to remind me that free and fair and legitimate elections are what we need to have. It's the very bedrock for this constitutional Republic. The Constitution is the foundation, but legitimate elections and the perception of legitimate elections are the very bedrock upon which the foundation of our country sits upon.

So through that period of time, we've watched since that there has been more and more election fraud, promoted by ACORN, that brought this to the public sight, but something that I've been on

now in my 12th year. As I brought legislation in the State forward to legitimatize the elections that were in question, I asked that we made sure that our voter registration lists are free of duplicates, deceased, and felons, and that we require a picture ID.

The gentleman from Arizona has put together a list of the things that you need a picture ID for, and it's rather astonishing when you look through that list. Since he yielded back the balance of his time, I'm going to just pick some things off of this sheet, Madam Chair. That is this:

You can't get a package from a post office, a post office general delivery box, without showing a picture ID in cities. I can in my hometown.

You can't purchase a handgun without a picture ID.

You can't purchase tobacco or liquor without a picture ID. I can't get a beer in Chicago without a picture ID, or open a bank account or get on a passenger plane or get a ticket to Amtrak or rent a car or return merchandise or a refund or sell scrap metal in a junk yard or purchase police uniforms in California. I've never tried that one.

You can't be treated in any doctors' offices or admitted to a hospital without being in an emergency without a picture ID, or rent an apartment or get a bank loan or a cell phone or a teaching license or enter a major university, enroll as a student or get a library card at any libraries or enter military ports, check into a major hotel chain, rent a truck from a U-Haul or, as the gentleman from Arizona said, you can't visit Eric Holder without a picture ID. It's pretty astonishing.

This morning, in a hearing before the Judiciary Committee, the Director of the FBI, Director Mueller, I asked him if he had heard of the incident of the early twenties young Caucasian male that walked into the polling place in Virginia and asked for Attorney General Eric Holder's ballot. He just gave the name and identified the address, and they tried to hand him the ballot. He said, I need to go get my ID. They said, You don't need an ID; here is the ballot. It didn't occur to the poll worker that this early twenties Caucasian male was not a 61-year-old black man whom everybody ought to know his face by now, the Attorney General of the United States.

The Attorney General of the United States apparently wasn't alarmed that he easily could have been disenfranchised of his vote if that individual had just gone and picked up the ballot and gone and voted. He was not alarmed. And the Director of the FBI said under oath, this morning, he hadn't heard of this case, this incident that, by the way, twice was brought before the Judiciary Committee and the video was run. It's a matter of record with the Judiciary Committee within the last month, Madam Chair.

There are things that you can't do. As I said, you can't get a beer in Chicago without a picture ID and you can't vote in Hugo Chavez's Venezuela without a picture ID. It's about time, in the United States of America, we allow the States to clean up our election laws and kept the Department of Justice out of the business of interfering with the justice that is delivered by the States in the United States of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. Let me say a couple of things.

One is that our country has managed to limp along for a few hundred years. We are the leading Nation in the world. We are the wealthiest Nation in the world. We are the number one superpower. I don't know how we got here with all of these imperfections in our voting system, but we'll try to go forward.

This notion that voter IDs—for instance, in the State of Texas, if you have a concealed-weapons permit issued by the State, that's good; you can go vote with it. If you have a State ID from the State university, that's not good.

In our State of Pennsylvania, we've got 30 types of different IDs that you can and you can't use. The Republican Governors and legislatures throughout our country this year have all come to the same conclusion. It's like a consensus that all of a sudden what America really needs is picture IDs for people to go vote.

I would suspect that when this is over with, after people go to the polls in November, there is going to be some regret. I think that in many areas of our country where there are people who may even cast votes on behalf of the GOP, that there are going to be senior citizens like—for instance, let me give you an example of my own mother. She is 80 years old. She has never driven a car. She's not traveled outside the country. She has no active passport or anything. She doesn't have a picture ID. She doesn't need one. We'll make sure she has one.

□ 1630

I believe that when we get to the final analysis here that there will be more interference in voting in places that don't have the same level of access to what the States have now required you to do, and I think that will be unfortunate. It's not the way for the leading democracy in the world to operate. Those who have promoted these laws and stand in support of them, I believe this will be a point in their careers that they'll look back on and wonder how it is that they got on such the wrong side of history.

I'm opposed to this amendment, which is another limiting amendment, limiting access to the courts for lawyers on behalf of our government, trying to protect citizens' right to vote in States where Governors have decided now you need a picture to go present yourself and cast a ballot.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GOSAR. I am proud of my colleague from Arizona for bringing up this amendment, and I am tired of the Department of Justice dictating to the States. It's about time that we embellished and supported States to actually help us with this. And I want to remind our colleagues, if it's good enough for us—here's my card in order to vote—it should be good enough for the rest of the United States. What we do in Congress we should do for the rest of the country, and this is where it starts.

There are so many things that we can talk about, but it's about time that we stopped suing States. And I think this is a great amendment—rewarding good behavior instead of rewarding bad behavior—and giving our Department of Justice an outline of what good behavior is, because I think they've lost their way.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enforce section 221(a) of title 13, United States Code, with respect to the American Community Survey.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chairman, my colleagues and I—Congressman GOWDY, Congressman KING, Congressman SCALISE, and Congressman LANDRY—have introduced an amendment to prohibit funds from going to the Census Bureau to enforce a criminal penalty that is imposed upon people who choose not to complete the American Community Survey.

The American Community Survey is not the same as the decennial, or every-10-year, census that is required by the U.S. Constitution. The census, of course, is conducted every 10 years to account for the population and includes, basically, 10 questions. The

American Community Survey is a different survey handled by the Census Bureau that has 48 questions and is sent to 250,000 people every month, or 3 million Americans a year. The questions that it asks have nothing to do with national security, but it asks specific—in my opinion, intrusive—questions to determine Federal funding for certain areas. Plus, businesses use these answers to the questions to make business decisions on locating or not locating in certain parts of the United States.

I don't argue the benefit of the overall purpose of the American Community Survey. My concern is that it's intrusive. And does the Federal Government really have the right to ask certain questions? There are 48 questions. I'm not going to go through all of them. However, I would like to put into the RECORD the American Community Survey.

There are three questions I would like to mention, however. One of them is, Does your home have a flush toilet? Or, Do you or any member of your household have a second mortgage or a home equity loan? The third question that I wanted to mention is, Because of a physical, mental, or emotional condition, does this person have serious difficulty concentrating, remembering, or making decisions?

Now, does the Federal Government really need this information? Should the Federal Government really obtain this intrusive information from citizens?

If Americans want to complete the American Community Survey, fill it out, give it to the Census Bureau, fine, but they shouldn't be required to do so with the threat of a fine.

I've heard from many people—not only in Texas but all over the country—that they are concerned when people come from the Census Bureau, or subcontractors, to have them fill out this questionnaire. These people from the Census Bureau, or those who are contracted by them, start with phone calls. First there's one a week, and then many times there's one every day. In one particular case, I had an individual who was a single mother with a young child who said the Census Bureau worker started coming to her house, sitting out in the front of her house waiting for her to come in. And then when she is in the residence, the worker is peeking through the window to see if she's in there, knocking on the door to have her come to the door to answer the American Community Survey.

Now, does that really need to take place in the United States just to get a 48-question survey filled out? I don't think so. The means to get this information does not justify the result. And if people don't want to complete the survey, they shouldn't be required, under our law, by the penalty of a fine, to do so.

I hope that we do, in this country, as the Canadians have done. They have made this type of information voluntary. They still obtain the information from people who want to voluntarily give the information. As smart as the Census Bureau is about collecting information, they can certainly do this without having to go door to door, 250,000 people every month, to do this. Figure out new innovative ways to obtain this information voluntarily. Maybe talk to some of the polling agencies that have specific information about all kinds of polls in the United States to obtain the information with the result to be for businesses to use and for Federal funding to be going into those areas.

So this amendment simply says, there will be no penalty for people who refuse to fill out the survey.

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

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. My colleague, the gentleman from Texas, was here with me in 2005 when, in fact, we had a President from Texas. This survey was done then. It was done in the same identical way. In fact, this would be the first time that we would act in a way contrary to our constitutional responsibility.

It is important to note that this is an authorized activity of the Census Bureau, not just directly related to our constitutional responsibilities but also Title 13 of the U.S. Code, and it has been judged in numerous courts to be appropriate. It is important for Congress and for our government to be able to act in ways, in terms of public policy, in which we have information.

I'm trying to figure out what's different now than in 2005. In fact, the development of this survey and these questions even happened prior to this administration. So I'm trying to figure out exactly why we're here today and what it is that we're trying to accomplish and why we want to create suspicion about the fact that we need to have information about the population, like the question about toilets that flush or things like this.

□ 1640

We do this with the Millennium Challenge grant, which was set up under the Bush administration, looking at developing countries and looking at some of the challenges in terms of population and when we want to know about the state of our own communities.

So I wonder why we're here. I do know one thing: I'm going to vote against this. I'm sure the gentleman has some reason why this was okay before and now it's not okay. The House will work its will on it.

Mr. POE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. To answer your question specifically, I am not arguing the point that this information is not valuable for businesses and for the Federal Government for funding in certain areas. My issue and the concern that has arisen since I have been in Congress is that people feel that they should not be forced to participate in the American Community Survey.

This is not the census. This is a different complete document. Sure, it's authorized by Congress. But maybe Congress needs to back up and say people should be allowed to opt out and not be required to fill out the survey.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, maybe Congress will, and you've offered us an opportunity to do so. You pointed out Canada. I guess you're recommending their system and the way they do things. For our purposes, the country seems to run pretty well by having the census data, having a capability of understanding of what the water needs may be, what the transportation needs may be, understanding what the conditions are in American families so that we can get appropriate public policy.

But if you think we can do that better being in the dark in terms of this data, fine. The Census Bureau says even though they don't really enforce the fine, they know for a certainty that absent a requirement, they will get less data back.

I know the gentleman is attempting to help our country. I'm just not clear exactly how this does it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I rise in support of the Poe amendment, and I thank the gentleman from Texas for bringing it.

Just to clarify some of the history, this is the questionnaire that apparently has replaced the need for what was the census long form. The census, of course, is directed by the Constitution every 10 years. And that's why we're going through redistricting now and all the primaries take place across the country.

But from 1940 until the year 2000, we also had the long form that was part of the census question. Some people got the long form; some got the short form. And this questionnaire came along and replaced the long form. So the perception was that it actually was a census question—the replacement for the long form—but it really is not. Of course, it's the American Community Survey.

I agree with the gentleman from Texas. If a government is going to be so intrusive, they're going to issue a 24-page packet of questions that's got 48 questions in it, some of them very, very intrusive. Just names, age, gender, race, income, physical and emotional health—that must have been the one where you have to answer the question on whether you're having trouble concentrating or making decisions—

your family status, details of your residence—that might be the one about whether you have a flush toilet or not—and intimate personal habits—whether you actually use it or not. I'm having trouble concentrating on whether I actually have one.

But I'm thinking that when one gets one of these in the mail and you're looking at someplace between—I know it's not been enforced, but they don't know that when they get the questionnaire—so someplace between a $100 fine and up to a $5,000 fine, by the information I have, that's pretty draconian just to get information from American people that volunteer on a basis by the tens of millions and contribute billions of dollars in charity. We can find enough Americans to fill out this survey and give the government the information that they need.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. There's some 309 million Americans, and some 200,000 will be getting this form, right?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I believe 250,000 is the number I have.

Mr. FATTAH. So 250,000. First and foremost, it's an opportunity for a sampling. As politicians, we know what sampling is all about. It is to take from a smaller group of people information that you can then extrapolate and make broader judgments about. So if you're only asking less than 1 percent of 1 percent, the notion that this is some intrusive governmental activity, I think—

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, Madam Chair, I would make the point if it's less than 1 percent of the population, it certainly is. It's far less than 1 percent of the population. We can find that many volunteers that will fill this out voluntarily. Send it to me. I'll fill it out voluntarily. But when you tell me you're going to come in and fine me for it, that's intrusive. And these questions are personal enough that people should be able to say, I don't want to share that information with my Federal Government. I don't want that to go into a database that might possibly get transferred across into other people's information.

I think it's important to have the information, but it's important that people have freedom and liberty and we do not have an intrusive Federal Government that would impose a fine on people if they didn't let the information come out about whether they had a flush toilet and whether they can concentrate on whether they had it and whether they used it. That seems to be part of the center of this. We can at least reduce some of these questions down there.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentlemen from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Obviously, it would be a different population if one were asked to volunteer versus one selected through a random sample.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I recognize that. I think we get better information from volunteers than we do people that are coerced. They may well not fill out this survey accurately if they think they're doing so under penalty of law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOWDY. Madam Chairwoman, if the government wants to ask you if you're having trouble keeping your attention or how many flush toilets you have, I suppose they can ask that. But should they really be able to fine you for not answering? And it is of very little comfort to us that the government has seen fit to not enforce that fine. To threaten somebody with the administration of a fine and then never to carry through on it sounds eerily similar, to me, Madam Chairwoman, to blackmail. What's the purpose of putting it on there if you're never going to enforce it? And if you can do it to 250,000 this time, what's to keep you from doing it to 500,000 the next time, and then a million?

The purpose of the census, Madam Chairwoman, is to apportion the several congressional districts. So what do you need to be able to apportion the several congressional districts? You need to know how many people of voting age are in a household. You need to know race so you can comport with constitutional provisions. You may very well need to know the gender of the people in the home so you can comport with constitutional provisions. But you don't need to know anything beyond that.

We had a subcommittee hearing on this, Madam Chairwoman, and what I find to be ironic—and I never got an answer to it—is this: you don't have to vote. The government can't do a single, solitary thing to you if you don't vote. They can't fine you. They can't put you in jail. But somehow or another they can if you fail to fill out the document that apportions the congressional districts so you can vote. That is tortured logic.

And I would say this in conclusion, Madam Chairwoman. If you want to ask about anything other than how many people live here, race, and sex, it's none of the government's business.

And that's just the way it is.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1650

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. WEBSTER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to conduct the survey, conducted by the Secretary of Commerce, commonly referred to as the ''American Community Survey''.

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

Mr. WEBSTER. Madam Chair, the amendment offered here by myself and Mr. Langford is simple. It prohibits taxpayer funds from being used to conduct the intrusive, unconstitutional American Community Survey. In addition to the constitutionally mandated census, the Department of Commerce Census Bureau conducts a number of other surveys. One of these is the American Community Survey which costs $2.4 billion to administer.

Some of the questions which have already been gone over that the American Community Survey contains have been routinely criticized as invasions of privacy. As a citizen who has normal expectations of what is private and what is not private, I share that criticism. For example, the survey requires respondents to detail their emotional condition. The survey wants to know what time respondents left for work and how long it took them to get home. The survey demands to know if respondents have difficulty dressing, or they have need to go shopping. Or have difficulty, as has been said before, concentrating or remembering or making decisions.

Failure to comply with this survey and turn over this personal information is punishable by up to a $5,000 fine. Given the intrusive nature of some of these questions, which are mandatory for Americans to answer under penalty of law, it would seem that these questions hardly fit the scope of what was intended or required by the Constitution.

What does the Constitution require? Article 1, section 2 calls for enumeration every 10 years. The actual enumeration shall be made within 3 years after the first meeting of Congress of the United States and subsequent terms of 10 years.

As you can see, at no point does the Constitution require me to tell the Census Bureau whether I have difficulty concentrating or whether or not I can climb stairs. Given the Nation's current fiscal situation, it is entirely appropriate to eliminate the survey as a taxpayer-funded activity of the U.S. Government.

The American taxpayers agree. I sponsored the majority leader's YouCut program this past week, and eliminating the American Community Survey was overwhelmingly the winner when the citizens were polled what Federal spending they would cut.

We need to ask ourselves whether this survey is worth $2.4 billion. Will continuation of this survey bankrupt the Nation itself? No, not hardly. But

as has been said before, the old saying is a billion here and a billion there, all of a sudden we're talking about a lot of money.

Why would we even pass a cybersecurity bill when we are using 5,779 hired government agents to collect sensitive information from our citizens at taxpayer expense? This American Community Survey is an inappropriate use of taxpayer dollars. It is the very picture of what's wrong in D.C.

I have here the questionnaire. At least it would be the questionnaire if DANIEL WEBSTER and Sandra and David and Brent and Jordan and Elizabeth and John and Victoria were all questioned. This is the size of that questionnaire. This is what we would have to fill out. This is what would be punishable by law if we did not fill it out. What would you think about some of these others that you read about in the newspaper, the Duggar family, who have 20 children. What would they do? It would be three to four times this size, and they would be required by law to fill it out.

This survey is inappropriate for taxpayer dollars. It is a definition of a breach of personal privacy. It is a picture of what's wrong in Washington, D.C. It's unconstitutional.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Webster-Langford amendment and prohibit funds from being used to conduct this American Community Survey.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. So we first had an amendment that said that we can't require people with a fine that's never enforced. Now we have an amendment that says you can't do the survey at all.

We've been doing surveys in the long form since 1790 as a Nation. It is critically important. Let me give you a for-instance. The gentleman who just spoke, my good friend from Florida, who served as speaker and as leader in both the House and Senate there, respectively, we're spending $200 billion a year on Alzheimer's alone. There are various forms of dementia as our populations age, Pennsylvania being the second State in the country in terms of aging population. It's important for us to know, unlike what was stated, the survey doesn't ask you whether you are forgetting things; the survey asks whether there are people in your home who might be suffering. It's important from a health perspective because it will guide our efforts. I'm leading an effort on brain research now to try to help us think through how we can develop more appropriate efforts to head off some of these challenges.

But the idea that we don't want to ask a couple hundred thousand citizens a question about something so that we can better plan for a country of 300 million, the idea that filling out a few pieces of paper is too much to be asked for for your country to help create a better Union of a citizen, I think citizens would welcome. In fact, the reason you don't have to fine anyone is because people do fill out the form.

But we know something with certainty. The idea that we are going to lead the greatest country in the world with less information about the conditions of communities and of our families, and that we are going to do that appropriately, defies logic. It is intellectually dishonest.

Now, we have done this survey for a very long time as a country. I suspect we will continue to do it. But for whatever reason, we are here today debating this. I welcome the debate. At least for myself and for my caucus, we stand in opposition.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. As I understand it, the American Community Survey is authorized by law and has been upheld by the courts. The ACS is authorized under Title 13, U.S. Code, the Census Act. On numerous occasions, the courts have judged that the Constitution gives Congress the authority to collect data on characteristics of the population in the census. As early as 1870, the Supreme Court characterized as unquestionable the power of Congress to require both an enumeration and the collection of data in the census. Is that your understanding?

Mr. FATTAH. That is my understanding. And reclaiming my time, any of the Members who are going to run in a competitive race without doing any polling, I assume they'll be voting for this. For those who want information in order to make good decisions, the government needs this information.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Here's this wonderful thing that would occur: you would open your mail one day and you would have a packet in there, and you would begin reading through these questions. And your first thought would be: Is this real or is this a scam artist trying to steal my information? Then you would call some office, or it gives you a Web site to contact just so you can see that this is really true, because this is not like the long form that just came to your mailbox; this is the American Community Survey. And what just landed in your mailbox, if you refuse to answer it, someone will call you. And then they'll call you, and then they'll call you, and then they'll show up at your door and check on you and why you haven't done it because this is not like the long form of the census that's gathering basic information; this is incredibly personal information.

And if we can ask these questions as a Federal Government, it begs the issue of what questions can the Federal Government not ask of someone, because the Federal Government does not have the authority to walk into every house in America and ask any question they want to ask about any private activity.

While it has been upheld that we can do the long form, this is distinctly different from the long form, and this is new. This is something that just transitioned in the last couple of years. And I get all kinds of calls in my office saying, what is this, and why are you asking for this.

Three quick things on it. I think this is incredibly inappropriate because it asks way too much personal information.

Second of all, I think it is incredibly inefficient. This form costs the Federal Government $67 per person that fills it out. Now, I can assure you, I've heard lots of people talking about polling data and about doing surveys. I don't know of anyone in politics, anyone in America, that pays $67 per survey that is filled out other than the Federal Government.

□ 1700

So this is incredibly inefficient in the way that we're gathering it. There are cheaper ways to be able to gather. Much of this information is already publicly available anyway; it just doesn't connect it to an individual person.

The third thing on this is it's incredibly invasive. Now, let me just run through some of the questions. We've highlighted a few of them, but let me just hit a couple of the high points and then I'll get a chance to talk to you.

It's not just a few things about your age and about your location; it also asks: Do you have hot and cold running water? Do you have a flush toilet? Do you have a bathtub or a shower? Do you have a sink with a faucet? Do you have a stove or a range? Do you have a refrigerator? Do you have telephone service? How many automobiles, vans, or 1-ton vehicles do you have in your home?

Let me keep going. About how much do you think the house or apartment would sell for if you were to sell it right now? What's the annual payment for your fire hazard and flood insurance on this property? How much is the regular monthly payment on your second mortgage for this property, if you have one? Is the person that lives in this home a United States citizen?

How about this one: How well does the person in this home speak English? Where did this person live a year ago? And give the address for that. Because of mental, physical or emotional conditions, does this person have serious difficulty concentrating, remembering or making decisions? Does this person have difficulty dressing or bathing? How many times has this person been married? Does this person have his or

her own grandchildren 18 or younger living in the home?

It gets better.

How many people, including this person, rode together to work last week? How many times did this person actually leave the home, and what time did they leave the home to go to work last week? Last week, was this person laid off from their job? When did this person last work even for a few days? What was your income in the last 12 months?

And not a range, the actual listed income.

Did you have any interest from dividends, rental income, royalties? Any public assistance or welfare payments did you receive?

It goes on and on and on. This is not just a few simple questions. This is a form that, if I walked up to anyone in this Chamber and said, I'm going to ask you a few questions and I'm going to write these down. Tell me first your income, then let's go to, do you have dividends? Do you have royalties? Do you have a bathtub or a shower? You would look at me and say, Go away—which is what thousands of people in America are saying to this survey.

This exceeds what we should ask as Americans.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Any one of millions of Americans—and we have an increase this week of people filing for new mortgages—have answered all of those questions, plus some. So if you think it's strange that people have to answer questions, if they can do it for a bank, they can maybe do it for their country.

But here's my question: You said this was new and it hadn't been done before. This was fully implemented in 2005 under President Bush. So why would you stand on the House—I mean, I don't understand. This is not new.

Mr. LANKFORD. Let me reclaim my time.

Yes, sir, it is. We started it in 2005 and started rolling it out a few at a time, experimenting with it, and now have increased it. In fact, the administration has asked for 50,000 more a month and has actually asked for $52 million more to increase the usage of this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this negative amendment that would eliminate funding for the American Community Survey.

Some have labeled the Majority the do nothing party. This amendment would make them the "know nothing party."

The ACS is the only source of national, annual socioeconomic, housing, and demographic data. It is used by Congress to help allocate $450 billion a year in federal grants to state and local governments, including the distribution of funds for veterans' job training programs and for improvements to low-income schools. The business community uses the ACS to help guide investment decisions like location and expansion plans.

Congress has required, directly or indirectly, all of the data gathered in the ACS. The ACS passed with bipartisan support under the previous Administration to ensure greater accuracy and streamline the decennial census.

Wade Henderson, CEO of the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, recently wrote about the ACS and asked, "Why would some members of Congress want to run the government without the most accurate information available to guide their decisions?"

I urge a "no" vote on the Webster amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chair, we have somebody who wanted to speak on this amendment.

Could we ask unanimous consent that we go back and allow the gentleman from Missouri to strike the requisite number of words?

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman wish to strike the last word?

Mr. DICKS. This will not be a process that will continue. This is one time only.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment has been agreed to.

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

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

Mr. CLAY. Madam Chairman, the American Community Survey is absolutely vital. That's why I'm kind of stunned at what I'm hearing. It not only allowed us to replace the long form census, making it easier for everyone to participate in the decennial census, but it provides all Americans with important information. But one particular area is of great concern to me, and that's the use of ACS data in determining the distribution of a substantial proportion of Federal assistance.

Now, we talk about accountability here. Well, let's start being accountable. Put your actions to words.

In fiscal year 2008, 184 Federal domestic assistance programs used ACS-related data to help guide the distribution of $416 billion. That's not chump change; it's taxpayer dollars. This represents 29 percent of all Federal assistance.

ACS-guided grants accounted for $389.2 billion, or 69 percent of all Federal grant funding. Most of ACS-guided Federal assistance goes to State governments through a handful of large formula grant programs to aid low-income households and support highway infrastructure.

Medicaid alone accounts for 63 percent of ACS-guided funding.

ACS-guided funding is highly concentrated in a small number of programs, recipient States, departments, and budget functions. State per capita ACS-guided funding is positively related to income inequality—high annual pay, high poverty—Medicaid income limits, and the percent of the population that is rural. The higher any of these measures, the higher per capita funding tends to be.

The ACS is absolutely vital. If you want to eliminate that, I'm sure you have certain reasons to do it, but it will take away an essential tool for us to be accountable with taxpayer dollars. So sign your name on the bottom line if you want to, but I suggest you think twice before you eliminate the ACS.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, let me seek unanimous consent that we have a recorded vote on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. For what purpose does the gentleman from Virginia rise?

Mr. WOLF. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 101, after line 10, insert the following new section:

SEC. 542. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110 140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

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

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment which would address another restrictive and misguided Federal regulation.

Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act prohibits Federal agencies from entering into contracts for the procurement of an alternative fuel unless its lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions are less than or equal to emissions from an equivalent conventional fuel produced from conventional petroleum sources. In summary, my amendment would stop the government from enforcing this ban on all Federal agencies funded by the CJS appropriations bill.

The initial purpose of section 526 was to stifle the Defense Department's plans to buy and develop coal-based or coal-to-liquids jet fuels. This stifling was based on the opinion of environmentalists that coal-based jet fuel produces more greenhouse gas emissions than traditional petroleum.

□ 1710

I recently offered similar amendments to four appropriations bills last year and each passed this House by a voice vote. My friend, Mr. CONAWAY of Texas, also had language added to the Defense authorization bill last year to exempt the Defense Department from this burdensome regulation.

We must ensure that our military has adequate fuel resources and can efficiently rely on domestic and more stable sources of fuel. But section 526's ban on fuel choice now affects all Federal Agencies, not just the Defense Department. This is why I'm offering this

amendment again today for the CJS appropriations bill.

Federal Agencies should not be burdened with wasting their time studying fuel emissions when there is a simple fix, and that's not restricting their fuel choices based on extreme environmental views, policies and misguided regulations like section 5266.

With increasing competition for energy and fuel resources, and the continued volatility and instability in the Middle East, it is now more important than ever for our country to become more energy independent and to further develop and produce our domestic energy resources. Placing limits on Federal Agencies' fuel choices is an unacceptable precedent to set in regard to America's energy policy and independence.

Madam Chair, section 526 makes our Nation more dependent on Middle East oil. Stopping the impact of section 526 will help us promote American energy, improve the American economy, and create American jobs.

Let's remember the following facts about section 526: it increases our reliance on Middle Eastern oil. It hurts our military readiness, national and energy security. It prevents the increased use of safe, clean, and efficient North American oil and gas. It increases the cost of American food and energy. It hurts American jobs and the American economy. And last and certainly not least, it costs our taxpayers more of their hard-earned dollars.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. The Congress of the United States, in a bipartisan vote, passed the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. It was signed into law by President Bush. It just suggests that, in Federal procurement, when we're seeking energy, that Departments should use energy-efficient sources so that we don't rely on unnecessary Middle East supplies for oil.

This removes this requirement, and so I would hope that we would vote against it.

This has been a part of the law for a number of years now, and it has helped save taxpayers money. So I would ask for a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. I concur with the gentleman. This is an effort to overturn a law that was passed in 2007 that says we're going to try to do the most energy-efficient approach to running the government. I mean, I think it's common sense, and I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. FLORES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLORES. Let's walk through this again. For instance, if you can't use fuel that's refined from Canadian oil sands, which is blended in with fuels from all sorts of oil sources, then you're stuck to use conventional sources, which means you're stuck with Middle Eastern oil.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, the section that you attempt to strike from the Energy Independence and Security Act that was passed in a bipartisan way, signed by President Bush, does not specify Canadian sand oil. What it says is that you have to use the most energy-efficient source that's available. That is what our government's been doing over a bipartisan administration. It has saved billions of dollars for the taxpayers.

Your offering today, on an appropriations bill—this effort to prohibit really should be handled in the Energy Committee.

Mr. FLORES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLORES. One of the things the Navy's had to do in order to do this and to develop other alternative fuel sources because it's not sure where it's going to get its fuel is to start using biofuels at the cost of $20-plus a gallon instead of buying it at $5 a gallon for jet fuel. That is not easier on the taxpayer.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, we're not trying to decide parochial kinds of decisions about which might be purchased and which not. The law, as passed by a Congress and signed under President Bush, requires the Department to act in terms of energy efficiency and to save taxpayers money. You want to prohibit that on behalf of what you think is a more appropriate way to go.

We should make an amendment to that law, bring it to the floor, bring it through the Energy Committee, and not attach it to a rider on this appropriations bill because we can't have a full debate on the merits thereof.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to request a recorded vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER).

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection?

Without objection, a recorded vote is requested on the Webster amendment.

There was no objection.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order 13547 (75 Fed. Reg. 43023, relating to the stewardship of oceans, coasts, and the Great Lakes).

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

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I rise to offer a simple amendment to address an overreach by the executive branch of the Federal Government. My amendment bans the use of Federal funds for any implementation of Executive Order 13547. Executive Order 13547, signed in 2009, requires that various bureaucracies essentially zone the ocean and the sources thereof. This could mean that a drop of rain that lands on your roof could cause the Federal Government to have jurisdiction over your property since that drop will eventually wind up in the ocean.

Concerns have been raised that the recently created National Ocean Policy may not only restrict ocean and inland activities, but given that it has not received any of its own funding, it will take scarce funds away from Federal Agencies and their currently authorized activities that are critical to the ocean and coastal economies, as well as our overall economy.

I look at a chart that I prepared, a look at Chart 1 reveals just how overreaching, overly burdensome, and ill conceived this plan is. The Natural Resources Committee continues to ask questions about ocean zoning, including its scope and its cost. However, we are not getting answers from the administration.

This chart, which is the watershed for the Mississippi River, our largest river, shows that 26 States would be affected by ocean zoning. This executive order would give unprecedented Federal reach by the Federal regional planning bodies to areas far inland to dictate activities that may affect the ocean or Great Lakes. And this is just one example of the incredible reach of this particular law or this particular executive order.

When you hear the words ''national ocean policy'' it sounds benign. But that's only a small part of the story. The scope and reach of this regulation is why we have the Chamber of Commerce, the American Farm Bureau, the home builders, the timber, mining and fisheries groups weighing in so heavily against this executive order. It affects our whole Nation and our whole economy. Again, if you think about it, it

means a drop of rain that falls on your property could be subject to this law.

Now, the last thing we need in Washington today is more bureaucracies. And you can see by this chart this executive order creates a huge new bureaucracy at a time when we're trying to grow our economy. This law, this policy, has been debated in the last four Congresses, and each time Congress elected to do nothing. So Congress explicitly does not intend for the oceans to be zoned in the manner that the President proposed to do it. Thus, Executive Order 13547 has no specific statutory authority, and there have been no congressional appropriations to pay for the cost of this new bureaucracy.

□ 1720

There are 63 agencies that are involved with this new policy. The last thing we need is more Federal bureaucracy trying to say that it's enacting a policy which doesn't cost anything. The last thing we need are more regulations from bodies like this in an already uncertain economic environment.

We also have a list of 83 groups that are in support of our proposed amendment. These groups include, as I said before, the American Farm Bureau, the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Home Builders, the offshore fishing industry, not only recreational but commercial, and the energy industries, including the renewable energy industries. We have letters of support for this as well.

There are significant concerns that remain related to the implementation of this executive order, its impact, the limit of its authority, and the lack of true stakeholder involvement. I urge Members to support this amendment in order to stop excessive regulation and to protect our ocean and affiliated inland economies.

The particular agency that is affected under CJS, more than any of the others, is the Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning Office, and that was specifically zeroed out in fiscal 2012. Yet this is the group. That red chart shows you that it's still actively involved in the process. Now, where they're getting the money, I don't know, but we have to assume it's from the taxpayer.

In closing, I am just asking that Congress do what Congress intended, which is not to have this activity.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PRICE of Georgia). The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Rather than attempt to restrict the President's efforts in this regard, I actually applaud the President's efforts. I was at the Coastal Zone Conference when the ocean policy, I think, was applauded by literally thousands of Americans from across the country when it was held in Chicago last year.

We as a Nation have more responsibility for the world's oceans than any other nation on the face of the Earth. There are documented challenges to the oceans' health that have been, I think, well-documented.

If you have a problem with the executive order, the problem is really not with the President of the United States; it's with the United States Congress. We have passed laws giving various responsibilities and duties to over 63 different agencies having to do with our stewardship of the oceans, and the only thing that exists in the executive order is the President's not taking any new action but to coordinate and supervise the implementation of the existing laws as passed by this Congress under the past four Presidents of the United States so that we can try to come to grips with the circumstances that afford such dire conditions in the oceans of the world.

So I applaud the President. I oppose this amendment that seeks to prohibit, essentially, the executive branch from the implementation of congressional laws that have been passed by the Congress. As to this idea that there is any kind of power grab in the executive order, I would invite Members to read it. It does not do anything other than move to more efficiently implement laws passed by our Congress.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

We have had several hearings on this executive order and on the potential impacts that this executive order would have far, far beyond ocean policy. The Natural Resources Committee also, obviously, has concerns about our environment. That's probably one of the reasons the committee was created many, many Congresses ago. But this step by this administration with this executive order goes far, far beyond what anybody would envision, and it is being done without going through the normal process.

In his remarks, the gentleman from Texas stated several organizations that are opposed to this executive order, and amongst those is the Farm Bureau. Now, when one thinks about the Farm Bureau, they are an organization that represents our diverse agriculture industry across the country, but you don't associate the Farm Bureau policies with the oceans or lakes. You associate them with crops that are grown on dry land or on irrigated land or whatever the case may be. With that being the case, why should the Farm Bureau be concerned about a policy dealing with ocean planning?

The reason is, obviously, in the fine print because, in the fine print of the executive order, it says that this ocean policy should look at a number of things, including ''by promoting and implementing sustainable practices on land.'' So, implementing practices on land, are those positive or negative?

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I will be happy to yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Let me just say that one of the problems we have is with runoff from agricultural lands that goes into the Chesapeake Bay, that goes into Puget Sound, that goes into the ocean, and that has to be dealt with in order to protect the oceans.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. In reclaiming my time, I would be more than happy to respond to my good friend in that regard.

Obviously, this is the concern because of that. They say then—and rightfully so—in their letter that was sent out to all Members of Congress:

> Thus, instead of being limited to oceans and coasts, the National Ocean Policy could extend to the regulation of every farm and ranch in the United States.

Now, I think they're right on that. But we do have statutes, by the way, that deal precisely with what my good friend from Washington brought up to me just a moment ago, and that is the Clean Water Act. That's what part of that is all about, is to deal with that. This is an executive order that gives potential authority far, far beyond those acts, and it's done by executive order. Now, there is a process to go through. Sometimes we can agree with that process or disagree, but at least let's go through that process with the Congress making the policy. That's what the issue is here with this executive order.

Finally, since my good friend from Washington brought this up, let me make this observation. Our State of Washington has an ocean policy. It was done by statute, and in it, it specifically says in that statute:

> The marine management plan, meaning the ocean policy, must be developed and implemented in a manner that recognizes and respects existing uses.

I think that's good policy. In fact, that's probably why so many Northwest fishing organizations are in support of the Flores amendment, but the policy that is driving this executive order is contrary to that. Let me take a direct quote—a direct quote—out of this policy driving this executive order:

> The task force is mindful that these recommendations may create a level of uncertainty and anxiety among those who rely on these resources.

''Resources'' meaning the land.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have to ask: Does this not sound suspiciously like, We have to pass the bill to find out what's in it? Does that sound somewhat familiar? So I think the gentleman from Texas is exactly right in that the way that we can exercise our prerogative and our authority is to deny funding.

By the way, speaking about funding, we had the Council on Economic Quality in front of our committee, and we asked particularly, Where is all this funding coming from? We've asked by letter. They have yet to respond. So they're taking parts of it here and there, and it's not showing up on anybody's budget at all.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. So what this attempts to do, by the gentleman from Texas with his amendment, is simply to say, okay, we're going to exercise our authority, and our authority is not to give any agency that contributes to this policy any funds. It's nothing more than that. So I urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I can't believe what we're hearing here. How quickly we forget.

It was your committee, Mr. Chairman, that passed the bill, the bipartisan bill, that created the Ocean Commission, which was signed into law by President Clinton, and then the appointees to that commission that were made by President Bush. Who was on that commission? The chair of it was Admiral Watkins—the former head of the Navy, the former Secretary of Energy, a great Republican, a great admiral who understood ocean policy.

□ 1730

Who else was on that commission? Oil and gas executives, fish processors, all kinds of people, because we set up a commission to look at these conflicts at sea. Why? Because, as was stated, America has more ocean water than any other country in the world because of the exclusive economic zone, which also applies to all the atolls and islands like Guam, Hawaii, and so on.

What was happening then? We were having all kinds of conflicts, conflicts between seismic boats that were going out to look for oil and gas, fishermen who had crab pots, stationary pots, buoys, everything that you could think of. And everybody came and said the only government that can resolve this is the United States Congress because these are all Federal agencies. They don't talk to each other and they don't have any coordination, but we need to resolve this.

So we appointed a commission, and they did their work and had hearings all over the United States and came back with their policies. Guess what we did like we do when we have commission work? We implemented those policies in a bill. I worked very hard on it, but I wasn't going to be the lead author on the bill because it was a Republican administration. So your colleague, Jim Saxton, authored that bill; your colleague, Congressman Gilchrest, authored that bill; your colleague, Mr. Jim Greenwood, authored that bill; your colleague, Mr. Curt Weldon, authored that bill.

These were Republican bills before your committee. And guess what? The chair at that time, Mr. Pombo, would not even hear their bills. Wouldn't hear them. Admiral Watkins came here and asked for a hearing on it. That policy has been lingering for over a decade, and all of the recommendations into that went to the administration. Guess what this administration did? They assembled every single agency of government, including DHS, the State Department, the Department of Defense. They were all in it because they all have issues.

We have an ambassador for fish, for example. It's in the State Department. All these things need to be discussed and resolved, and they came up with this ocean policy. This is to avoid conflicts. Everybody is satisfied by it. The Navy needs it. The military needs it for security purposes. You're nuts not to have it. To defund this because you say your committee hasn't heard it—which is just false, because your committee had that bill for not one session, two sessions, three sessions, about four sessions and never took it up and never dealt with the policy. It was all there.

For lack of congressional action, this is now done by executive order. Thank God it's done by executive order and those—those were all the people that were opposed because they said these things may happen. Well, my God, are we worried about maybe because they're in Idaho and think that potato farmers are going to be affected by ocean policy? Come on. That's a stretch.

I tell you, this amendment is not only not good, it goes backwards in being able to deal with the conflicts at sea and being able to do what the United States Government has to do, which is to lead the world on ocean policy, not take a second seat to it.

I urge a strong defeat.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. Certainly I will yield.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Here is the crux of the issue right here. The gentleman started his remarks by saying that the committee, which I had the privilege to chair, created the Ocean Commission. I was not on the committee at the time, but I acknowledge that. We did create that.

And this is the crux of the matter right here. One of the recommendations that came out of that committee was that the policies—it said: The Ocean Council should work with Congress and so on to develop a flexible and voluntary process for the creation of regional ocean councils. States working with relevant stakeholders should use this process to establish regional ocean councils. That is exactly the process we should be going through, but the process of the executive process is 180 degrees from that. So the legislation the gentleman is citing is being used is contrary to what he is trying to promote. That's the whole point of this amendment.

Mr. FARR. You're absolutely wrong.

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

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

Mr. FARR. Thank you very much.

As the President cannot create the councils by executive order, the councils have to be created by Congress. I would hope that the leadership of your committee and jurisdiction would create those councils so that they will have some bottoms-up authorities.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I just want to make this point. The gentleman makes the point of how maybe the process should work and the commission was created.

My objection—and I think the gentleman from Texas' objection—is this is being done by executive order. The way that the process is laid out totally ignores the recommendation that came out of that policy. That is the whole point.

Mr. FARR. Reclaiming my time, the responsible issue here is if you want to do that, let's have a congressional hearing, an oversight hearing on this ocean policy. I would be proud to defend it. But to take a meat-ax approach and whack it and say whatever it is, whatever it accomplishes, we're not going to allow it to be implemented I think is reckless and irresponsible.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, we have had five hearings on this, just to make a point.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, it is time for the Republicans to stop being afraid of commonsense initiatives like the National Ocean Policy. Why is that? Well, it's because the National Ocean Policy will reduce bureaucracy and streamline government operations.

Why would anyone be opposed to that? Could it be because Big Oil doesn't want anyone other than themselves to have a voice in how we're using our coastal resources? Is that what this is all about? Is this really just another drill-baby-drill issue where the oil industry has a policy, the oil industry has a voice? What we're trying to say here is that others should have a voice, too. They are America's oceans, not ExxonMobil's oceans.

So following a decade of discussion and shareholder engagement, President Obama established the National Ocean Policy in July of 2010. Creating such a policy was the cornerstone recommendation of President Bush's U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy. Now, following even more public engagement, we await the final National Ocean Policy implementation plan to come out this summer.

Now, the assertions that the policy will create new regulations, usurp State authority, restrict land use or zone the oceans, are patently false and misleading.

The National Ocean Policy will allow Federal agencies to better coordinate amongst themselves and with other levels of government and all stakeholders to eliminate red tape while managing effectively for multiple ocean uses.

Opposing ocean planning is like opposing air traffic control. You can do it, but it will cause a mess or lead to dire consequences. Our coastal counties make up only 18 percent of the country's land area, but are home to 108 million people, or 36 percent of our Nation's population. These numbers are steadily increasing.

There's a saying in Washington that if you're not at the table, you're on the menu. When it comes to our Nation's oceans, more and more guests are coming to dinner. Fishing grounds, shipping lanes, Navy training ranges, offshore energy production, wildlife habitats, and other uses are increasingly in competition, and the National Ocean Policy will help ensure that everyone has a seat at the table.

Instead of supporting a plan for our oceans, the Republican majority continues to pursue scare tactics, claiming that the policy creates additional regulation and kills American jobs. Yet, they have no evidence that that is the case.

Let's go to what this bill proposes to do. It proposes to slash $93 million from the NOAA budget, threatening the health, the safety, and the prosperity of Americans.

□ 1740

Specifically, the bill calls for a $5 million reduction to the NOAA Coastal Services Center, which helps the States, the localities, and individuals, as well as protects private property and valuable infrastructure by addressing the challenges associated with flooding, hurricanes, sea level rise and other coastal hazards.

Number two: this bill, the Republican bill, seeks to cut $32 million to the National Marine Fisheries Service, which has the difficult responsibility of managing fisheries to sustain our coastal communities and ocean ecosystems.

And they also want to cut $30 million, which would be cut from NOAA's Competitive Climate Research budget at a time when much of our country has been experiencing severe drought and other extreme weather. We need to study and understand these extreme weather events in order to protect lives and livelihoods. By sticking our heads in the sand and refusing to act, we do a disservice to the people we are elected to represent.

We know that the oceans are warming, and are warming dramatically because of climate change. Should we study that? We know that tornadoes are now ripping through the Midwest in February, not in April or May. Should we be studying that? We know that people now all across the country are becoming more fearful of these ever-intensifying climate conditions that are threatening the lives and the livelihoods of tens of millions of Americans. Should we be studying this? What do the Republicans say in their budget? No.

So I understand that some of them do not believe that this should be studied. I understand that they do not believe that the ordinary American is becoming increasingly concerned about this change in climate. But I tell you this, they are.

I urge a ''no'' vote against this Republican proposal.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

The implementation of the National Ocean Policy will help to protect, maintain, and restore our ocean, coastal, island, and Great Lakes ecosystems, which provide jobs, food, and recreation, and serves as a foundation for a substantial part of our Nation's economy. Only healthy, functioning, and resilient marine and freshwater ecosystems can support the fisheries which we depend on so heavily.

Across the continental United States, our coastal and ocean ecosystems are suffering from an outdated issue-by-issue approach to stewardship and management. We are already seeing the threats posed by ocean acidification, low dissolved oxygen, harmful algal blooms, and dead zones in the gulf, the Chesapeake, Puget Sound, and throughout our Nation's coastal waterways. The National Ocean Policy would help us better address the cumulative threats to our aquatic ecosystems from overfishing, coastal development, storm water run-off, carbon emissions, and other pollutants entering our waterways; and it will also help us balance the many overlapping ocean uses.

The core approach of the National Ocean Policy is to improve stewardship of our oceans, coasts, islands, and Great Lakes by directing government Agencies with differing mandates to coordinate and work better together. The National Ocean Policy creates no new authorities. The result of increased coordination will be better stewardship of our national heritage through improved government efficiency, better development and use of data and information and a process of open and transparent stakeholder engagement that informs decision-making. This increased coordination between Agencies is the sort of effort that needs to be taking place on a Federal level in order to reduce inefficiency, waste, and redundancy among Agencies.

The National Ocean Council brings together State, local, and tribal governments and all of the ocean's users—including recreational and commercial fishermen, boaters, industry, scientists, and the public—to better plan for, manage, harmonize, and sustain uses of ocean and coastal resources.

The virtue of the National Ocean Policy is that it develops and facilitates the planning process, deals with many overlapping ocean uses, and expedites the approval process of new uses being introduced. The National Ocean Policy offers an avenue for thoughtful planning and is the best choice for those stakeholders looking to be involved in the process or at least having some voice in the discussion.

While not required to participate, most States and regions see the benefit of marine planning as a way to leverage their interests and achieve desirable outcomes.

I would say to my friend from Texas, in the Pacific Ocean, there are debris fields the size of the State of Texas. Now, if you think we're taking care of our oceans, if we're taking care of our rivers and streams and lakes, you are, at best, ill-informed. We need a national effort, an international effort—to clean up the oceans and protect them. And what do we get from the Republicans? A non-science, nonfactual approach to this problem. It's disgusting, to say the least.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Members are admonished to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

The gentleman, when he made his remarks about all of the challenges that we face, if you heard, nobody is arguing on our side about that. Nobody is arguing about that. It is the structure of which we are talking about here. And, unfortunately, we have experienced painfully in this body and in this country when we have a structure of a top-down solution, it always seems to come out wrong. And that is what the issue is all about.

We have had five hearings, like I said, in my committee on this issue. But the way this is set up, it was designed to be voluntary, and it was designed to be in corroboration with the States. Our home State of Washington has responded to that. But the way this is written and the way it is interpreted, it is a top-down issue; and if we

let it continue going, we are going to have a problem, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. DICKS. Reclaiming my time just to briefly say to the gentleman, what we have been doing isn't working.

The oceans are in trouble. We have got acidification that affects our shellfish, and it's because of too much carbon dioxide going into the oceans. The oceans are warming. The world cannot survive without the oceans.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DICKS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DICKS. I will just say to my friend, there is a problem with fertilizer runoff from agricultural lands. We've got it in the Puget Sound. These are serious matters that have to be dealt with, and to look the other way is not a solution.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am aware of that. Clean water takes care of that, and that process is going through. Sometimes we agree. Sometimes we don't.

But just let me make an analogy that I think the gentleman would agree with. We had a long debate last night on catch shares, something entirely different. The gentleman was very much so defending—and I agree with him—the fact that there was regional planning. And catch shares works in our part of the country. That is all that we are saying. We think that is probably a better model.

This executive order is contrary to that. So my arguments here over and over have been the model, and that's why we should defund it and come back and do it correctly.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. DICKS. No more hearings. Let's have a bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARDNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let's make sure we all understand exactly what my amendment does. My amendment doesn't roll back any regulation that currently exists. My amendment doesn't strike any money for any Agency that is currently looking at how the ocean works. My amendment does nothing like that.

My amendment specifically says that if this process is going to be done, that it's going to start where the Constitution says it starts. It starts in the United States Congress.

Now, Mr. FARR talked a few minutes ago about how this was already an authorized activity. And to that extent, he introduced a bill in the 111th Congress, H.R. 21, on January 26, 2009. That has not become law. There has never been an appropriation that has been issued to support that.

On the other hand, here is what the executive order does do: it creates 10 new national policies, nine new national priority objectives, nine new strategic action plans, seven new national goals for coastal marine spatial planning, 12 new guiding principles for coastal marine spatial planning.

□ 1750

In addition, the agencies are advised to evaluate necessary and appropriate legislative solutions or changes to regulations to address the constraints. That, my friends, did not start in the United States Congress pursuant to the Constitution.

Now, it's been said this is not going to cause any additional regulation. It's been said this is not really ocean zoning. Well, let me give you an example of one of the things that is required to happen.

It requires the Department of Transportation to inventory and evaluate best management practices to address storm water runoff from the Federal highway system. In terms of where people say it's not zoning, it says:

CMSP allows for a comprehensive look at multiple sector demands, which would provide a more complete evaluation of cumulative effects. This ultimately is intended to result in protection of areas that are essential for the resiliency and maintenance of a healthy ecosystem, services, and biological diversity.

I've got no problems doing that as long as the Congress authorizes it and the Congress appropriates the money to do so. The Constitution doesn't say that the President is king and under the executive orders he can do whatever he wants to.

This action will identify and assess high-quality ocean and coastal waters and the waters that drain into them and establish or modify existing water quality monitoring protocols and programs.

That sounds like a regulation to me. That's government-speak for ''regulation.''

This executive order is an overreach. The cost of this executive order is being hidden. The National Ocean Council specifically asks agencies to tell us what this is going to cost, and the agencies have specifically refused to comply. The Natural Resources Committee in these hearings has specifically asked for the cost of this program, and we've specifically been ignored.

If these agencies are spending this money to implement this program, this executive order, where are they taking it from? What legislatively authorized activities are not being done and what appropriated dollars are being used from their appropriated function for something else? What's going on?

There are 83 interest groups in this country that are not the types that you would not like—it includes folks like the cattlemen and the farmers—that think this is an overreach and think this could damage our way of life. All we want is to have a clear and transparent and constitutional process for this to be carried out.

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

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

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

Mr. MORAN. I rise as well in very strong opposition to this amendment that prohibits funding for the National Ocean Policy. The purpose of this policy is to improve our Nation's ocean management effort, protect and create jobs, and grow our economy by ensuring all the multiple uses of the ocean are coordinated in a more seamless manner.

Far from a heavy-handed directive, as it's being described, the National Ocean Policy will actually streamline government programs and regulations. It will reduce bureaucratic red tape. And perhaps most importantly, it enlists local stakeholders in the decision-making process. And it shouldn't be a partisan issue.

The National Ocean Policy was a cornerstone recommendation of both the independent Pew Oceans Commission, which was chaired by current Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, and by the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, appointed by George W. Bush. Both commissions called for harmonizing the responsibilities of the 27 different Federal agencies with jurisdiction over some aspect of ocean management.

As my colleagues can imagine, the current arrangement has led to ineffective management of resources, inefficient use of taxpayer dollars, and increased conflicts among a growing number of ocean users. Strategic planning maximizes organizational efficiency and use of public resources.

The National Ocean Policy will improve opportunities for community and citizen participation in the planning process and facilitate sustainable economic growth by providing transparency and predictability for economic investments. It represents a science-based strategy to align conservation and restoration goals at the Federal, State, tribal, local, and regional levels, and it will strengthen the integration of Federal and non-Federal ocean observing systems and data management into one national system.

Of particular interest to me, the Chesapeake Bay—I know it is to Chairman WOLF as well—is poised to benefit from the National Ocean Policy action plan. It will help advance the bay's health, from increasing public school education about the Chesapeake Bay region to creating a mapping tool for the Chesapeake Bay watershed that allows stakeholders to share information and ideas for land protection and restoration.

It calls for the establishment of a National Shellfish Initiative, in partnership with commercial and restoration aquaculture communities, which includes pilot projects to explore the ecosystem benefits of shellfish aquaculture while increasing shellfish production in U.S. waters. That's so important for our economy. In fact, all oceans, coasts, and Great Lakes are critical components of our Nation's economy. U.S. coastal communities are home to more than half of all Americans. They generate an estimated $8 trillion a year and they support 69 million jobs.

Declining ocean health and a lack of effective coordination is putting this great economic engine at risk. Comprehensive planning will ensure the stability of the Nation's seaports as additional users of ocean space evolve, including the responsible development of offshore energy resources.

But we must make no mistake: This attempt to defund and delay the National Ocean Policy is a dangerous political move that puts the health of our oceans, coastal communities, jobs, and our fishing industry at risk. We need to protect, maintain, and to restore the health of our oceans and coasts. Continuing to develop the National Ocean Policy offers our Nation the best path forward.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided amendment and to do something that is very much needed for our economy, for our oceans and particularly for our coastal communities. Let's do the right thing. Let's get all these users organized and working together in pursuit of a streamlined consistent constructive policy. It's the right thing to do. This amendment is not. Let's defeat this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Again, this is a little bit different than the optimism in Chicago at the Coastal Zone Conference where the Ocean Policy just had such an enthusiastic response from constituencies all around the country and in other parts of the world.

The development of this is bipartisan: the Pew Foundation, headquartered in my home city of Philadelphia; the Lenfest Foundation, led by Gerry Lenfest, and their investments in studying the oceans. We've seen the work that has been done that's led to this.

I would hope that we would oppose this amendment and we would work to build a further consensus and hopefully have legislation come out of the Natural Resources Committee.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I hope that we vote this amendment down.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, I would like to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Thank you very much for yielding.

I think you can note the passion I've had on this issue because we worked at it a long time. And I want to assure you—I'm ranking member of the Ag Appropriations Committee. I probably represent more productive agriculture than anybody in Congress. I have just one county I represent that has 85 crops in it. We do about $4.2 billion of agriculture out of that county.

I can assure you that coastal States' agriculture is very much concerned about all of these issues that are coming up and really supports the ideas that we can have a coordinated effort. This is a long effort. We had the military involved in this. We've got FEMA involved in this. We've got the Department of Agriculture involved in this. We've got every other agency. And it's how you resolve conflicts that are there.

Yes, we in Congress have enacted an awful lot of laws. And I want to say there isn't anything the President has done or any of these agencies are doing that isn't authorized in law. We gave them those authorities. We just never required them to all sit down and talk about those conflicts and how to resolve those conflicts.

We have a huge responsibility here. This is a long effort to create a National Ocean Policy. It's the smart thing to do. It's got all the Federal agencies at the table, finally, and it's got all the user groups, both private and public.

□ 1800

So I just think that this is kind of a meat-ax approach. If you do have concerns, let's do it in the regular legislative order, not just say that we're going to eliminate that whole ability for them to resolve conflicts. You're going to end up with more lawsuits and a lot of concerns by people who are going to wonder what the future holds without a good, comprehensive plan.

So I again compassionately ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this amendment. It would be a very dangerous thing for this country to do, to adopt this amendment.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from California for their hard work on this issue, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

Mr. WOLF. 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. HASTINGS of Washington) having assumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5326) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON H.R. 4966, SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT ACT OF 2012

Mr. CHAFFETZ, from the Committee on the Budget, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112 469, Part 1) on the bill (H.R. 4966) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to replace the sequester established by the Budget Control Act of 2011, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON H.R. 5652, SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2012

Mr. CHAFFETZ, from the Committee on the Budget, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112 470) on the bill (H.R. 5652) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 643 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5326.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1803

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5326) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, with Mr. PRICE of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) had been postponed and the bill had been read through page 101, line 10.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will

now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. CHAFFETZ of Utah.

An amendment by Mr. TIERNEY of Massachusetts.

An amendment by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 38 by Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

An amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

An amendment by Mr. SCHWEIKERT of Arizona.

Amendment No. 46 by Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

The first amendment by Mr. FLORES of Texas.

The second amendment by Mr. FLORES of Texas.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes 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 381, noes 41, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

AYES—381

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Baca
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
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
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
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)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
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
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—41

Andrews
Becerra
Butterfield
Carson (IN)
Chu
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Dicks
Dingell
Edwards
Fudge
Hahn
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
Meeks
Moran
Pascrell
Rangel
Richardson
Rothman (NJ)
Schakowsky
Scott, David
Stark
Waters
Watt
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—9

Bachmann
Bachus
Costa
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Garamendi
Kucinich
Pelosi
Slaughter

□ 1829

Messrs. DAVIS of Illinois, ROTHMAN of New Jersey, BECERRA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HONDA and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Messrs. BRADY of Pennsylvania, COFFMAN of Colorado, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Messrs. ACKERMAN, RICHMOND, KEATING, ELLISON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. GONZALEZ and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 226, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded that remaining votes in this series will be 2-minute votes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TIERNEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 260, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 227]

AYES—160

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Camp
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Chandler
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crawford
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
Dent
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Ellison
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gowdy

Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harris
Hayworth
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pence
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Richardson
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Visclosky
Walden
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—260

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Barletta
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
DeLauro
Denham
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Himes
Hinchey
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
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
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann
Bachus
Cleaver
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Garamendi
Kucinich
Miller (FL)
Pelosi
Slaughter
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1832

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 227, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chair, due to being unavoidably detained, I missed the following rollcall vote: No. 227 on May 9, 2012. If present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 194, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 228]

AYES—229

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
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
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Scalise
Schilling
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
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 (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—194

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee

Kind
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
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
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Bachmann
Bachus
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Kucinich
McCaul
Schmidt
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1836

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 228, I made an error voting. It was my intention to vote ''aye'' on the Blackburn Amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 228, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 192, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 229]

AYES—232

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

NOES—192

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)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—7

Bachmann
Bachus
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Kucinich
Schmidt
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1840

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 229, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 185, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 230]

AYES—238

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei

Austria
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
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
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
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 (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—185

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
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
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
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
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
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
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Bachmann
Bachus
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Kucinich
Schmidt
Slaughter
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1844

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 230, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 190, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

AYES—232

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

NOES—190

Ackerman
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
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
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah

Forbes
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
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
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
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
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Bachmann
Bachus
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Kucinich
Miller (NC)
Schmidt
Slaughter
Welch

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1847

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 231, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. WEBSTER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 190, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 232]

AYES—232

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
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)
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
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
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—190

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
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
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
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
McHenry
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Bachmann
Bachus
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Kucinich
Olver
Schmidt
Slaughter
Welch

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1850

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 232, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 250, noes 173, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

AYES—250

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash

Amodei
Austria
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Doyle
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
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—173

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
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
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Bachmann
Bachus
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Kucinich
Schmidt
Slaughter
Welch

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1854

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 233, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 174, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 234]

AYES—246

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

NOES—174

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
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
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch

Dicks	Larsen (WA)	Richardson
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Richmond
Doggett	LaTourette	Rothman (NJ)
Dold	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Doyle	Levin	Ruppersberger
Edwards	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Ellison	Lipinski	Ryan (OH)
Engel	Loebsack	Sánchez, Linda T.
Eshoo	Lofgren, Zoe	
Farr	Lowey	Sanchez, Loretta
Fattah	Luján	Sarbanes
Fitzpatrick	Lynch	Schakowsky
Frank (MA)	Maloney	Schiff
Fudge	Markey	Schrader
Garamendi	Matsui	Schwartz
Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)	Scott (VA)
Grijalva	McCollum	Scott, David
Gutierrez	McDermott	Serrano
Hahn	McGovern	Sewell
Hanabusa	McIntyre	Sherman
Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Sires
Hayworth	Meeks	Smith (WA)
Heinrich	Michaud	Speier
Higgins	Miller (NC)	Stark
Himes	Miller, George	Stearns
Hinchey	Moore	Sutton
Hinojosa	Moran	Thompson (CA)
Hirono	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (MS)
Holt	Nadler	Tierney
Honda	Neal	Tonko
Hoyer	Olver	Towns
Israel	Pallone	Tsongas
Jackson (IL)	Pascrell	Van Hollen
Jackson Lee (TX)	Pastor (AZ)	Velázquez
	Pelosi	Visclosky
Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter	Walz (MN)
Johnson, E. B.	Peters	Wasserman Schultz
Jones	Pingree (ME)	
Kaptur	Polis	Waters
Keating	Price (NC)	Watt
Kildee	Quigley	Waxman
Kind	Rangel	Woolsey
Langevin	Reyes	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann	Filner	Slaughter
Bachus	Kucinich	Welch
Bishop (UT)	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Donnelly (IN)	Schmidt	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1857

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 234, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

□ 1900

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POLIS. I rise today for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy about the importance of computer science in a balanced program of science, technology, education, and math. I thank the chairman for including extensive language in the committee report on STEM education, but I would like to highlight today some specific needs in the critical area of computer science.

More than 1.5 million high-wage computing jobs will be created by 2018—the largest growth area across science, technology, engineering, and math. Yet few computer science classes are available to students; and when they're offered, they're typically only electives. Many States don't have proper teacher certification programs for K 12 computer science and don't clearly connect the certification to content. In recent years, the number of computer science bachelor degrees in the U.S. actually fell from 60,000 to 38,000, even as computer science breakthroughs are transforming our economy.

I have legislation—the Computer Science Education Act—that focuses on this issue, but there are other steps as well. First, I believe it's important that Federal STEM education programs explicitly incorporate the broad definition of science, technology, engineering, and math reported by the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology. This definition helps make sure that STEM is sufficiently interpreted and not too narrowly to cover just math. Second, to ensure that there's a comprehensive pipeline for science from K 12 all the way through to the workforce, it's essential that NSF and other Agencies identify our Nation's highest STEM-related workforce needs and use that information to prioritize STEM-related subjects in our schools.

I very much look forward to working with the chairman to address these issues as this bill continues to move forward through the appropriations process. I'm grateful to the chair for this conversation and his perspectives on all these critical issues, and I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for his comments and for his active support of STEM education in all forms. We'll be happy to work with the gentleman as we move forward to ensure that NSF and other Agencies in this bill are getting the most appropriate direction on STEM education needs and priorities.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of a colloquy with the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity to discuss one of my top priorities with you today: NOAA's Comprehensive Large-Data Array Stewardship program, otherwise known as CLASS. This program has been funded at the same base level of $6.5 million for each of the past 10 years, despite an increase in their mission.

This is NOAA's enterprise system for handling all of its environmental data critical for weather predictions. Simply put, CLASS therefore must rely on programs within the satellite program to overcome their $24 million funding shortfall. We should be creating certainty, Mr. Chairman, for the NOAA CLASS program, instead of expecting them to rely on these other satellite programs to transfer funds for their own budget to CLASS.

Under last year's budget, CLASS fell short of the necessary funding to sustain core mission values. Mission failure of CLASS will continue if we don't provide CLASS with funding certainty this year and not depend on transfers from other satellite programs.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Appropriations Committee consider the importance of the CLASS mission in conference, and encourage the chairman to adequately fund their mission—a mission defined as a level of funding equal to last year and no job losses.

Mr. WOLF. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WOLF. I want to thank the gentleman for speaking on this issue. Funding the weather satellites is a very high priority in this bill, as well as the data systems used to store and process data from the satellites. We will work with you and also our other colleagues in the body to ensure that the CLASS program is adequately funded.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I look forward to working with you on this matter.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANDRY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement a proposed rule for turtle excluder devices as described in the Southeast Fishery Bulletin published by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration on May 8, 2012.

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

Mr. LANDRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

NOAA and the fishing industry have had a long history of working together. Since the 1990s, NOAA has worked with the fishing industry to develop a regulatory system that provides meaningful protection to turtles, while at the same time not economically harming our fishermen. Under the system, fishermen had agreed that they would periodically remove their nets from the water, allowing any turtles trapped in the net to escape. By offering to do so, they would not have to use the turtle exclusion devices.

Now NOAA intends to regulate these shrimpers and force them to use TEDs. The recent rulemaking negates this partnership and places the whims of environmentalists ahead of the scientific data or economic well-being of the fishermen in the coastal communities. There is no scientific data that's proving that the lack of the use of TEDs by shrimpers is causing any additional deaths in the turtle population.

□ 1910

Over 60 percent of the shrimp landed in Louisiana is by the inshore and near-shore fleet, which is primarily

skimmers and butterflies. This regulation, if implemented, will affect thousands of fishermen in Louisiana. Fishermen will lose money due to the cost of TEDs equipment and also the money lost from loss of catch.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment. Turtle-excluder devices are already required in other shrimp trawl fisheries in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic to reduce sea turtle bycatch.

In many cases, fishermen have reported actually preferring the use of TEDs in their trawl nets because when they are used properly, TEDs allow up to 98 percent of turtles to escape from trawl nets while retaining up to 97 percent of target shrimp catch. TEDs also provide other economic benefits to fishermen. Again, when installed properly, they can prevent other species bycatch and unwanted marine debris from entering the trawl nets, thereby increasing shrimp catch efficiency and the quality of their shrimp catch.

TEDs can also cut down on unwanted debris which can damage and increase the drag in fishing nets, causing fishermen to incur other costs. At this stage, NMFS is merely proposing this rule and will provide ample opportunity for public comment, including public meetings before any final regulation is in place; and, therefore, I urge defeat of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. GARDNER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce who uses amounts in the Fisheries Enforcement Asset Forfeiture Fund of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration that consists of the sums described in section 311(e)(1) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1861(e)(1)) for any purpose other than a purpose specifically authorized under such section.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee, as well, for his work and leadership on this bill today and yesterday. We voted long into the morning this morning, and certainly appreciate his time and consideration.

The appropriations bills before us present an opportunity to provide oversight that is one of the most important duties and functions of this Congress, to make sure that we are looking at the ways our Federal Agencies, our administration is spending money and making sure that it is carried out properly.

One of the areas where I believe this Congress needs to further its oversight and step up its oversight concerns the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's asset forfeiture fund. This is money that is comprised of fines paid by individuals who violate the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. The act, as many Members know, is the primary law governing fish management in our Federal waters, and it is responsible for managing fisheries, promoting conservation, producing bycatch, and ending overfishing.

The money in NOAA's asset forfeiture fund can only be used for express purposes that are laid out in statute, such as paying costs associated with providing any temporary storage of property seized during civil or criminal proceedings, paying off valid liens or mortgages against forfeited property, or reimbursing any Agency that assisted NOAA in enforcing the law.

Unfortunately, what we have seen is a pattern of unaccountability, a pattern of abuse of this money, including a purchase of a $300,000 yacht that was used for personal use by certain officials within NOAA.

This amendment simply says that the law, the money in the asset forfeiture fund should only be used for those express purposes as defined in statute, making sure that these abuses do not continue and making sure that this Congress steps up its role in oversight when it comes to funds of the United States.

With that, I ask for a ''yes'' vote on the amendment to make sure that we are accountable for the funds from the taxpayer, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 542. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles, for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum-Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

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

Mr. ENGEL. On May 24, 2011, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance which requires all new light-duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternate-fuel vehicles, such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel, by December 31, 2015.

My amendment echoes the Presidential memorandum by prohibiting funds in the Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill from being used to lease or purchase new light-duty vehicles except in accord with the President's memorandum.

Last year, I introduced similar amendments to four different appropriations bills—Agriculture, Defense, Energy, and Homeland Security. All were accepted and passed by voice vote.

Our transportation sector is by far the biggest reason we send $60 billion per year to hostile nations to pay for oil at ever-increasing costs. But America doesn't need to be dependent on foreign sources of oil for transportation fuel. Alternative technologies exist today that when implemented broadly will allow any alternative fuel to be used in America's automotive fleet.

The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light-duty vehicles in America. According to GSA, there are over 660,000 vehicles in the Federal fleet, with over 41,000 being used by the Department of Justice and another 2,400 with the Department of Commerce.

By supporting a diverse array of vehicle technologies in our Federal fleet, we will encourage development of domestic energy resources—including biomass, natural gas, agricultural waste, hydrogen, and renewable electricity.

Expanding the role these energy sources play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage over Americans held by foreign government-controlled oil companies and will increase our Nation's domestic security and protect consumers from price spikes and shortages in the world oil markets. So I ask that you support the Engel amendment.

On a similar note, I have worked with my colleagues JOHN SHIMKUS, ROSCOE BARTLETT, and STEVE ISRAEL to introduce the bipartisan Open Fuel Standard Act, H.R. 1687. I have particularly worked with Congressman SHIMKUS on this bill in this Congress. Our bill would require 50 percent of new automobiles in 2014, 80 percent in 2016, and 95 percent in 2017 to be warranted

to operate on nonpetroleum fuels in addition to or instead of petroleum-based fuels.

Compliance possibilities include the full array of existing technologies—including flex fuel, natural gas, hydrogen, biodiesel, plug-in electric drive, and fuel cell—and a catchall for all new technologies.

In conclusion, I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment and the open fuel standard as we work toward breaking our dependence on foreign oil.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. WOLF. I think this amendment has been adopted on other bills. We accepted the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALSH OF ILLINOIS

Mr. WALSH of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program under the heading ''Department of Justice—State and Local Law Enforcement Activities—Office of Justice Programs—State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance'' may be used in contravention of section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373).

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

□ 1920

Mr. WALSH of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, immigration enforcement—whether issuing or revoking a visa, deportation, and even providing citizenship—is a Federal responsibility and should remain so. However, our law enforcement in cities and States is sometimes the first line of defense in these Federal courts.

In 1996, almost 20 years ago, Congress passed the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act. This bill not only required localities to communicate with Federal agencies when legal and illegal aliens may have been picked up for crimes but also provided money to help them do so. Since then, additional programs such as the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program and Secure Communities have been implemented to ensure further that localities have the resources they need to meet their responsibilities.

The Federal Government has stated time and again that participation in these programs is not optional. Yet despite that, some cities and even whole States blatantly ignore Federal requirements. What is even worse is that these sanctuary cities still receive money for their so-called ''immigration efforts'' under the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program. In fact, one city received $1.1 million at the same time it designated itself as a city and county of refuge. And one State has even passed laws that prohibit law enforcement agencies from detecting or apprehending those in violation of U.S. immigration laws.

For this reason today, I am offering an amendment that would prohibit the Department of Justice from providing funds to these sanctuary cities for immigration enforcement efforts. This is a smart amendment that will require America's local law enforcement officers to do just that—enforce the laws we pass to receive the money we provide them to do so. I urge the House to vote in its favor.

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

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

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, which provides that none of the funds in the SCAAP program can be used in contravention of existing law.

This amendment is like several others we've considered today that simply say either the obvious, which is, Federal funds can't be used in violation of Federal law, in which case the amendment is unnecessary and accomplishes nothing; or, the amendment seeks to go beyond existing law and set new policy, in which case the policy that it would set is one that is disadvantageous to States and local law enforcement.

State and local community safety policies prioritize budgetary and law enforcement resources according to community needs while still permitting Federal immigration enforcement to take place. In many cases, such local laws support community safety by encouraging citizens who are crime victims or witnesses to come forward and work with police regardless of their immigration status.

These local policies don't interfere with Federal enforcement. In fact, a 2007 Justice Department audit of such laws found that in each instance where cities were so-called ''sanctuary cities,'' the local policy either didn't preclude cooperation with ICE, or else included a policy to the effect that those agencies and officers must assist ICE or share information with ICE as required by Federal law. That year, DHS Secretary Michael Chertoff testified before Congress:

I'm not aware of any city, although I may be wrong, that actually interferes with our ability to enforce the law.

The amendment, if it went beyond the mere statement that you can't spend Federal funds in contravention of Federal law, might deny funding to already cash-strapped police departments.

For these reasons, we urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of Justice may be used, with respect to the States of Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington, to prevent such States from implementing their own State laws that authorize the use, distribution, possession, or cultivation of medical marijuana.

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today, along with Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. FARR, in support of a commonsense amendment that would prohibit the Department of Justice from using funds to prevent States from implementing their own State laws that authorize the use, distribution, possession, or cultivation of medical marijuana. This amendment would take a step in the right direction of respecting States' rights and individual liberties, and it would help the Federal Government prioritize its very scarce resources and show compassion for those thousands of ailing patients across our country.

To date, 17 States, including the District of Columbia, have passed laws allowing for the medical use of marijuana, and the list continues to grow. Connecticut is in the process of passing a similar law as well. Many of these State laws, including in my own home State of California, have passed these statutes through the initiative process—meaning that a majority of California voters specifically decided that sick individuals ought to have the right to use this herb for medical purposes. Why the Federal Government continues its hard-line prohibition, then, is completely beyond me.

As far as the medical marijuana is concerned, individuals ought to have a right and ought to be able to act in accordance with their respective State laws without the Federal Government coming in and interfering. Neither should the Federal Government threaten to prosecute State employees who are carrying out the implementation of their State laws. Indeed, the Founding Fathers wanted criminal law to be the domain of local and State government. Unfortunately, however, this is not the approach that recent administrations

have taken, including the current administration. For example, the Governor of Washington State received a letter from the Department of Justice and was warned that:

State employees who conducted activities mandated by the Washington legislative proposals would not be immune from liability under the CSA.

Additionally, the DEA has conducted numerous raids on medical marijuana dispensaries that are in full compliance with State law. Businesspeople and cooperatives who are licensed and certified within these States to function as legitimate medical marijuana dispensaries have seen their businesses locked down, assets frozen, businesses driven away, and in some cases the victims of a SWAT squad coming into their operation. It is simply outrageous that we are spending scarce Federal dollars to interfere with the medical needs of individuals, especially when it's been recommended by a physician and approved by the voters of a State.

Importantly, this amendment does nothing to prevent the Federal Government from being able to go after drug traffickers. In fact, it makes it easier because it prioritizes and gives those people a chance to go after drug traffickers rather than sick people.

Under this amendment, the DEA would still have the power to arrest anyone selling marijuana for recreational use or engaging in any activity that is not expressly allowed under State law. But they will have more time to go after the drug traffickers if they are not going after people who are providing medical marijuana to people who are sick.

□ 1930

It is time that we respect States' rights, get serious about prioritizing our Federal Government's activities, and show some common sense and compassion when dealing with the sick among us.

I urge all Members to vote ''yes'' for the Rohrabacher-Hinchey-McClintock-Farr amendment to prevent the Department of Justice from continuing to engage in activities that it has no business engaging in.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. What does this amendment say if a young person, 15, at a high school in whatever State is watching the House at 7:30, and they say the United States Congress is ready to make it easy to get marijuana, and their mom or dad—what is going on?

This amendment hurts law enforcement. Our law enforcement people are jeopardizing their lives.

Marijuana is one of the most widely abused drugs in the United States. According to the DEA, more young people are now in treatment for marijuana dependency than for alcohol or all other illegal drugs combined.

This amendment does not address the problem of marijuana abuse and possibly makes it worse by sending a message to young people that there can be health benefits.

The Drug Enforcement Administration, DEA, describes marijuana as ''the top revenue generator for Mexican drug trafficking organizations, a cash crop that finances corruption and the carnage of violence year after year.''

All you have to do is look at the news. That's why we put money back in here for the National Gang Intelligence unit to keep the Mexican gangs from coming into the United States. The Mexican gangs are being funded and they have a marijuana operation.

I don't understand. I mean, I respect that maybe for medical use at a time. And I will tell you, the first time this issue came up, I voted for it, but it was on a narrow basis. But this is wide open.

And then you're going to tell your 15-year-old or 16-year-old don't use drugs. Well, we've got the marijuana center downtown, and everybody's going in.

The FDA has stated that ''smoked cannabis has no acceptable medical use and treatment in the United States.''

I could go on, but I think that the message that this amendment would send to young people is that Congress wants to aid and abet, if you will. And we all know. We've watched ''60 Minutes.'' We've watched all these shows.

If somebody purely, really—my mom died of cancer. So many people in my family died of cancer. It's so narrow. But this is just wide open. And we've seen it where they're coming in and they're pouring over. In essence, I think this would be bad for the country.

In our hearings, we heard that more young people are dying from overdose of drugs. Then marijuana, then do we go into heroin, and then we go into OxyContin. You just saw today's Washington Post where some of the drug companies were promoting these pain operations which are basically moving and pushing OxyContin, hiring some really prominent lawyers in this town to represent them.

This would not be a good amendment for the country; it would be a bad amendment for the young people, and I urge defeat of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HINCHEY. I rise today in strong support of this amendment, and I thank, particularly, my friend from California for offering it with me and for what he said about it just a few minutes ago very clearly.

This amendment is very simple. It directs the Federal Government to respect the laws enacted by States that have legalized marijuana for medical use.

The Constitution of the United States is very clear. It authorizes States' rights in every other area that is not specifically designated to the Federal Government. Currently, 16 States and the District of Columbia have legalized medical marijuana, benefiting over 730,000 patients nationwide. In addition, the State of Connecticut will soon sign a similar bill into law.

President Obama has made it clear that the Justice Department should not prioritize medical marijuana arrests, especially when there are so many other more significant issues that need attention. Unfortunately, some in the DEA clearly didn't get the memo. That's why we're here today.

According to Americans for Safe Access, since October 2009, the Justice Department has carried out an estimated 170 raids of medical marijuana dispensaries and cultivation centers in nine States that have legalized medical marijuana. Without a doubt, these raids are clearly a waste of taxpayer dollars, but they are also fundamentally wrong.

Medical marijuana is proven to reduce pain and increase quality of life for patients suffering from debilitating diseases, including cancer, multiple sclerosis, and HIV/AIDS. Medical marijuana is a safe and effective treatment for many of the symptoms that accompany these diseases. However, the DEA wants to deny patients medicine that can dramatically improve their lives or reduce their suffering. This is wrong, and it needs to stop.

This amendment does not do anything to advocate any violations of the law. It just says those States that have approved medical marijuana ought to be able to determine how to take care of their own people effectively.

This amendment does not affect States that have not approved medical marijuana. It does not require or encourage other States to adopt medical marijuana laws.

This amendment does not stop law enforcement officials from prosecuting the illegal use of marijuana.

This amendment does not encourage drug use in children. Studies actually suggest that teen use of marijuana has declined in States that have passed medical marijuana laws. That, in and of itself, is very interesting and important.

The purpose of this amendment is to allow these 16 States to give relief to people suffering from horrific diseases without fearing Federal intervention or prosecution.

I urge Members to support this amendment and support States' rights and compassion. Doctors in these 16 States know what is best for their patients. The DEA should not stand in the way of these doctors and their patients.

All of this is serious for the health and safety of many, many people in these 16 States. And, in fact, other States are coming into this as well. This is something that really needs to be enacted because it is safe and secure and reasonable.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rohrabacher-Hinchey-Farr and now McClintock amendment.

It is obvious from the votes that we've been casting here, yesterday and tonight, this afternoon, that this body insists on protecting the rights of States to define marriage. This body insists on protecting the rights of States to set abortion policies. This body insists on protecting rights of the States to determine education curricula and standards. Just yesterday this body decided that certain States get to enforce Federal immigration laws however they see fit.

But when it comes to protecting the rights of States to set medical scope of practice laws, this body balks. All of a sudden States no longer have the right to determine what is best for their citizens and when those rights include medical marijuana.

The Rohrabacher-Hinchey-Farr-McClintock amendment doesn't change Federal law. It doesn't change drug policy. However, it does protect States' rights.

□ 1940

For those of you who come from States that do not have medical marijuana laws, nothing in this amendment will impact your States. Everything in your States remains exactly status quo. For those of you who come from States that do have medical marijuana laws, which means the States of Alaska, Arizona, California, which is my own State—it's interesting what we have done in California. We've decriminalized the possession of medical marijuana. It's an infraction, not a felony. We've also legalized the use of marijuana for medical purposes, but the voters at the same time have turned down an intensive legalization use. So it's very controlled. The laws are tight and they are enforced.

The other States that have passed laws are Colorado, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington. For your States, very little in this amendment will impact your States except that you will now have a State that will be able to implement the laws without fear of retribution or of retaliation from the Federal Government. I will also note that, in addition to the 16 States I've just mentioned, the State of Connecticut just passed a medical marijuana bill last week, and the Governor said he'll sign it. So, to the list of 16 States, we soon have added No. 17, the State of Connecticut.

If States' rights are not a good enough reason to pass this amendment, then do it because of compassion. Compassion demands it. We offer this amendment for terminal cancer patients, for AIDS victims, for persons who suffer with chronic pain. We offer this amendment not only to protect those people, but we offer this amendment to protect the States that are progressive enough to provide alternative medical options to those who need it. I urge all of my colleagues to support the Rohrabacher-Hinchey-Farr amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I want to share a slightly different perspective on it.

I served as an assistant U.S. attorney in Los Angeles for 6 years. In 1987, when I started in the office, the office had a guideline where we wouldn't take a case for prosecution involving less than a kilo of cocaine. Now, that didn't mean that it didn't get prosecuted. It did mean that it was referred to the district attorney's office, but we just didn't have the resources to go after every cocaine case involving less than a kilogram. A couple of years later into my tenure in that office, we had to raise the guideline to 5 kilograms because we had so many 1 kilogram cases, and we couldn't even handle those prosecutions.

I don't know what the policy is now, whether it's 10 kilograms or 20 kilograms, but the reality is we have very finite resources within the Justice Department to prosecute drug cases. Then, of course, the funds for drug prosecutions have to compete with the funds for terrorism cases and carjacking cases and bank robberies and T-Chek thefts or whatnot. We are in a limited resource world, and I don't think it's a good use of our Federal law enforcement resources to be prosecuting medical marijuana cases in States that have legalized medical marijuana. On the priority list of Federal law enforcement priorities, that ought to be near the very bottom.

At a time when we can't even keep up with the more serious narcotics cases and when we have so many other unmet needs in the Justice Department, this is not where we should be putting our resources, and I urge support for the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate and thank the sponsors of this amendment for introducing it. The amendment begins to break down the taboo in American politics about discussing drug policy intelligently. It also begins to, hopefully, result in the Federal Government having a more humane and human policy on medical marijuana.

I heard the gentleman from Virginia say that the DEA says there is no medical use for marijuana. That's true that they've said it. The DEA has no credibility with people who have looked at this—on this subject, on most subjects with respect to drugs these days. One reason there is no proof of the successful medical use of marijuana is that the DEA systematically tries to make sure there is no adequate research on that, and it denies the use of supplies of marijuana for medical research.

But we have ample proof from the 16 States which have legalized the medical use of marijuana. We have ample anecdotal proof. We know that, for people suffering pain, for people suffering nausea from AIDS and cancer, marijuana is the only thing that produces relief and enables them to eat and to get sustenance and to regain weight and to, perhaps, regain health. We know this. We know this from thousands of cases. The DEA doesn't know it because it refuses to see it and refuses to allow systematic research. That's wrong. It's inhumane.

Now, I wish this amendment didn't specify the 16 States because maybe a 17th and an 18th will come along this year. I hope that they will. Certainly, the Federal Government has a better use for its resources than in trying to prevent the policy that 16 States have adopted, the humane policy of allowing the medical use of something that has been proven to be medically useful in many cases. Doctors and other medical professionals ought to determine treatment, not bureaucrats in Washington.

So I support this amendment, and I hope that maybe, if it passes, and maybe if we have a rational policy with regard to medical marijuana, that two other things will happen: that maybe the DEA will get its head out of the sand and will permit proper research so we'll get better research and better results; and maybe we'll begin a discussion of our general drug policy toward marijuana, which is certainly a much, much more benign drug than alcohol, which is legal, than tobacco, which is legal. We have a very irrational policy toward it, a policy which reminds one of the policy of the 1920s, which had such deleterious effects with regard to alcohol and alcohol use.

So I congratulate the sponsor of this amendment for having the courage to help break the taboos concerning this subject and for introducing an amendment that, if it passes, will result in many, many thousands of people being more healthful and more comfortable, and it will be a great thing for this country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. COHEN. There have been quite a few good arguments made—excellent arguments—as to why this amendment should pass. Justice Louis Brandeis is

one of my favorite Justices. He said the laboratories of democracy are the States. Indeed, 16 States, mostly through, if not entirely through, referenda determined that they wanted to try to find out whether medical marijuana laws worked.

The Federal Government should not be infringing on what the States have determined and their citizens have determined in the most direct form of democracy that this Nation knows—State referenda. The Federal Government has been using its resources, which could be used in better ways, to police the jurisdictions that have voted it in. That's what this amendment does. It says there will not be any additional spending of Federal moneys to try to thwart the will of the people of the States on issues on which they have voted.

This is the most basic democracy that we could be talking about. You talk about the Founding Fathers. This is the people who give us power. They have voted in their States to make it the law, and the Federal Government has taken its heavy hand and has tried to come in there—and has come in there—to prosecute individuals. It's for the States to prosecute those individuals if they want.

As the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) has pointed out, Federal priorities have to be made to meet the resources available. The moneys that they're spending now in these States could be spent on border traffic and could be spent on policing against heroin and cocaine, which cause people, when they get hooked, to commit violent crimes in order to get their money to buy their drugs. That has never been known to be the case with marijuana, and it is not the case with marijuana. That's where our priorities for law enforcement should go and prosecution should go is to crack and cocaine and heroin, and they're not being used there.

So this is a commonsense, basic, democratic proposal to tell our Federal Government that has gone astray to not use its resources against the people of this country who have made this determination.

Now, as far as some of the other statements that have been made, I think the public who listens knows that this is not about legalization, that this is not about 14-year-olds or 15-year-olds or 18-year-olds.

□ 1950

It's about States, democracy, doctors, and people who have cancer, glaucoma, AIDS, MS, whatever. Montel Williams has testified how it has helped him with his illness. I had a Navy SEAL friend who died of cancer. There is no question but that marijuana, which he smoked, helped him with his appetite when he wasn't eating, and his pancreatic cancer took him from 215 pounds to 115 pounds. His grandmother said it's the only thing that makes Orel laugh, and it's the only thing that makes Orel eat. And when he was dying, I wanted my friend to have whatever he could have to make his illness less damaging to him and less difficult to deal with.

So I rise here and assure people that it won't affect your States; it will just be those States where it's been voted in. It will save resources and be able to give our government the proper direction, the usage of resources to protect us against heroin, crack, and cocaine.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Actually, Mr. Chairman, if I could, I would strike many of the words we've heard today.

I first want to acknowledge the leadership of my colleague from California. He has a characteristic that is all too rare in politics, an intellectual consistency. We have people on the one hand that talk about freedom of the individual, liberty, and respect for States' rights, but when it comes up against some pet project of theirs, all that goes out the window.

Let's be very clear. This is not a case of people advocating that other people smoke marijuana. It is for me an advocacy that we allow people some degree of free choice. I listened to the gentleman from Virginia, and I admire his diligence. But I have to say, I disagreed with almost everything he said. There was one thing he said that I thought was appropriate. He said we shouldn't be debating this at 7:30. I agree. We should have been debating it at 4:20. That would have been a much better time. But other than that, he says, What about 15-year-olds, they'll see marijuana centers.

Well, they'll see liquor stores. They'll see many more liquor stores than marijuana centers. The notion that because something is inappropriate for a teenager or a child, adults should not be allowed to use it, is mindlessness. You can't run a society that says we're not going to let a 15-year-old see the things a 15-year-old can't do. Liquor stores would be a great example.

I have been disappointed on this point with the Obama administration. The Clinton administration was quite sensible on this. The Bush administration slipped back, and I had hoped that with the Obama administration it would be more sensible.

The gentleman from Virginia said, Well, this is a great source of money for the Mexicans. Sure, because we won't let people grow it in America. To the extent that people are buying medical marijuana from Mexican drug cartels, I think, is a somewhat overdone thing with regard to this. That's because we have had people refusing to allow them to grow it here in America for that use.

People say—again, I'm surprised by some of my conservative friends—there is no medical value. The Federal Government now becomes the arbiter and tells the States you may not make that judgment that there is medical value. We know an awful lot of people think it has medical value for them.

As to addiction and the notion that if you get all these drugs together, what marijuana has in common with Oxycontin—which the gentleman from Virginia mentioned—and other drugs is that we treat them the same. They are not the same in any rational way. They're not the same in addictive prospects. They're not the same except we treat them the same. And we're the ones that by this foolish policy—that I regret the administration I supported is engaging in—give people the notion that they're the same thing. It's a very simple point.

People in the States have voted that marijuana should be available for people who want to use it for medicinal purposes, and the States are then in charge of setting up ways to deal with it. We have people out of their ideological opposition announcing that they will not be allowed to do that, that they will tell people it has no medical use despite the testimony of so many who think it does. This again is a form that I thought we learned didn't work, and it's prohibition of the worst sort. And by the way, it is going to lead to very ineffective law enforcement because we are a free country. You cannot impose, in a free society like ours, a regime of law enforcement that the public rejects without a great deal of repression. State by State by State, the people of the States have voted to allow this. So when we send the Federal agents in to disregard what the State did, to disregard State law, of course you're going to engender resistance; of course you're going to engender people going around. And I would just close by saying after listening to this debate, I think tonight C SPAN has merged with Turner Classic Movies because ''Reefer Madness,'' that great movie from the thirties, appears to be being shown on both channels.

This notion that because 15-year-olds are watching us talk about how people who are ill and in pain should be allowed with the vote of the State to get marijuana prescribed by a doctor, and that's going to lead a 15-year-old to go out and do it, makes no logical sense. As I said, if you're worried about what 15-year-olds can see, they can see X-rated movies that are being advertised; they can see cigarettes being sold widely; they can see alcohol. They can see all manner of things that we don't want them to do.

This is a very sensible amendment. No one has shown, let me say finally—and you know the DEA, they want to do this. I have not seen the evidence that says that medical marijuana has led to any problem. I haven't seen it linked to crime. I haven't seen it linked to anything negative. What we have, frankly, are some prejudices being used to interfere with people's rights.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan amendment. I want to thank Mr. ROHRABACHER and all of the cosponsors of this amendment for their leadership and for bringing this amendment forward.

This amendment would prohibit the Department of Justice from using Federal funds to prevent the implementation of State laws authorizing the use of medical marijuana.

In recent months, the Federal Government has stepped up raids on legally operating clinics in many States where it is permissible for seriously ill patients to be prescribed medical marijuana by their doctors. These raids are shutting down legally operating businesses and are putting the health and the well-being of patients with cancer, HIV and AIDS, multiple sclerosis, and other serious illnesses in jeopardy.

Marijuana has proven medical uses that improve the quality of life and extend the lives of desperately ill people. By shutting down clinics, Federal agents are forcing patients who may be dying, for example, of cancer out into the streets to buy prescription drugs like narcotics, which oftentimes leads to prescription drug addiction. These raids also undermine the ability of States to faithfully implement the will of their voters.

The people in my home State of California have voted to make medical marijuana legal. These laws have been enacted to allow patients safe and legal access to appropriately produce and dispense medical marijuana in the safest possible environment. Yet in the last 18 months—for whatever reason—the Drug Enforcement Administration has raided and shut down many licensed and regulated dispensaries, which are legal, mind you, under State law. For example, the Berkeley Patients Group in my district, which had worked closely with the city of Berkeley to stay in compliance with local and State laws in order to serve critically ill patients in my community, has been forced to close its doors and turn their patients away. Complying with the State law and relying on a memorandum from the Department of Justice, thousands of small businesses across my State have invested millions in dollars in building their businesses, created good paying jobs, and have paid millions in taxes. The business owners in my home district are doing everything they can to comply with the law, but clinics in Oakland and Berkeley continue to be subject to raids by Federal authorities.

Many of my colleagues and I have made repeated requests to the Department of Justice to seek clarification regarding their enforcement policies on medical marijuana. Mr. Chair, this is about recognizing the will of the voters. The Federal crackdowns ignore the will of the voters in 16 States across the Nation. The clinics, doctors, and businesses, which bring medicine—medicine mind you—to suffering patients need clarity, certainty, and an end to arbitrary raids.

□ 2000

We should be protecting, not undermining, our democracy by prosecuting small business owners who pay taxes, comply with State laws, and provide medicine to people in need.

But really, and most importantly, it should be out of compassion for our fellow Americans suffering from a serious illness that compels us to vote for this amendment. It is the humane thing to do, and it is the right thing to do.

So I want to thank Mr. ROHRABACHER once again and the cosponsors of this amendment for bringing this forward tonight, and I urge an ''aye'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from California for bringing forward this amendment.

This amendment is absolutely critical for Colorado. We have a legal regulatory structure for medical marijuana and for the many businesses and nonprofits that are active in providing patients with medical marijuana, and yet they live under a constant fear, a constant fear of selective enforcement from the Attorney General or from the DEA.

I had the opportunity in the Judiciary Committee to question the Attorney General with regard to this issue, and he acknowledged that the only possible enforcement—because of the large-scale use of medical marijuana in the States where it is legal—would be selective enforcement. And that is a very dangerous precedent and a very dangerous power to hand an Attorney General, the Department of Justice, and the DEA.

I have heard from the other side of the aisle in different contexts many comments critical of the current Attorney General. But regardless of who is sitting as Attorney General, do we want to have an Attorney General that has the ability at any given time to engage in selective enforcement against a large group of people, whomever he or she wants to prosecute?

What if the select enforcement is politically motivated? What if we have an Attorney General that decides he or she doesn't like the Tea Party or doesn't like the Occupy movement? What if they then force the States to give the records that they keep of who has the medical marijuana licenses and then go after the people with whose politics they don't agree? It's a very, very dangerous road to go down, a dangerous power to give to the Federal Government.

This is a very real and important issue. Drug abuse is a terrible problem that plagues our country and plagues Colorado families. We can reduce drug abuse and reduce access to minors of both marijuana as well as other drugs by making sure that we regulate them appropriately.

In Colorado, medical marijuana dispensaries are regularly audited. They are required, under State law, to have video cameras keep track of who comes and goes. Minors are not allowed to enter the premises. It is, of course, the underground illegal corner drug dealer that will sell to the 15-year-old, not the legal State-regulated dispensary.

We have limited law enforcement capabilities, as highlighted by my colleague from California (Mr. SCHIFF), and to go after patients and their caregivers rather than drug smugglers and Mexican drug cartels does a huge disservice, not only to law enforcement, but also to the many, many victims of the drug war, both from collateral damage as well as those who fall victim to the drugs themselves.

It's critical, at a time when our Nation continues to battle with narcotic use, that our limited resources are focused on the real problem. The real problem is not the 68-year-old cancer patient. The real problem is not the business or the nonprofit that operates under a legal State regulatory system in providing these essential services in our communities in accordance with State and local law.

This amendment is common sense. I hope that colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join in passing this amendment.

And I understand that for many of our colleagues, they don't have legal medical marijuana in their States, and that's fine. No one is saying that they should or they shouldn't. It's up to the residents of each State to decide how they want to treat the criminal aspects of regulating marijuana use.

What we're asking is, for those of you who come from States who don't have legal marijuana, consider that some States might think about it a little differently. Consider that some States have, in fact, authorized dispensaries and authorized a system to ensure that it stays out of the hands of minors, to focus their State law resources on harder drugs and ensuring that minors don't have access to marijuana or other drugs. And consider that that is their prerogative, just as it is your prerogative in your State to continue to approach marijuana usage as a criminal issue.

I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important amendment, to focus our limited resources and allow legal businesses and legal caregivers to operate without the fear of a DEA agent busting in their door.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. I hear people talking about States' rights. If a State said sexual trafficking is okay, would we honor that and say that we're not going to protect? I would hope not. States, in the past, have done some things that have not been good in this country.

Secondly, we know that many of these marijuana dispensaries are simply fronts for illegal marijuana distribution. The FDA noted in 2006 that ''there is currently sound evidence that smoked marijuana is harmful''—harmful—and that ''no sound scientific study supported medical use of marijuana for treatment in the United States, and no animal or human data supported the safety of efficacy of marijuana for general medical use.''

As required by the Controlled Substances Act, the DEA requested a scientific and medical evaluation and scheduling recommendation from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. And what was concluded is ''that marijuana,'' the stuff that we're saying tonight—anybody, if you saw the ''60 Minutes'' piece, they come in, they buy, they take. We talk about doctors. The number of doctors that were ripping off people with OxyContin, the number of doctors that were devastating—

You can go down to Broward County, Florida, and go into some of these pain clinics. There are buses coming down and planes coming down to buy it. And doctors are writing prescriptions. So we're going to hide behind and just say doctors are? The number of doctors that ruin, that ruin young people on OxyContin, whereby they died—they died. So to hide behind a doctor says that that means it's okay—but Health and Human Services said, ''Marijuana has a high potential for abuse, has no accepted medical use in the United States, and lacks an acceptable level of safety for use under medical supervision.''

I may be the only one in this body that feels this way, but I will tell you, I think if this amendment passes and this becomes the law, this would be a gateway to young people. This will literally send a message down to the Mexican cartels. There is going to be a market all over.

It will also increase automobile accidents because you will basically be finding people that are driving while they are high versus driving while they are intoxicated.

So, lastly, I would just hope and ask that we defeat this amendment.

Why don't you have hearings in the Judiciary Committee? Why don't you have hearings some other place? But at 7:30—and my friend from Massachusetts was joking about the time. The time is now 8:05, and we're doing this. We're changing the law. And I think it would be bad for the country and urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 2010

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (and before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. . None of the funds provided by this Act may be obligated for the purpose of closing the regional field offices of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I rise today to offer an amendment that would prevent the closing of four field offices of the Department of Justice Antitrust Division. These offices are located in Atlanta, Dallas, Cleveland, and Philadelphia. The Justice Department announced plans to close these offices with the stated goal of saving $8 million. These closures will not save a dime. In fact, these closures would actually end up costing the government money in lost criminal fines and restitution.

Closing the Atlanta office does not even reduce Federal overhead. The Atlanta field office is located in a Federal courthouse building which will continue to operate. Not only will the antitrust division likely lose those talented lawyers who do not choose to relocate to one of the remaining offices, but it will also move people to some of the most high-cost locations in the country.

The southern region is home to the corporate headquarters of over 100 of the Fortune 500 companies. The Atlanta office prosecutes individuals and companies who engage in bid-rigging, price-fixing, and illegal kickback schemes. Shutting down the Atlanta and Dallas sites leaves the entire southern region of our Nation without any local presence to prosecute and deter antitrust violations and white collar criminal activity.

We cannot and should not underestimate the deterrent effect that the presence of regional law enforcement officers has on white collar crime. We cannot afford to leave the Southeast and Southwest without vital law enforcement officials who are tasked with reducing white collar crime.

I ask all of my colleagues to vote for this amendment to prevent the closure of these critical law enforcement offices until a more thorough review of the consequences can be undertaken. This is not a done deal. Congress should and must act.

My amendment won't cost a cent, but it would bring in more than a few dollars. Over the past 11 years, the Atlanta field office alone brought in over $265 million in fines and restitution. Let me be clear that is a 600 percent rate of return on this investment. What better proof do you need?

Mr. Chairman, I ask each and every one of my colleagues again to support the Lewis-Johnson amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman LEWIS for offering this amendment to the Commerce-Justice-Science fiscal year 2013 appropriations bill. The amendment is designed to prevent the U.S. Department of Justice from closing and reducing its antitrust division field offices from seven to only three in a country of over 300 million people in 50 States.

The Department of Justice literally and regrettably wants to, or is proposing to, close four of its antitrust field offices in response to budgetary pressures. This is partly because the Republican budget fails to provide the administration with the resources it has requested to carry out its basic mission.

Under Republican leadership, the legal activities account, which funds the antitrust division, was 2.2 percent less than the administration requested for the fiscal year 2012, and that resulted in a 5.2 percent cut compared to fiscal year 2011. When we cut 5.2 percent out of a particular account that primarily funds salaries and expenses, there are consequences.

However, congressional Republicans are not totally to blame. The President's budget says that the antitrust division is expecting an increase in caseloads and requested additional funding to administer the increase in caseload. Yet the administration wants to close over half the division's offices. What sense does this even make?

Also, the antitrust division is a key participant on the President's Financial Fraud Enforcement Task Force. How can the division be a helpful participant when it is reducing its footprint across our country?

In one of America's poorest cities with lingering high unemployment—Cleveland, Ohio—that Department of Justice antitrust field office is scheduled to be closed. I'm concerned about the impact it will have, first of all, on the administration of justice in the field of antitrust, but also on the employees, businesses, and consumers that serve us in the greater Ohio area.

I'm very concerned for the hard-working employees in the Cleveland field office, one of the most efficient

antitrust divisions in the country because its employees are so talented. Cleveland is a community that still endures high unemployment due to the economic crisis and its lingering effects. Why would we want to do this now?

From my perspective, the amount of money the Department of Justice expects to save will not actually materialize because costs will increase elsewhere as a result of a reduced footprint across the country.

The reality is we should be furthering our support for the antitrust division, not closing offices or cutting funds. As currently structured, the antitrust division is one of the most efficient Agencies within the Federal Government. Its base budget was $159 million. Yet from 2009 to 2011 the division's efforts resulted in $2 billion in criminal fines and antitrust violations. That's a seven-to-one return on investment.

In addition, over the last two fiscal years, the antitrust division has been estimated to have saved consumers over $650 million as a result of its criminal enforcement efforts. Furthermore, the antitrust division successfully resolved 97 percent of its criminal cases in fiscal year 2011.

Without question, the antitrust division more than pays for itself seven times over. It has an outstanding track record. We should leave its current structure alone. In fact, we should seek to strengthen it and get greater return to the taxpayer for every dollar invested. No matter what happens here today or tomorrow, I'll continue to work with the other body to protect the antitrust division's presence across this country and work to ensure that the employees in communities like Cleveland and the other communities are treated fairly, because in the final analysis, the American people need a robust antitrust division at the Department of Justice.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Lewis amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise in support of this amendment which will ensure that the Department of Justice has the resources it needs to fight white collar crime. The Department is preparing to close antitrust regional offices in Atlanta, Cleveland, Dallas, and Philadelphia. This amendment will prevent the closure of these field offices during fiscal year 2013.

As a member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, Competition, and the Internet, I am concerned about the impact of these closures. This action will seriously undermine the division's ability to enforce antitrust laws by limiting the number of boots on the ground, particularly in the Southeast and the Southwest.

Closing these offices is very shortsighted. It puts nearly 100 jobs at risk in Atlanta and saves only $500,000 in fiscal year 2013. The proposal could end up costing money by transferring employees to regional offices with higher costs of living and higher salaries, like New York and San Francisco.

□ 2020

Further, the proposal will weaken the antitrust division as experienced attorneys who choose not to transfer leave for other opportunities. Antitrust law is a highly specialized field of law and the institutional knowledge of an experienced attorney is invaluable.

The Atlanta office ranks number one in terms of the most trial wins of any of the eight criminal offices. In fiscal year 2008, the Atlanta office ranked first among all of the criminal offices in the amount of restitution obtained for victims. For that fiscal year, the Atlanta office accounted for 71.2 percent of all restitution imposed by the division.

As this Nation recovers from a recession largely caused by white collar misdoing, I implore this House to consider the message that closure of these offices will send to the public. Those considering whether to commit white collar crime need to know that there is strict Federal enforcement. Closing these field offices sends the wrong message to criminals and the public at exactly the wrong time.

This Congress has been consumed with debating the proper role and scope of government. During that debate, we have all agreed that the minimum role of government is to ensure an equal playing field that allows opportunity for all and ensures that all wrong-doers will be prosecuted, no matter if they are engaged in petty criminal offenses or white collar crimes.

The antitrust division, which promotes and protects competition in the marketplace, is essential to good governance and fairness. Surely Tea Partyers and progressives, ALEC members and union leaders can all agree that government must ensure a fair and competitive marketplace that allows for innovation.

The closure of these four field offices will have the effect of significantly eroding the division's criminal enforcement program, leaving U.S. consumers and businesses in at least 19 States, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico unprotected against white collar crooks like Bernie Madoff who seek to rig bids, inflate prices, and otherwise defraud consumers and businesses.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Lewis-Johnson amendment. This amendment ensures that none of the funding provided in the bill will be used to facilitate a closure of the Department of Justice antitrust division's regional offices in Atlanta, Cleveland, Dallas, and Philadelphia.

Mr. Chairman, from our discussions in the full committee markup of this bill, I understand that Mr. WOLF, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, believes that this matter can be worked out and that Justice is perhaps willing to move on this. But I am deeply concerned that this action will seriously undermine the division's ability to enforce antitrust laws by limiting the number of boots on the ground, particularly in the Southeast and the Southwest. Accepting that this is a done deal and there is no room for negotiation by Congress will severely weaken our ability to enforce the antitrust laws.

Furthermore, given the already heavy workload of the Washington, D.C., San Francisco, New York and Chicago field offices, the antitrust division will not have sufficient human resources to investigate and prosecute many regional and local conspiracies in the areas of responsibility that those four offices have, the ones that are slated to be closed.

I want to ensure that the antitrust division can continue to protect taxpayers and preserve integrity of our free market system. The regional offices in Atlanta, Cleveland, Dallas, and Philadelphia help facilitate these efforts, and they should remain open. Closing these offices, I believe, is penny wise and pound foolish. It puts nearly a hundred jobs at risk, and it poses only a $500,000 savings in fiscal year 2013. In fact, the proposal could end up costing money because it would transfer employees to regional offices with higher costs of living and higher salaries, like New York and San Francisco.

It's extremely important that we don't close these offices until a thorough review of the antitrust division is completed. When deciding to recommend these closures, the Department of Justice did not consider other more cost-effective options. Furthermore, if offices must be eliminated, all of the closures should be based on merit and productivity rather than on politics.

Let me speak for a moment on the Atlanta office which does better in terms of overall performance and productivity than say, for instance, some of the other offices which are slated to remain open. The Atlanta office obtained over $265 million in fines and restitution between FY 2000 and 2011. With an annual operating cost of $4 million, the criminal fines and restitution recovered by the office represent a return rate of 600 percent. Indeed, closing these offices is penny wise and pound foolish, and I urge adoption of the amendment for the good of our free market system and our capitalist economy.

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

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

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

Mr. WOLF. I want to thank the gentleman and the gentlelady for raising this issue and standing up. This was not done by our committee. This was done by the Justice Department, by the administration.

But what we will do is next week we will ask the three or four who spoke, that we bring the Justice Department in. We will get them to come up here whereby they can sit down with all of you together and your staffs to explain why, and see if they can justify this. But I just want to be clear, this was not done at the committee's request. This was the Justice Department.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I appreciate those comments. I think it is clear that this was an action by the Department, and it was not an action taken by the committee.

However, several of us on the committee have grave concerns about it, and we appreciate the chairman's agreement and his willingness to discuss it with the Justice Department and see if we can't get this situation corrected.

Mr. WOLF. I thank you, and with that I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the purpose of implementing section 36.302(c)(9) of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, a couple of short months ago, the Department of Justice in support of the Americans with Disabilities Act added a new provision. This provision said that in order to be in compliance with the ADA regulations, businesses must now allow service horses into their businesses. And you did hear right: they're talking about service horses to be in compliance with the ADA regulation. And I dare to stand and say we need to say ''nay'' to that type of effort. Pardon the pun. It's kind of hard to get through this without smiling about it, but this is the kind of regulation that has an untold number of consequences on small businesses.

While I recognize the imperative and the need that some unfortunate Americans go through in having to deal with things, there comes a point where we have to stand up and say wait a sec, wait a sec, wait a sec. Do we really need to allow service horses into airplanes, into hotels and into restaurants just to accommodate a particular person?

This amendment would prohibit funding from the implementation of yet another costly Federal regulation. The regulation would require businesses and restaurants to admit service horses in the same way they admit service dogs into their areas of operation. I wish I didn't have to bring up this amendment; but since the administration has now put this into a rule, we're going to have to introduce this amendment.

Despite the difficulty—and some would say the impossibility of housebreaking a horse—the Obama Justice Department has ruled that service horses, miniature horses used to accompany people with disabilities, are no different than guide dogs under the Americans with Disabilities Act. As a result, shops, restaurants, hotels, even airlines, can now be sued if they do not accommodate horses in their place of business.

That regulation joins a long list of rules with which small businesses must comply. In fact, the New York Times recently reported on a particularly insidious scheme in which lawyers recruit disabled people, pay them a fee, and use them to file lawsuits against businesses that fail to comply with any one of the hundreds of ADA rules. For small businesses, the cost of compliance with that law that designates, for instance, 95 different standards for bathrooms alone is just the beginning.

□ 2030

They must also pay attorneys' fees to the litigants in such case, even though many businesses say they would have complied without a lawsuit.

Some 1.65 million lawsuits are filed each year over enforcement of Federal regulations, according to Berkeley law professor Sean Farhang, author of ''The Litigation State.'' Estimates by the Competitive Enterprise Institute suggest that regulation cost the economy some $1.75 trillion in 2008 alone. That's a massive drag on the U.S. economy. With the average of nine new rules appearing in the Federal Register every day, small businesses with fewer resources struggle to keep up with the ever-changing regulatory environment.

Some 65 percent of the Nation's net new jobs are created by small businesses, according to the Small Business Administration. Overregulation has a direct effect on their ability to create jobs and compete in the marketplace.

If a person wishes to bring a horse into an establishment, then the request should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis, not through some new Federal mandate. Ironically, even the Miniature Horse Association—and I'm sure all good Americans subscribe to the magazine put out by the American Miniature Horse Association—but their president, Harry Elder, has looked at this. He does not condone the use of these horses as a replacement for guide dogs. In fact, he has said:

The American miniature horse can readily be trained to be led or driven, but in most cases it would not make a suitable replacement for an animal such as a guide dog.

So there is an association that deals with these miniature horses. Even that association and the president is saying this is not a wise move.

If the body feels that this is an imperative thing to do, I suggest a Member of Congress be brave enough to introduce such a piece of legislation, that it be properly vetted by having a hearing about this, and we can move through the legislative process. But since the administration has introduced this regulation, this is just suggesting that we should not spend money against this and let this be a little more vetted. It would help American businesses. Unfortunately, there are already lawsuits flying.

I would encourage Members on both sides of the aisle to please vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. I had an opportunity to visit, while I was in Connecticut with Chairman LARSON, with a brave young soldier who lost his eyesight in Iraq. It was a situation where his ability to function required an animal to help guide him so that he could go about his normal functions of daily life.

What the gentleman who made this amendment neglected to share with the House is that it has been the law that, under the ADA guidelines, you could have any animal—monkey, horse, so forth and so on—that could be of use to someone who was disabled. What the administration has done with this new regulation is limit this to only two types of animals: one are guide dogs—as we would normally know them—and the other are miniature horses that meet certain requirements, including being housebroken and so forth and so on. The reason why people who are disabled in some cases find this a more useful animal to use is that they live three times longer than a dog does and they have perfect vision.

But I see that there has been some, I guess, laughter, as if this is comical. The fact of the matter is, when I met

with this young soldier and his wife and their two kids, he talked about how it just made him feel whole that he could go get the newspaper from out in front of the house, that he could go to the store.

So the idea that this is some new policy of the Obama administration is false, number one. Number two, it's restricting an overly broad set of allowances in this regard, and it restricts it to only two types of animals, both of which can be used by people who are disabled.

So I would hope that the House, even those in the majority who seem to find, for some reason, challenges in this bill, in particular with the provisions that they want to go after that allow disabled people to use pools—and we heard yesterday how every group in the veterans associations around our country opposed this effort yesterday on the pool access, and now we're here talking about whether or not people who have lost their sight or are disabled can have a guide animal.

So I oppose the amendment. I hope the House rejects it.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I do want to indicate that I believe it was in March that the Department of Justice title III regulations issued a new ruling. So, we may disagree on what to do with this.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, you are aware, I assume, that this ruling was a restriction from a much broader ruling that allowed any type of animal, including monkeys—and I can go into the different other animals if you'd like.

I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I would disagree with that assessment. This is a new regulation, and it has led to lawsuits that have already started to happen. One news report is of a lawsuit in California.

Mr. FATTAH. Let me reclaim my time just so we can clarify this one matter of fact here, okay, in that the regulation prior to this adjustment allowed for service animals of any type—including a dog, a horse, monkey, bird, rat—trained to assist and alert, okay, that's number one. So this is a move by the Obama administration to restrict it to two types of animals. So I just want the House to be able to operate off of actual information because this is an effort to both help those who are disabled, and also to avoid unnecessary circumstances in which regulations are too broad.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I would be happy to work with you on that. I do disagree with that assessment and that reading of it.

Mr. FATTAH. Let me reclaim my time. This is not an assessment; this is a fact. So, this was the regulation. The new regulation retreats and constrains the regulation to two animals versus a multiplicity of animals.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. FATTAH. I'd be glad to yield.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I simply disagree with that assessment. We'll have to agree to disagree, and I look forward to working with you.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, because we're not talking about an assessment, I want the House to be aware of that. This is not the appropriate place to deal with this matter. But if we insist on it, I would hope that we would err on the side of that young brave soldier who risked his life on behalf of our country, and that he should have whatever assistance that can be provided.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ___. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Justice in contravention of any of the following:

(1) The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

(2) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) (relating to nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs).

(3) Section 809(c)(1) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3789d(c)(1)) (relating to prohibition of discrimination).

(4) Section 210401(a) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14141(a)) (relating to unlawful police pattern or practice).

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simple: to prohibit any Federal funds from flowing to law enforcement organizations that engage in any form of racial, ethnic, or religious profiling.

It's been a matter of concern for decades among minority communities when policing organizations engage in profiling, but recent events have brought the problem into sharp focus.

□ 2040

Starting last August, the Associated Press published a series of disturbing stories about the systematic racial, ethnic, and religious profiling conducted by the New York City Police Department against Muslim and Arab Americans in New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and Louisiana.

In September of last year, I asked the Department of Justice to investigate what we now know was a pattern of surveillance and infiltration by the New York Police Department against innocent American Muslims in the absence of a valid investigative reason. These Muslim communities were mapped, infiltrated, and surveilled simply because they were Muslim.

Profiling is wrong. Profiling on the basis of the race, ethnicity, and religion is a violation of core constitutional principles.

Profiling is also wrong because it is not good policing. Profiling is an unthinking, lazy, unprofessional approach to police work and intelligence work, and it only raises the risk that the real plot will slip through the cracks. Indeed, profiling is counterproductive.

The sloppiness of the NYPD surveillance effort was such that several non-Muslim establishments were labeled as being owned by Muslims and, contrary to the blanket assertions by some that the tactics have kept New York City safe, the NYPD failed to uncover two actual plots against New York City, those perpetrated by Faisal Shahzad and Najibullah Zazi.

In Shahzad's case, the FBI was surveilling both the mosque he attended and the Muslim Student Association of his accomplice. In Zazi's case, the NYPD actually took actions that let Zazi be tipped off about the FBI's investigation.

The NYPD's surreptitious, uncoordinated, and unprofessional approach to counterterrorism prevention within the American Muslim community shows that they have learned nothing from the lessons elucidated from the 9/11 Commission's report.

Now, let me be clear. This amendment is not aimed solely at one particular law enforcement organization. Over the decades, law enforcement agencies across the country have profiled against African Americans, Hispanics, and other minorities. Indeed, the Department of Justice has specific guidance prohibiting this practice because it has become widespread, and it has conducted litigation against Police Departments for using race or ethnicity to target citizens for arrest in California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and other States.

My amendment would ensure that no Federal funds are flowing to any law enforcement entity that the Department has identified as engaging in racial, ethnic, and religious profiling.

Racial, ethnic and religious profiling by police is not something taxpayer dollars should be spent for. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

PEOPLE FOR THE AMERICAN WAY,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2012.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: On behalf of the hundreds of thousands of members of People for the American Way, I urge you to support Representative Holt's amendment to H.R. 5326, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013. A vote is anticipated this afternoon. This amendment would prohibit federal funds made available through the act to be used for programs or activities that involve racial, ethnic, or religious profiling by any federal, state, or local law enforcement organization.

Such profiling undermines America's status as a nation founded on Equal Justice Under Law. The story of America is one of a nation founded on timeless ideals of liberty and equality, and struggling generation after generation to make those principles real for those not included. Society's ''outsiders'' are brought in and made to know that they in fact belong to the community that is America. Profiling damages that process. It sends a powerful message to entire communities that they are, in fact, not quite the equal members of society that we said they were. It tells them that their very existence raises suspicions. It harms the individuals profiled, as well as those who live in constant apprehension of being profiled. The practice undermines our nation's principles, and our federal government should not be funding it.

Profiling does not even produce the benefits that it is purported to provide: It is counterproductive. When limited law enforcement resources are spent targeting innocent people simply because of their real or perceived race, ethnicity, or religion, that is not an efficient use of resources. Nor is it efficient to alienate entire communities, making them feel resentful toward or fearful of law enforcement. People living in America should be able to rely on law enforcement as a partner in making their lives safer. But those who feel unfairly targeted by profiling will be far less likely to cooperate with law enforcement when their cooperation is needed, whether it is a case of local violent crime or national security. That does not make our nation or our communities safer.

A practice that undermines both our principles and our safety is not one that the federal government should be funding. We urge you to vote for Representative Holt's amendment.

Sincerely,

MARGE BAKER,
Executive Vice President for Policy and Program.

PAUL R. GORDON,
Senior Legislative Counsel.

INTERFAITH ALLIANCE,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2012.

Re Interfaith Alliance Recommends Voting YES on Rep. Holt Amend. to H.R. 5326.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of Interfaith Alliance, I urge you to vote YES on Rep. Rush Holt's (D NJ 12) amendment to H.R. 5326, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2013. A recorded vote on this amendment is anticipated on the House floor today. The amendment states:

''None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for programs or activities that involve racial, ethnic, or religious profiling by any Federal, state, or local law enforcement organization.''

As the only national, interfaith organization dedicated to protecting the integrity of both religion and democracy in America, Interfaith Alliance supports Rep. Holt's amendment because:

Racial and religious profiling is an affront to the principle of religious freedom on which our nation was founded. Profiling individuals simply because they belong, or appear to belong, to a particular religious community turns First Amendment-protected beliefs and activities into cause for suspicion.

Racial and religious profiling undermines Americans' trust in those sworn to protect them. Numerous studies have shown that singling out individuals for investigation based solely on their appearance is ineffective and dishonest, alienates racial and religious minorities, and diminishes cooperation and effective law enforcement.

Racial and religious profiling fuels divisiveness by casting suspicion over an entire religious community, perpetuating discrimination against religion generally and religious minorities in particular.

Protecting religious freedom is most critical in times of crisis and controversy. Most law enforcement agents discharge their duties honorably, and do not engage in racial and/or religious profiling. Prior to 9/11, both Congress and President George W. Bush made a commitment to end the practice of racial profiling. However, the September 11th attacks caused a dramatic rise in the inappropriate profiling of Arabs, Muslims, Sikhs, and South Asians. This profiling based on religion, race, ethnicity, and national origin continues to persist today.

Again, please vote YES on Rep. Holt's amendment to H.R. 5326 and affirm our fundamental moral and democratic values of equal protection and religious liberty while making our nation safer by ending this practice now. Please call Deputy Director for Public Policy Arielle Gingold with any questions at 202 238 3266.

Sincerely,

REV. DR. C. WELTON GADDY,
President, Interfaith Alliance.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2012.

Re: NAACP Strong Support for the Anti-Racial Profiling Amendment to be Offered by Congressman Rush Holt (NJ) to H.R. 5326, A Bill Making Appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice and State.

Hon. MEMBERS,
U.S. House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the NAACP, our nation's oldest, largest and most widely-recognized grassroots-based civil rights organization, I strongly urge you to support Congressman Rush Holt's (NJ) amendment to HR 5316, the Commerce, Justice, State, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act 2013. Congressman HOLT's amendment would prohibit federal funding for programs or activities that involve racial, ethnic, or religious profiling by any federal, state, or local law enforcement organization.

Racial profiling betrays the fundamental American promise of equal protection under the law and infringes on the Fourth Amendment guarantee that all people be free from unreasonable searches and seizures. Such discriminatory law enforcement practices have no place in American life and certainly should not be supported by federal funds. Racial profiling targets individuals not because of evidence of criminal activity but because of the individuals' perceived race, ethnicity, nationality or religion. It diverts limited law enforcement resources away from more effective strategies. Racial profiling also causes resentment in targeted communities and makes people in those communities less likely to cooperate in crime prevention reporting or investigations. When individuals and communities fear the police, they are less likely to call law enforcement when they are the victims of crime or in emergencies. Creating a climate of fear compromises public safety and limits the ability of law enforcement officials to effectively carry out their responsibilities. Such counterproductive law enforcement practices should never receive federal support.

As I stated earlier, I hope that you will support the Holt amendment to H.R. 5326 and help address the very serious problem of racial profiling. Thank you in advance for your attention to this NAACP priority. Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at my office at (202) 463 2940.

Sincerely,

HILARY O. SHELTON,
Vice President for Advocacy / Director, NAACP Washington Bureau.

Mr. KING of New York. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Chairman, I must say that I strongly oppose this amendment, and I disagree with virtually every word spoken on the floor tonight by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Let's understand one thing. The NYPD has the most effective counterterrorism unit in the country. There are 1,000 police working day in and day out. As a result of that, almost 13 or 14 attempts, terrorist attempts, Islamist terrorist attempts to attack New York have been stopped.

Now, let's get something straight. The President's Homeland Security Advisor, John Brennan, recently visited with the NYPD. During that meeting, or following that meeting, Mr. Brennan, President Obama's Homeland Security Advisor, stated:

I have full confidence that the NYPD is doing things consistent with the law, and it's something that again has been responsible for keeping this city safe over the past decade.

Mr. Brennan, the President's Homeland Security Advisor went on to say:

If we are going to have the ability to identify and stop terrorist operatives and terrorist attacks here on our shores, the national government cannot do it alone. The NYPD is a model of how a community can come together.

He closed by saying to the NYPD:

You have had a very difficult job. I think you've done it very well. The success is in the record in terms of keeping your city safe.

In addition to that, FBI Director Mueller has stood by the NYPD, said that they are in full compliance with the law. CIA Director Petraeus, there was an IG inspection done, that the NYPD's relationship with the CIA was in full compliance with the law.

These slanderous attacks by the Associated Press and The New York Times cannot point out one instance of a law being violated or one provision of the Constitution being violated.

We should be here tonight giving the NYPD a medal. We sit here, 10½ years

after September 11, and the most effective law enforcement, counterterrorism unit in the country is being attacked? We are attempting to cite the Constitution and provisions of law as somehow an attack on the NYPD, when no one complies with these more than the NYPD.

And again, we go through, whether it's Director Petraeus, whether it's Director Mueller, or whether it's the President of the United States, his own Homeland Security advisers have said this.

Now, I work closely with the NYPD, those in New York, whether it's Mayor Bloomberg, whether it's City Council President Christine Quinn. She's a Democrat; he's an independent. Both stand by the NYPD because of what they have done.

And to think that the most effective organization is being attacked by the Associated Press, The New York Times, and those attacks are being joined here on the floor of the Congress of the United States, without one fact to back them up. There is no spying. All this is good police work.

The reality is we're not going to sit back like we did on September 11 and allow the enemy to come. If we know that an attack is coming and we're told, for instance, that operatives are coming from a particular country and there's a community in New York City where those people live, then obviously you go, you conduct open surveillance. No one's talking about any violations to the Constitution.

I remember years ago when the Justice Department was going after the Mafia, they went to the Italian American communities. When they were going after the Westies, they went to the Irish American communities. When you're looking for the Russian mob, you go to the communities in Coney Island and Brighton Beach. That's where the enemy comes from.

Ninety-nine percent of the people are law-abiding. But if you're looking for the person who is going to that community to carry out a crime, you look in that community. If you're looking for an Islamic terrorist, you don't go to Ben's Kosher Deli. When they were looking for the Italian mob, they didn't go to an Irish bar. They went to the Italian social clubs.

This is solid law enforcement. That's not profiling. That's an abuse of the term ''profiling'' to even suggest that.

So I cannot be more emphatic or stronger in my denunciation of this amendment, calling for its defeat and urging people to stand by the NYPD, which has kept New York safe for 10½ years.

I went to too many funerals. I attended too many wakes. I lost too many constituents. I'm not going to allow it to happen so long as I'm in this Congress.

I oppose this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman's time has expired.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. This is a well-intentioned issue in the sense that all this amendment says is that none of the funds in this bill should be used to violate the Constitution of the United States, the Fifth and the 14th Amendment, so I'm sure there will be those who want to adhere to it.

But this is not the appropriate place to be dealing with this issue. This is an appropriations bill. We've had dozens of riders, one after another, with people trying to get at other issues.

Now, there is no instance, no matter what the purpose, under which we should be condemning law enforcement when they are carrying out appropriate responsibilities, and they should be given the benefit of the doubt. In the same instance, we have a responsibility to uphold the Constitution. The Constitution is clear in its delineation that you can't discriminate.

And we shouldn't—it's not good law enforcement practices, no matter who you're looking for, to act in ways in which you close your eyes to other possibilities. If you're looking for terrorists, they don't come in any particular subset or group. And I know that wise law enforcement is aware of this, and that they look across the board at what the vulnerabilities may be.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his steadfastness in trying to protect against religious bigotry or ethnic discrimination or unintentional stepping across the line, however one might want to look at this. But, again, this is a bill in which we're trying to deal with the appropriation of Federal dollars for needed law enforcement activity.

Mr. HOLT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLT. Thank you.

This is completely consistent with an appropriations bill for the Department of Justice. Just as we have spent decades getting away from the practice of harassing people for driving while black, we've got to get away from the practice of harassing people for shopping while Muslim.

□ 2050

Mr. FATTAH. In reclaiming my time, the point here is that, with every dollar that we appropriate to the Department of Justice, we operate under the belief that they're carrying out their constitutional responsibilities, so a limitation that says that they have to operate within the Constitution, at best, is somewhat redundant.

Mr. HOLT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Reference was made to the Deputy National Security Advisor of President Obama's, Mr. Brennan.

What Mr. Brennan actually said was that, for the NYPD to be effective, they need the cooperation of the Muslim community. In fact, if you talk with the Muslim community, they are not only outraged by this behavior; they are intimidated by it. They see it as profiling. My colleague from New York and my colleague from Pennsylvania can say, well, of course everybody is operating under the law.

Mr. FATTAH. In reclaiming my time, I didn't say that. I understand, from the press reports one could consider this profiling. All I am suggesting to you is that this is not the appropriate vehicle for us to deal with it. Profiling would be improper, and I believe the Justice Department has articulated that their position is not to profile.

Mr. HOLT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. I would hope that the gentleman would find a place for this instruction to the Department of Justice in order to make sure that the recipients of their grants do what they are, indeed, supposed to do. We're talking about money spent. We should make sure that the taxpayer money is spent for good policing.

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentleman. As I indicated, I commend you for raising this issue. I know it's unpopular in some areas.

I'm just suggesting that, when in an appropriations bill, a rider like this, dictating to the Department that it should comply with the Constitution is similar to some other amendments we've seen today. I believe that the Department has an ongoing, everyday responsibility to comply with the Constitution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. I share the comments made by Mr. FATTAH and by my friend from New York (Mr. KING).

At every hearing we have, we raise this issue with Director Mueller. Director Mueller may be the best—not one of the best—the best Director that we've ever had at the FBI. I think Director Mueller has stood with the NYPD. He had an opportunity to speak and to say something negative. He did not.

My good friend—and he is my friend. I think we throw words around there, but I like RUSH HOLT, and he knows how I feel about him. Yet this is not a good amendment, and it almost makes the FBI or the NYPD look like they're doing something wrong. It's one thing to have a colloquy on the floor, but another to have an amendment that looks like it's a direct kind of attack on it after. I looked at the original amendment, and you had to kind of change it for it to be in order.

Secondly, I think Ray Kelly is one of the finest police chiefs we've ever had in the country, and if you were an NYPD policeman, you would see this and think.

Thirdly, to validate what Mr. KING said, I will read here:

President Barack Obama's top counterterrorism adviser praised the New York Police Department's work Friday, saying the agency has struck an appropriate balance between keeping people safe and protecting their rights.

We have to remember Major Hasan was responsible for the death of 13 people, and there were targets and signs that nobody wanted to kind of identify. As Mr. KING said, there are about 180 people from my congressional district who died in the attack at the Pentagon.

Brennan goes on to say:

It is not a trade-off between our security and our freedoms and our rights as citizens, John Brennan said Friday at an appearance at NYPD headquarters.

I believe that balance that we strike has been an appropriate one. We want to make sure that we're able to optimize our security at the same time we optimize those freedoms we hold and cherish so deeply.

Brennan's comments represent a White House stamp of approval of the NYPD's tactics. For months, the Obama administration has sized up the question about the NYPD surveillance program while insisting on the importance of building partnerships with American Muslims.

Then it goes on to say:

City officials said the police department has done nothing illegal and argued that the NYPD would have endangered the city it is charged with protecting if it did not take such preventative measures. Officers cannot wait to open an investigation until a crime is committed, they argue. Police Commissioner Raymond Kelly has said it is a mischaracterization to describe the department's tactics as spying.

I will close with this:

In a speech to the police department's officials and representatives from private security firms, Brennan then went on to say, The NYPD's counterterrorism work was essential to the safety of the Nation's citizens.

So I agree with Mr. KING, and I agree with Mr. HOLT.

Mr. HOLT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Since you refer to the Deputy National Security Advisor, it's worth pointing out that a couple of days later the White House felt it necessary to back away from his comments and to say:

John, in his remarks, wasn't referring to the NYPD surveillance.

Of course he was, but they had to say he wasn't because he had misspoken. Rather, he was stating that everyone in the counterterrorism and law enforcement community must make sure that we are doing things consistent with the law.

In other words, Mr. Brennan was out of bounds, and the White House had to walk that back. So I wouldn't, if I were you, choose his endorsement of these NYPD activities as the best argument against my amendment.

Mr. WOLF. In reclaiming my time, I do take Mr. Brennan at his word. I think Mr. Brennan is actually a constituent who lives in my congressional district. He has a pretty distinguished career in having been our station chief in Saudi Arabia and the head of the Counterterrorism Center, and he probably knows more about terrorism than any Member here in the Congress but for, perhaps, Mr. ROGERS or Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

Secondly, Director Mueller, I maintain, is one of the best Directors. Director Mueller is an honest, decent, ethical guy, who cares deeply with regard to civil rights. Mr. SERRANO is not here, but God bless Mr. SERRANO. At every hearing, Mr. SERRANO always bears in to make sure that the FBI is doing things appropriately. I believe they are, and he validated what the NYPD did.

It's just not a good idea to be attacking our law enforcement and saying this when they're actually doing a good job. So I stand with Mr. FATTAH, and I stand with Mr. KING.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the chairman for yielding.

It is not inconsistent for us to want to have support for law enforcement and also that the Constitution be followed. We have access to law enforcement. If you want them to come in and brief you on these tactics and to talk this thing through, that's fine; but I don't believe that we should take a position of all the angels on one side. To the contrary, there is no police department that's perfect.

The point here is that the effort is one, I believe, to comply with the constitutional restrictions that you do not operate without due process and probable cause. Let's see if we can find a way other than with this amendment to see if we can get to the heart of this.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CRAVAACK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the activities of the Climate Change Education program of the National Science Foundation.

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

Mr. CRAVAACK. I rise today to offer an amendment that would prohibit any more funding going to a duplicative program. I'd like to think that everyone in this room is well aware that we are $15.7 trillion in debt.

□ 2100

Our spending is out of control. We are simply spending money we don't have and massively indebting future generations of Americans.

The GAO reports duplicative U.S. Government programs costs billions of dollars. Thirteen agencies fund 209 different science, technology, engineering, and math education programs. Of those programs, 173 overlap with at least one other program. We have to be responsible for how the government spends Americans' hard-earned tax dollars. We cannot afford to borrow money to fund duplicative programs that are already under the purview of established agencies and protocols.

The Climate Change Education program at the National Science Foundation duplicates education programs already in place. Currently, worthy research proposals are subject to rigorous peer-reviewed processes. The Climate Change Education program sets aside money for a specific purpose, which is already covered in interagency education programs. This is just more Big Government and a waste of taxpayer dollars.

Last year, the Climate Change Education program funded partnerships among K 12 education, related nonprofit organizations, and relevant education and/or climate-related policymakers. This year, however, the program has morphed into the Sustainability Research Network to create new interdisciplinary learning experiences for graduate and undergraduate students, as well as literacy programs. In the military, we call this mission creep.

The National Science Foundation funds basic research and serves as an engine of our innovation economy. However you feel about global warming, that is not the debate here today, though I look forward to engaging in that in the future.

This amendment addresses a duplicative program that is not necessary and is costing the taxpayers money we simply don't have. We need to prioritize innovation and research and NSF, and eliminate duplicative education programs that do nothing to improve the economic outlook of our future. We need to get back to the basics.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me in this commonsense amendment in ending a duplicative program that is wasting taxpayer dollars and further indebting future generations.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment.

Climate change is a big issue in the world we live in. It affects our economy, our ability to move goods. We've had the most severe weather season we've had in history over the last 12 months at a cost of a billion-plus dollars. Our ability to understand the weather and the climate and its impact on business and industry and agriculture is critically important. I think that the National Science Foundation—which is an entirely merit-based system of scientific awards in which they fund less than one out of every five meritorious pieces of research proposals. There is absolutely no politics. The National Science Board, which is confirmed by the Senate, reviews these proposals, they make selections. The idea that we don't want to know more or learn more, I think is interesting. I would hope that the House would reject that, and that what we would do is seek knowledge as a way to retain our global leadership as the leading Nation in the world.

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

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Chairman, regarding duplicative programs—again, this is about duplicative programs. The National Science Foundation already funds STEM education and even climate-change education programs in the Directorate for Education and Human Resources with worthy peer-reviewed proposals.

Total U.S. spending for the U.S. Global Change Research program for 13 agencies is more than $2.5 billion, primarily at NASA, NOAA, and NSF. NSF spending for the U.S. Global Change Research program is over $333 million. NSF spending for education is $1.2 billion a year. Climate change education can be addressed through NSF climate research activities and NSF education activities. There is no need to fund additional special climate-change education programs.

This newer program under the Obama administration is currently funded at $10 million a year, $5.5 million from the Education Directorate and $4.5 million from several research directorates as identified. Again, this is a duplicative program and a waste of the taxpayer dollars.

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

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BROWN OF FLORIDA

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ___. The amount made available by this Act For ''Department of Justice—Office of Justice Programs—State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance'' for emergency federal law enforcement assistance, as authorized by section 609M the Justice Assistance Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10513; Public Law 98 473) is hereby increased by $20,000,000 and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for PERIODIC CENSUSES AND PROGRAMS AND STATISTICS is hereby reduced by $20,000,000.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I'm very excited that finally we have an amendment that I think everybody can support since everyone supports law enforcement.

This amendment fully funds the Emergency Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Program in the amount of $20 million. This program was designed to help local government respond to extraordinary law enforcement emergencies after they have exhausted their own budgets. The Emergency Law Enforcement Assistance Program authorizes the Attorney General to provide funds, equipment, training, intelligence, and personnel to alleviate the financial impact of unforeseeable emergency law enforcement situations.

This program was authorized in 1984 but has not been funded since 1996. Had it been funded, this program would have helped a community in my district. In October of 2007, a 7-year-old girl, Somer Thompson, went missing on her way home from school. The Clay County sheriff's office followed garbage trucks and found Somer's body in a Georgia landfill 2 days later. Thanks to this quick thinking, her killer was captured and will never harm another child.

Investigations like this one cost a lot of money. Overtime, lab tests, travel costs, and numerous unforeseen expenses can blow even the most prudent budget. Small communities simply lack the resources to pursue investigations on this scale. The sheriff told me he had exhausted his budget for the year on overtime just for this one case.

I did what I could to help scrape together grants from other sources, but this program would have filled the gap. By the way, the sheriff and almost everyone in Clay County is a Republican, but this is not about party. It's about doing what is right. In an era when local government can barely afford the police they have, a major crime can wipe them out and leave the community more vulnerable. The basic purpose of government is to protect the citizens. This amendment will make sure police can do it without worrying about a crisis that will break their budget.

Mr. WOLF. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. We have a little concern, but we are going to accept the amendment with the idea we can work as we go to conference. We will accept the amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. If the gentlewoman will yield, I thank the chairman, and I thank the gentlelady from Florida.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. REED). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2110

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, in lieu of an amendment, I would like to take this time to engage the subcommittee chairman in a colloquy about the importance of our Nation's fisheries management commissions.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for funding our Nation's fisheries management commissions and the good work they do to help keep more fish in our waters. NOAA's Inter-Jurisdictional Fisheries Act, IJFA, program supports the conservation and management of fish species which occur in both Federal and State waters. Funding for this program is used to support conservation and management tasks not currently being undertaken by NOAA or the Regional Fishery Management Councils. Similarly, fisheries commissions on the Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf coast represent an important bottom-up stakeholder approach to managing our Nation's many fisheries and often develop innovative programs to enhance America's fisheries resources.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman from Alaska. We will work with the other body to ensure that these programs are adequately funded.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In these tight budgetary times, hard choices must be made, and we should ensure that we do our utmost to put funds back into productive programs that increase the sustainability of fisheries and benefit the States, and the IJFA and councils and commissions accounts are areas where current programs are producing proven results for fisheries' sustainability.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by—

(1) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Department of Commerce; International Trade Administration; Operations and Administration'' (and the amount provided under such heading for official representation expenses abroad) by $155,979;

(2) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Department of Commerce; Bureau of Industry and Security; Operations and Administration'' (and the amount provided under such heading for official representation expenses abroad), by $6,750;

(3) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Department of Commerce; U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; Salaries and Expenses'' (and the amount provided under such heading for official reception and representation expenses) by $450;

(4) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Department of Commerce; National Institute of Standards and Technology; Scientific and Technical Research and Services'' (and the amount provided under such heading for official reception and representation expenses) by $2,500;

(5) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Department of Commerce; Departmental Management; Salaries and Expenses'' (and the amount provided under such heading for official reception and representation) by $2,250;

(6) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Department of Justice; Legal Activities; Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities'' (and the amount made available under such heading to INTERPOL Washington for official reception and representation expenses) by $4,500;

(7) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Department of Justice; Legal Activities; Salaries and Expenses, United States Attorneys'' (and the amount provided under such heading for official reception and representation expenses) by $3,600;

(8) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Department of Justice; United States Marshals Service; Salaries and Expenses'' (and the amount provided under such heading for official reception and representation expenses) by $3,000;

(9) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Department of Justice; Federal Bureau of Investigations; Salaries and Expenses'' (and the amount provided under such heading for official reception and representation expenses) by $98,640;

(10) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Department of Justice; Drug Enforcement Administration; Salaries and Expenses'' (and the amount provided under such heading for official reception and representation expenses) by $45,000;

(11) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Department of Justice; Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives; Salaries and Expenses'' (and the amount provided under such heading for official reception and representation expenses) by $18,000;

(12) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Department of Justice; Federal Prison System; Salaries and Expenses'' (and the amount provided under such heading for official reception and representation expenses) by $2,700;

(13) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Science; Office of Science and Technology Policy'' (and the amount provided under such heading for official reception and representation expenses) by $1,125;

(14) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Science; National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Cross Agency Support'' (and the amount provided under such heading for official reception and representation expenses) by $31,709;

(15) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Science; National Science Foundation; Agency Operations and Award Management'' (and the amount provided under such heading for official reception and representation expenses) by $4,140;

(16) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Science; Office of the National Science Board'' (and the amount provided under such heading for official reception and representation expenses) by $1,250;

(17) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Related Agencies; Equal Employment Opportunity Commission'' (and the amount provided under such heading for official reception and representation expenses) by $1,125;

(18) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Related Agencies; International Trade Commission; Salaries and Expenses'' (and the amount provided under such heading for official reception and representation expenses) by $1,125;

(19) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Related Agencies; Office of the United States Trade Representative; Salaries and Expenses'' (and the amount provided under such heading for official reception and representation expenses) by $58,032;

(20) reducing the amount made available under the heading ''Related Agencies; State Justice Institute; Salaries and Expenses'' (and the amount provided under such heading for official reception and representation expenses) by $1,125; and

(21) by increasing the amount made available for ''Department of Commerce; National Institute of Standards and Technology; Industrial Technology Services'' (and the amount provided under such heading for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership) by $443,000.

Mr. GARAMENDI (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, day after day, or at least week after week, my colleagues and I are here on the floor talking about jobs. It is about jobs and jobs and jobs again. Our agenda, which we call ''Make It in America,'' is an agenda that would rebuild the American manufacturing sector, a sector that has lost about 40 percent of its jobs in the last 20, 25 years from just under 20 million to just over 11 million Americans who are working in manufacturing today.

One of the innovative ways of improving manufacturing has been developed. It's called the Manufacturing Extension Partnership. It's actually modeled after another Federal-State program that's been in existence for more than 100 years. Anyone that's in agriculture would recognize the Agricultural Extension Program. This is the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, a program that has actually added another feature to the old and still very successful Agricultural Extension Program, and that is a public-private partnership. In this program, the Federal Government, through the National Institute of Standards and Technology, runs a program in which funding is provided for local, private, or nonprofit organizations to become extension program managers.

In California, this has been a very, very successful program. Some $447 million in new retained sales have occurred, $128.8 million in new investments, and some 3,769 jobs have been created.

Some examples exist throughout California. In southern California, a manufacturer, a small company that makes high-tech parts for the aircraft industry, has been able to improve their manufacturing techniques and have been able to stay in business, and they now have been very successful in bringing down contracts with the aircraft industry.

In the Bay Area, another program—actually run out of San Ramon, near my district—has been very successful. This program, called MANEX, has been very successful working with companies in the area. Morgan Hill Precision, to be precise, is a company that, again, is a machine shop. That company has used the MEP program, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, to good success.

Now how do we pay for this? Some $437,000. We take a little bit from some 20 different parts of the Department of Commerce. The result is it's working. We would like to keep it working at its full level, at last year's level. The bill before us actually reduces it by 50 percent. So we're adding $437,000 back by taking small amounts from some 20 different programs.

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

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

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

Mr. WOLF. I have no objection. I support the amendment. It's appropriate to reduce the Agency's representation funds in this austere fiscal environment. Last year, the House and Senate conference committee on the bill reduced every representation account in

the bill by 10 percent. So I think MEP is a great program, and I support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. I have no higher priority in the Commerce section of the bill than MEP. I have visited with them in their meetings with local manufacturers. I visited with them in Orlando with over 1,000 manufactures from around the country. I know intimately the work that they're doing. The National Innovative Marketplace, which the gentleman refers to, has been very helpful.

This is the only program in the last year that left the House at a higher number than the Senate and left the conference committee at a higher number than the House or the Senate. So you can tell it rose to its highest level of funding at $128 million. This program started under Senator Hollings at $5 million. It's very, very important.

But not only would we accept this amendment—and I thank the chairman—but I think you have to look at what we've done in this bill in total in terms of manufacturing because the chairman has been focused on this. Over $140 million in the National Science Foundation with the Advanced Manufacturing Initiative. We have money in this for the Advanced Manufacturing Technology Consortium.

We, with the chairman's leadership, have an onshoring initiative funded at $5 million to help businesses think through their cost-benefit analysis of coming back home. And we actually held a hearing, as the last hearing of the subcommittee before we marked up our bill, focused on manufacturing. I've said there's nothing more important to the country or to my caucus than this matter. It's not a partisan issue. Manufacturing, making things in America is of importance to our national security and is important to our economy.

I want to thank you for your leadership. And I also agree with the amendment.

I will yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement section 10011(b) of Public Law 111 11.

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chair, the amendment that I'm offering is intended to fortify the underlying appropriations bill. Under the bill, the National Marine Fisheries Service and this amendment seek to ensure that funding doesn't have a detrimental impact on my district.

This amendment was adopted on the floor by a voice vote last year and added to the Energy and Water appropriations bill. Further, it was also supported in H.R. 1837 earlier this year, and you would have supported what this amendment will achieve.

The San Joaquin River Restoration Program continues to push forward on an ill-advised path of wasting water out of the ocean under the guise of saving salmon. Every year, the San Joaquin River Restoration Program would require the reintroduction of salmon into the San Joaquin River if this ill-advised attempt to introduce the species fails.

□ 2120

The problem is that the river is not yet in a condition where the salmon can survive.

There's still a number of different problems and projects along the river that need to be completed, from a bypass to several fish screens, and even in one section of the river the administration hasn't even designated a channel from where the river will flow—and will not for another 2 years.

Premature introduction of salmon in the river will only lead to their death at a high cost to taxpayers and the local community. This amendment simply prohibits the premature reintroduction of an endangered salmon species into an uninhabitable river. Central Valley salmon runs are struggling to regain healthy numbers. This amendment ensures that bureaucrats don't purposely reduce the numbers of available salmon in other streams just to plant them into the San Joaquin system and further threaten and endanger current runs.

Agencies already possess the necessary authority to make the right decision and delay the reintroduction of salmon into a river that cannot sustain the life cycle of the salmon, but they continue to bend to an environmental agenda. More time is needed to build the infrastructure required for the San Joaquin River Restoration Program before the river can sustain the salmon run.

Finally, even the National Marine Fisheries Service has doubts about the success of reintroduction. Contained within the final draft of their reintroduction strategies, the Service stated the river would not support full-scale reintroduction of the salmon. And, further, the Department of the Interior and the Department of Commerce jointly stated that the completion of phase 1 of the restoration project was needed before reintroduction of salmon can be successful.

This is a very commonsense amendment. The river needs several different projects to be completed for the salmon to even survive. So why would we, year after year, take salmon off of other tributaries, move them to somewhere they can't survive at a huge expense to taxpayers?

Mr. Chairman, it's a commonsense amendment to prevent taxpayer dollars from being wasted on killing an endangered species.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. I have no objection to the amendment. I accept the amendment, and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. I'm going to be brief.

This amendment seeks to intervene or prohibit a court-supervised settlement of an 18-year running litigation having to do with some very delicate issues that he has I think articulated around an endangered species of salmon. To do this at this hour of the night on this bill I think is not prudent. I'm opposed to it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. For more than 20 years, there's the question of what to do with the San Joaquin River, a river that was essentially dried out and a river in which the indigenous species—salmon and other fish—were simply nonexistent. That fight went on and on and on. And after 20 years of fighting and litigation, a settlement was reached—a settlement that called for the restoration of stream flows in the San Joaquin River so that the salmon and other species in that river could be returned. This amendment simply overturns that. It was a Federal court order that approved the settlement—a settlement between the water users of the CVPIA and also the environmental groups.

To do this amendment is simply going to once again reignite a major water war that is totally unnecessary. Certainly, it is going to be difficult to restore the river, but it can be done and it is going to take time and it is going to take money—and we should do it. This is one of the two largest rivers in the State of California. It's a river that had in the past, before the reservoirs were built and before the river was dried up, an extraordinary run of salmon. It will never be able to return to what it once was, but it can return to a viable river.

To take action at this hour of the night on an amendment that is going

to only be heard between half a dozen of us here on the floor seems to me to be quite wrong. We ought to oppose this amendment. We ought not allow it to be in the bill, and we ought to allow things to go forward.

I would remind those who are supporting this that this is going to be a major blowup in the U.S. Senate. I know we don't much care about that, but, nonetheless, Senator FEINSTEIN has authored legislation to implement this particular settlement. This unravels all of that. We ought not be moving forward, and I therefore oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. Thank you for yielding.

As my friend from California completely understands, we can't reintroduce salmon in an area that isn't inhabitable by salmon. It's just not only a waste of money, but it's going to kill the endangered species. Why move them from one tributary where they are surviving to one where they can't survive?

Don't take my word for it. Take the word of the National Marine Fisheries Service or the Department of the Interior or the Department of Commerce. Take the opinion of the Exchange Contractors Water Authority, the San Luis & Delta Mendota. These are the locals that live there. Why waste the money?

He knows the issue. So either he wants to kill the salmon at a huge expense or he just wants to waste the money. This does nothing to overturn the settlement. All it merely says is let's follow what was originally intended, wait until 2014 when the projects are complete, give the salmon a fighting chance to survive, and let's not waste a lot of money in the meantime.

Let's not confuse the issue. He understands this has passed the House by a voice vote. It has passed the House in a bill. And now, once again, after being debated several times in committee, in the light of day, with many amendments, with many opportunities, with the American public watching, we're going to pass it one more time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk, amendment No. 27.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Executive Office for United States Attorneys (including the offices of United States attorneys), the United States Marshals Service, or employees of the Department of Justice, to carry out activities located at a newly constructed Federal courthouse located on a site between Broadway, Hill, First, and Second Streets in Los Angeles, California.

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. This simply just prevents the funds from being used to divert vital resources to an unneeded Federal courthouse in Los Angeles.

I have the distinct privilege of chairing the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings & Emergency Management. In that capacity, I have oversight over the Federal courts.

The last Congress, at the request of this subcommittee, the GAO completed a review of the 33 courthouses constructed between 2000 and 2010. What the GAO found was incredible. GSA has built over 3.5 million square feet of courthouse space that we don't need—at a cost of $800 million. As a result, the Judiciary abandoned existing courthouses across the country and severely underutilizes every single new courthouse.

The GAO identified three reasons:

First of all, when GSA is not busy taking vacations in Las Vegas, they continue to build bigger courthouses than Congress authorizes.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

Would the gentleman clarify which amendment he offered: Amendment No. 27 printed in the RECORD or the amendment at the desk?

□ 2130

Mr. DENHAM. It is the new amendment that is at the desk that corrects the printed amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. That is the amendment that was reported by the Clerk.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DENHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

As I was saying, the GAO identified three different reasons:

GSA continues to build courthouses bigger than what Congress authorizes. Congress authorizes one thing, but then GSA goes out and builds not only something completely different, but much bigger and at much greater expense.

Number two, we don't have the judges that were once proposed.

Third, judges don't share courtrooms. These courtrooms get used about 2 hours a day, and we don't have any courtroom sharing across the Nation.

We could be utilizing these courthouses quite a bit more than what they are today. As a result, we demanded that the judiciary conduct a real courtroom-sharing study so that a third party can figure out how many judges are needed. And over the last 11 years, the judiciary projected there would be somewhere between 72 and 81 judges in L.A. by 2011.

The judiciary declared L.A. the number one judicial space emergency in the United States and proposed a massive, huge new courthouse. However, today we know the primary justification for an L.A. courthouse was wrong. There are fewer judges in L.A. today than there were in 1997. Today we have two buildings with 61 courtrooms and 59 judges. We have 61 courtrooms and only 59 judges, no courtroom sharing, being utilized less than 2 hours a day.

In that light, I have asked GSA to stop its plans to spend $400 million on a courthouse in Los Angeles. GSA has told me explicitly that they will continue with the project at whatever cost. After building a $400 million courthouse, we will have 85 courthouses and 59 judges, 85 courtrooms and 59 judges.

All of these judges—not only do we need less courtrooms, we don't need to build the one that we currently are proposing to build. You could put all of these judges in one courthouse, sell off the other courthouse, and never build the one that's being proposed at $400 million.

We've seen this before at least seven times in other cities where new courthouses were built and the old ones sit vacant today, a burden to the taxpayer and eyesores to the community. There's a big courthouse in Miami, sitting vacant. One being redone in New York, vacant. And yet we want to spend $400 million on something we don't need in Los Angeles.

I personally toured the L.A. courthouse facilities and found there's vacant space currently not being used in both the Roybal building as well as the Spring Street building. GAO ran a centralized sharing model for L.A. and found that all the judges could fit in the Roybal building alone.

This country has a $15 trillion debt, and GSA continues to waste millions of dollars on projects that no one needs. What we do need is to move everybody into the Roybal building, get rid of the vacant space, and sell off the other courthouse. At a time like this, we should be utilizing the best use of taxpayer dollars.

This is why I introduced the Civilian Property Realignment Act, to get this out of the hands of the legislature, to make sure that we are actually selling off properties we don't need.

We've sold 82 properties over the last decade, and we have 14,000 that are sitting on the vacant list. We can do a much better job, but it starts right here with the L.A. courthouse. Before we can sell off the things that we don't need, we ought to stop building the things that we don't need. Sell off the property. We can create jobs by letting the private sector go there and build something to get out of a lot of the lease space that we have in the L.A. area.

I ask my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. FATTAH. As best as I could determine, this prohibits the spending of funds; no funds would be expended under this fiscal year. So I know that the gentleman is quite energized about this, but I think it is better handled in the authorizing committees since he has legislation, and that hopefully will one day get passed and signed into law to deal with this.

If the Congress could manage buildings and deal with the utilization, you know, the Capitol Visitor Center, I mean, we can go through a whole laundry list of our own. We spend a lot of time criticizing other agencies—the GSA for conferences. You should look at what we spend. I mean, you could go through it. We could point fingers forever.

I would rather see, rather than curse the darkness, that we light a candle. We're trying to finish an appropriations bill. I'm in opposition of this amendment because it prohibits the use of funds spent on employees in a courthouse that won't have any employees this year.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Denham amendment. The building his amendment targets does not exist. That's right; the building he wants to prohibit federal agencies from occupying next year in fiscal year 2013 doesn't exist.

The Central District of California courthouse which is scheduled for construction in the near future is sorely needed to meet serious safety and security deficiencies at the current courthouse built in 1940. I am submitting for the record a memo from the U.S. Marshals Service which details these concerns. It tells of criminal defendants being escorted through hallways and in elevators with judges, jurors and the general public. It talks about the physical limitations of the aging building to meet the security challenges of the post 911 world. These issues, along with a shortage of space and concerns for the seismic stability of the building, have prompted the Judicial Conference to list the project as its number one priority since 2003.

The courthouse has been reviewed by OMB and GSA and approved in both Republican and Democratic administrations. For example, President George W. Bush requested funding for the courthouse in two of his annual budget requests to Congress and the House Transportation & Infrastructure Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee authorized it with bipartisan support. Furthermore it is important to note that this not new money. The House Appropriations Committee provided funding for this Central District Courthouse several years ago. This project has enjoyed bipartisan support from the Los Angeles County congressional delegation.

For the RECORD, I am also submitting a letter signed by both of our U.S. Senators and 17 members of the California House delegation urging the General Services Administration to move forward on the project.

Construction of the Central District courthouse will address long standing safety and security issues in the current facility in addition to bringing much needed jobs to the Los Angeles area.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this pointless amendment.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE,
Los Angeles, CA, Nov. 2, 2011.

Memorandum To: Audrey B. Collins, Chief District Judge.

From: David M. Singer, United States Marshal.

Subject: Security Issues at 312 N. Spring Street.

You have asked me to describe the physical security deficiencies of the 312 North Spring Street Courthouse. We can provide you with photographs depicting many of these deficiencies, if needed.

The United States Courthouse located at 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles CA, was built from 1937 to 1940. The age of this building and design has presented various logistical problems for The United States Marshals Service (USMS) in regards to Prisoner Operations, Court Operations, and General Courthouse Security.

LAW ENFORCEMENT GUN STORAGE LOCKERS

In the Central District of California certain law enforcement agencies are not authorized to remain armed after passing the USMS security screening sites. Because of this rule, there is a need for an area to secure the officers' and agents' firearms. The only USMS space available out of public view for the firearms locker, within close proximity to the screening site, is also the entrance for attorneys to speak with in-custody defendants. The officers and agents must remove their firearms in plain view of visiting attorneys and prisoners, showing where firearms are carried on their person.

JUDGE'S UNDERGROUND PARKING AT THE MAIN STREET ENTRANCE

Prisoners transported for court appearances at the courthouse must be offloaded in the Judges' Main Street parking garage, in plain view of judicial vehicles, license plates, make-model-color of judicial vehicles, and at times while Judges are walking to or from their vehicle.

To reach the USMS cellblock, the prisoner must walk up the same ramp and pass the same doors as the Judiciary. It is not uncommon to encounter Judges or court staff while prisoners are approaching the cellblock area.

There is always the potential for prisoners to attempt escape or be assisted by an outside threat because the Main Street garage gate entrance opens directly onto the public sidewalk and a heavily trafficked entry route to the freeways.

MOVEMENT OF PRISONERS

The hallway that serves the USMS cellblock, as well as the only prisoner elevator, is also the only way for Judges to get to their vehicles.

The area to wait for the prisoner elevator is a highly traveled common area for various agencies and contractors in the building. The court's procurement office is located off this hallway, and court staff, delivery personnel, and contractors constitute daily traffic.

The prisoner elevator does not connect directly to any of the courtrooms in the courthouse; instead, USMS staff must escort the prisoner through the public hallway, passing potential victims, prisoner family members, witnesses, jurors, and other prisoners in protective custody.

While walking to courtrooms located at the other end of the building, USMS staff must pass various entrance doors to judicial chambers.

Only two courtrooms have usable adjacent prisoner holding cells. As a result, in-custody defendants sitting in the courtroom galley across from potential victims and prisoner family.

The courtroom doors leading to judicial chambers cannot be secured due to the age of the doors' hardware and design, which cannot be altered due to the building's historic status.

All prisoner movement is done through public hallways, creating unnecessary hazards for USMS personnel, court employees and the public.

The routes from courtrooms back to the USMS cellblock require the use of the public corridors providing the potential for inappropriate verbal contact with witnesses, jurors, family members, etc.

The prisoner elevator is out of service at least once a week due to the age of the elevator. Prisoners must be escorted using the public elevators, walking through the main lobby.

There is no secure circulation for judges. The elevator utilized by judges opens to the same public lobbies used to transport prisoners.

Of the 29 courtrooms in the building, only 12 are accessible using a tunnel system which originates in the USMS cellblock.

The tunnel access uses a combination of steep stairs and narrow, winding hallways with restricted head room in various areas. The hallways have numerous blind spots from camera coverage, and an elevator that is usually not operational. For this reason the tunnel system is not regularly used.

If the tunnel access is used, prisoners must still be escorted through the rear secured judicial hallway that connects courtrooms and judicial chambers.

PHYSICAL SECURITY ISSUES

The screening stations located at the Main Street entrance, the Spring Street entrance, and the Spring Street loading dock were never designed to accommodate current upgraded security and the large crowds who visit the courthouse on a daily basis. Despite the additional concerns and potential threats posed by high threat criminal court cases and increased violence in society, we are not able to redesign these security sites due to the historic nature of the building, and the limited space available.

The ground floor windows around the courthouse are continuously a target for vandalism due to the increasing population of homeless people, as well as anti-government protests occurring daily at surrounding local and state government buildings. The windows' general make-up is inconsistent around the building, with some windows being bullet resistant, some with a protective mylar film, and some with just solar tinting film. The historic status of the building makes it difficult, if not impossible, to install bullet resistant glass in all first floor windows. Three ground floor windows have been broken by vandals in the past year alone.

The courthouse lacks available handicap access on the Main Street entrance, the most heavily used access. The courthouse thus must have two entrances, Main Street and Spring Street, which requires staffing by six court security officers (CSOs) rather than just one entry where we can put less CSOs, concentrating staffing more effectively at a single controlled entry point.

HIGH THREAT TRIALS

The Spring Street Courthouse is an unsafe physical facility for the transport of even one prisoner. Here are examples of some of the high threat, multi-defendant trials held in downtown Los Angeles. They provide a vivid picture of the type of defendant, defendant families, witnesses, and victims involved in federal criminal proceedings held

in the Spring Street and Roybal court facilities.

1. U.S. v. Orozco et al. The indictment names 53 defendants who are all members or associates of the 38th Street gang, and charges them with RICO, VICAR, drug trafficking/possession, firearms trafficking/possession, and conspiracy to tamper with witnesses.

2. U.S. v. Santiago Rios, et al. The indictment charges 51 defendants who are all members and associates of the Azusa 13 criminal street gang or validated members and associates of the Mexican Mafia. The charges are RICO conspiracy, civil rights violations, weapons and narcotics offenses.

3. U.S. v. Darbinyan. The case involved 70 defendants who were members or associates of the Armenian Power Criminal Enterprise. Approximately 15 of the defendants would be categorized as very dangerous based on their criminal histories and/or criminal conduct during the investigation.

4. U.S. V. Ron Hirsch. This is the synagogue bomber case. The defendant is charged with attempting to blow up a synagogue with a large pipe bomb. This case received considerable national media coverage.

5. U.S. V. Oscar Juarez, et al. The indictment charges 5 defendants, two of whom are Clanton 14 gang members, with Hobbs Act Robbery, 924(c), and Conspiracy to Distribute Cocaine charges.

6. U.S. V. Edwin Mauricio Palacios. A 1326 case involving an MS 13 gang member whose criminal convictions included a 1995 conviction for second degree robbery, 2008 conviction for terrorist threats, and two arrests for participating in a prison riot.

7. U.S. v. Raul Mercado Mercado. This is a 1326 case involving a Sangra gang member with a prior 1996 conviction for voluntary manslaughter and robbery.

8. Operation Silent Night. There were approximately 30 defendants arrested. Extra manpower was needed at all times for movement due to the high security risks. The defendants are charged with numerous homicides, including the murder of a Burbank Police Officer. They are also charged with narcotics trafficking, extortion, and racketeering. This is a capital offense case.

9. Twenty defendants in another case are all gang members of the East Side Wilmas, and were charged with murder, as well as conspiracy. They are also charged with distribution of illegal narcotics.

TERRORISM CASE

10. U.S. v. Mihalik. The indictment returned August 30, 2011 charges one defendant with making a false statement in a terrorism matter.

MULTI-DEFENDANT COURTROOM IN ROYBAL

The availability of this courtroom assists the USMS and judges in the Spring Street courthouse who need to be conducting high threat, multi-defendant trials as it was built out specifically for such proceedings. Use of the courtroom requires the USMS to provide security transportation from Spring Street, where the judge has parking, to Roybal, two blocks away from chambers.

On a regular basis, however, there are far too many criminal proceedings for the 21 district judges to hold their criminal calendars all in this one courtroom. In 2011, for example, 1,685 defendants had proceedings in downtown Los Angeles, or 48 criminal cases per judge. Virtually all judges hold criminal calendar on Mondays making use of the Roybal multi-defendant courtroom unavailable to more than one judge at a time. Roybal judges also use the courtroom.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, October 28, 2011.

Hon. MARTHA N. JOHNSON,
Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, DC.

DEAR ADMINISTRATOR JOHNSON: We write to urge the General Services Administration (GSA) to proceed immediately with construction of a new federal courthouse for the United States District Court, Central District of California in Los Angeles. Congress first authorized site, design and acquisition in 2000 and the project was declared a space emergency by the Judicial Conference of the United States in 2003 and has been the Judiciary's top building priority since that time. It has been delayed too long.

Located in one of the busiest metropolitan areas in the nation, the Los Angeles court handles a high percentage of complex criminal cases related to drugs, murder, mafia, and terrorism. A request to create new permanent judgeships for the district, many of which will be placed in Los Angeles, is currently pending before Congress to handle the court's pressing caseload. Moreover, additional growth is expected in the near future when several active judges in existing judgeships assume senior status and their replacements come on board. The two buildings that currently house the court already suffer from critical security and operational deficiencies that will only be exacerbated as the court grows.

Congress approved the funding for GSA to construct the new courthouse in fiscal years 2004 and 2005, but escalating construction costs at the time caused the project budget to exceed the appropriation. With no additional funding available to build the project as planned, congressional committees directed the court and GSA to work together and agree on a building that could be built within the funds appropriated. It is our understanding that GSA and the court have now reached agreement on a proposal that will do just that. We hope, therefore, that GSA will proceed with the process of awarding a contract to build the new courthouse.

In closing, we want to stress again the critical need of the Los Angeles community to have safe, functional and efficient facilities in which to litigate cases and redress grievances. The new courthouse that is currently planned will allow them to do so. Building the courthouse, moreover, will create thousands of construction and related jobs, which are sorely needed in an area where unemployment exceeds 12% and a large percentage of the unemployed are in the construction industry. We commend GSA and the court for developing a new courthouse plan that can accommodate the needs of the Los Angeles community within the funds that have been appropriated for this project and we ask you to move ahead without delay.

Sincerely,

Dianne Feinstein, Barbara Boxer, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Grace F. Napolitano, Henry A. Waxman, Judy Shu, Howard L. Berman, Lois Capps, John Garamendi, Doris O. Matsui, Xavier Becerra, Laura Richardson, Loretta Sanchez, Barbara Lee, Bob Filner, Adam B. Schiff, Janice Hahn, Linda T. Sánchez, Karen Bass.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk labeled as Flake No. 2.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR SELECTUSA INITIATIVE

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may used to carry out the SelectUSA initiative.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funding for President Obama's SelectUSA Initiative. It's a program that would otherwise receive just over $6 million in this bill.

Now, if you've never heard of SelectUSA, you're not alone. Virtually nobody has heard of it outside of the committee and those who are funding it.

Last June, President Obama issued an Executive order to establish SelectUSA. It was called the first-ever Federal effort to attract, retain, and expand business investment in the United States.

It seems to me that whenever a new Federal program is touted as the first of its kind, it's usually a pretty good indication that it's completely unnecessary. This is no exception to the rule.

A quick read of the vague ways in which SelectUSA says it serves the firms and economic development organizations certainly proves that—promoting the benefits of investing in the U.S.A., responding to inquiries about the U.S. business climate, helping investors confused by regulatory processes, offering guidance—these are hardly the responsibilities of the Federal Government.

In reality, it seems that the taxpayers are buying little more than a Web site pitching the benefits of U.S. subsidiaries to foreign companies. It includes 10 pages of links to Federal subsidized programs like Grants.gov, AARP-E, and the Department of Energy Loan Guarantee Program. That was the program responsible for Solyndra. Only the Federal Government could find a way to waste taxpayer dollars promoting the waste of taxpayer dollars.

Figuring out what SelectUSA does is one thing; deciphering its actual accomplishments is downright impossible. The Web site includes testimonials from companies like Rolls-Royce and Ikea, of plans to invest and develop in the U.S. These companies already do. This SelectUSA isn't helping them any more than it is helping anyone else. All the announcements are dated between 2006 and 2010, long before this program was even established. So these companies are touting the benefits of a program that wasn't even established yet; how do they know?

Hours of research by our staff uncovered only one investment that's even tied to SelectUSA, and those claims are very dubious. There's a company that's called AGS, and the President has touted this in his program as being

responsible for luring AGS to the U.S. It's mentioned in conjunction with the Michigan Economic Development Corporation and other local agencies, and it recently elected to invest more than $20 million in new U.S. manufacturing capabilities. SelectUSA, described as an Obama-launched program, is said to have facilitated coordination between AGS and local officials. But if you look at AGS, AGS has been in this country for more than 40 years, just under a different name. It was called A.G. Simpson Automotive. It's been in business, as I said, with General Motors and Ford for more than 40 years. That company has been a manufacturing presence in the U.S. since it opened a Michigan plant in 1991. Another plant was opened in Louisiana in 2003. This hardly sounds like a company that needed SelectUSA to help it discover the benefits of investing in the U.S.

□ 2140

There is simply no record of this investment outside of the administration press release and the Commerce Department blog post—not from AGS, not from the Michigan Economic Development Corporation, not even from SelectUSA. Only an administration press release touts the involvement of SelectUSA.

Most telling of all, the 2013 Commerce Department budget justification to Congress—which requested $12 million and 20 additional full-time employees—doesn't even include a word about the AGS investment. So what does SelectUSA even do? Well, I think the committee isn't even sure what SelectUSA does because the report language in this bill asks SelectUSA to justify what it does and explain what it does because apparently nobody even knows. Yet we took the request from the administration of $12 million and simply cut it in half and gave them half of what they requested.

Why in the world are we doing this? At what point are we going to say we can't afford to throw money away like this? Congress didn't even create this program. It was just the administration who thought it up and now is trying to justify it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Hopefully, this will be the last time when I have to oppose my good friend on the floor of the House.

Let me just try to put this in some perspective. This is an administration that, in the last 26 months, 4.25 million new private sector jobs. In '09, $70 billion in loans to small businesses. An administration that's well on its way to more than doubling the number of exports. We have seen a very significant turnaround from the administration that left a couple of years ago, walking out the door while we were losing 700,000 jobs a month, and we lost millions of jobs over the last few months of the last administration.

So now they have a Commerce Department that says we're willing to build on the efforts to have companies around the world select the United States as a place where they want to set up manufacturing plants stretched throughout much of our country now. The President visited the Rolls Royce plant in Virginia. In Alabama, you have BMWs being built. All throughout, you see companies that see the United States as a place that has a world-class workforce, the kind of transparency, the rule of law, the ability to do transactions and have them protected in a court system that functions, to attract foreign investment here.

So what the Commerce Department has done, which is not unlike other administrations, they take in a group of these activities and they've rebranded them under SelectUSA because it's catchy, it's got a phrase to it. But these are activities that have been conducted by other administrations and will be conducted by future administrations because we want businesses to see the United States as the place to locate—even in States like Arizona, to locate and put people to work and make products.

So to come to the floor and say, well, this $6 million is wasted—no. This is a small investment that leads to billions of dollars in salaries, hundreds of millions in tax ratables for our country. We want to be open for business. This is a new day. It's a new administration. They have been creating jobs. I guess that some want to wish back the old crowd that were losing jobs, but I think we should follow in the right direction here.

I disagree with the gentleman. I hope that we vote down this amendment, and that we support the activities of our Commerce Department to continue to build this economy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I yield to my friend from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would simply submit that when the committee has to ask in report language, please justify and tell us what you're doing, it's a pretty good indication that we don't know and that the program is frivolous and we're wasting money with it.

So, right here, SelectUSA, let me read from the committee report: ''The committee recommends $6.125 million for SelectUSA initiative, which is $3.425 million more than the fiscal year 2012 level and $6.125 million less than the request''—like I said, simply cut the request in half. ''The ITA redirected $2.7 million in FY 2012''—on and on and on. It says:

No later than November 30, 2013, the Secretary shall report on the location and type of assistance provided, the State to which firms sought to relocate and why, as well as the number of foreign firms that actually decided to locate in the United States as a result of the SelectUSA process.

I would submit that if we didn't know this by now, why in the world are we giving them 6.125 million more dollars? We're running a deficit of $1.3 trillion, and we're frittering away money like this when we don't even know what they're doing.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. The gentleman from Georgia, I thank you. And we'll be together tomorrow morning at the prayer service—8 a.m.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I'm looking forward to that.

Mr. FATTAH. But let me say this: Georgia has benefited from this effort, and Arizona has benefited, Pennsylvania has benefited. The report language you see is just the work of the committee to ensure oversight for the funds that are now being provided, for a report on those funds and what States benefit so that when we have some other gentleman on the floor wanting to cut this program years forth from now, that we'll have an opportunity to be able to specify, as I've done, the great work that this program is doing.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FLAKE. Let me simply say that when we don't know what they're doing and the only justification comes from the administration that a company called AGS, that has already been investing in this country for more than 40 years, that needs no help in deciding or having a matchmaker pair them with U.S. firms—in fact, this is a Canadian firm investing in the U.S. They actually received trade adjustment assistance during a downturn when employees were laid off from a Canadian company in the U.S. I would submit that if a company knows how to milk the U.S. taxpayer for that, a foreign company, they know how to invest here. They know it pretty well. We've advertised it. In fact, what this Web site of this SelectUSA does is tell them the benefits they can receive if they're here—often subsidies like this.

So I would just submit, Mr. Chairman, we've got to start somewhere, and this ought to be it. I can't stress enough how we've got to start cutting some spending. This is a great place to start.

With that, I urge adoption of the amendment and thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, designated as No. 3.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 101, after line 10, insert the following new section:

SEC. 542. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the functions of the Political Science Program in the Division of Social and Economic Sciences of the Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences of the National Science Foundation.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit the National Science Foundation from using taxpayer dollars to fund political science research.

To be clear, my amendment does not reduce funding for the NSF. Earlier in consideration of this bill, I offered an amendment that would reduce NSF funding. This amendment is simply oriented toward ensuring, at the least, that the NSF does not waste taxpayer dollars on a meritless program.

□ 2150

The Nation is closing in on a $16 trillion debt; deficit, more than $1.3 trillion. Nearly 40 cents of every dollar we spend is borrowed. Congress can either continue funding unnecessary programs like someone is printing cash in the basement, or we can face facts that there simply isn't enough money to go around.

Now, I stand here today and I'll defend responsible Federal spending on matters of Federal responsibility. Among other things, Congress ought to ensure funding for strong national defense, a secure border.

There are things, however, given the economic realities, that Congress ought to reconsider funding on the back of future generations. Just remember, every dollar we're spending in discretionary spending this year, we are borrowing from our kids and our grandkids.

Let me simply say I can think of few finer examples to cut than the National Science Foundation's Political Science Program. According to the NSF Web site, to date, more than $80 million has been awarded to the program's nearly 200 active projects. Three-quarters of these awards, totaling over $46 million, were directed to universities with endowments greater than $1 billion.

Again, three-quarters of these awards under this program for political science research, totaling over $46 million, were directed to universities that have endowments greater than $1 billion.

Think about it. Three out of the four of the grants awarded by the NSF Political Science Program go to the wealthiest universities in the country. Would those who would oppose this amendment have believed that Harvard and Yale would have to close their political science departments if Federal grants are not available for this program? Of course not. These universities and the field of political science will be just fine.

However, my greatest concern is not who received these funds, but how they are spent. Every dollar Congress spends is money we don't have, as I mentioned.

So what kind of research is NSF charging to our credit card? $700,000 to develop a new model for international climate change analysis; $600,000 to try to figure out if policymakers actually do what citizens want them to do.

Let me say that again: $600,000 here spent trying to figure out if policymakers actually do what citizens want them to do. I think we can answer that question in about 5 minutes when we vote on this amendment because I can tell you, people out there want us to quit funding projects like this.

$301,000 to study gender and political ambition among high school and college students; $200,000 to study to determine why political candidates make vague statements. $200,000 to study why political candidates make vague statements. That's what we're paying for here.

These studies might satisfy the curiosities of a few academics, but I seriously doubt society will benefit from them. How can we justify this outcome?

Now, I hold a graduate degree in political science myself. I agree that such research has its benefits. The work of political scientists advances the knowledge and understanding of citizenship and government, politics, and this shouldn't be minimized. But they shouldn't be subsidized by the National Science Foundation.

We can't continue to spend money like this. I urge adoption of the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. So hope springs eternal, but here I am again opposing my friend's amendment.

Let me say, this program has been around for over 30 years, and a lot of political change has swept across the world from the time that this program started.

I think that it may appear to be costly, $11 million out of a $7 billion funding for the National Science Foundation, but I think that however expensive an education may be, ignorance will probably cost our country more.

It is important that we understand the political dynamics, radicalization of populations around the world, how political parties operate in the former Soviet Union, all of the other issues that are being studied.

I can see that you could probably bring a list of studies in front of the Congress from the National Science Foundation and get a laugh on any day. But these studies are important. They're merit based. They're decided on merit only.

The fact that some of the best funded universities win has to do, in part, with the fact that they're able to have very good faculty who put together very good research projects, and they provide our country and our society a great deal of intellectual benefit.

Now, there's some advantage, I guess, politically to appear to be anti-intellectual, to have some desire to know little or less about what's going on in the world about us. But it is not worthy of a great Nation.

Now, Singapore has 4.8 million people. They put $7 billion in the National Science Foundation. We put $7 billion, and we spend our time tonight debating whether we want to cut some money, trying to understand how their political system got to the point of understanding that even in a very small country, it was critically important for them to become indispensable in terms of having a thirst for knowledge.

I would hope that this House would reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield to my good friend from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let me just say, and I won't take all the time, but there is something to the ''laugh factor.'' At some point we've got to realize here that the country's watching us, and they're looking to see if we're funding programs like $600,000 to try to figure out if policymakers actually do what citizens want them to do? $200,000 to study why political candidates make vague statements?

We're funding this with taxpayer dollars. The acid test ought to be for all of us, whenever we're spending money here, is this program worth borrowing money from our kids and our grandkids, from some countries, that don't like us very much who are buying our bonds?

And this doesn't pass that test. It doesn't even come close. And if we simply say this is a big NSF budget and this is a very small part of this, this program, if we continue to say that, we'll never cut it, and that's the problem here. We aren't.

The NSF funding, overall, is way up from the post-stimulus level. We said at the time that the stimulus was passed that that's just a one-time deal, and these rates will come down, or these programs will come down. They haven't. We're continuing to fund

them. And programs like this, the country just looks around and says, this is laughable. Look at what our policymakers are doing.

Again, I would say that we will find out the question, the $600,000 question, as to whether or not policymakers actually do what citizens want them to do, by how we vote on this amendment right now.

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

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out or enforce section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973c).

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would simply prohibit any funds in this underlying bill from being used to carry out or enforce section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Under section 5, seven States in the South, as well as Arizona, Texas, and a number of counties scattered across the country, are required to receive Federal pre-clearance to every change they make in election laws.

The provision stipulates that only changes to election law in those covered locations which are shown to be nondiscriminatory may be pre-cleared. Unfortunately, the burden of proving that a change is nondiscriminatory is on the State or locality which wishes to make the change.

The standard and practice is known to be highly subjective, with no presumption of innocence.

□ 2200

It is also highly unfair to allow some States to make changes to their election laws while other States wishing to make the same changes are forced to jump through a bunch of hoops. I know firsthand how onerous this law is.

My home State of Georgia, as an example, has long struggled with the U.S. Department of Justice over its voter identification laws. They're not alone. The State of Arizona is currently suing to be free from section 5, showing evidence that it made accommodations for Spanish-speaking voters long ago. On the other side of the country, South Carolina is challenging the Department of Justice's decision to overturn its voter identification law.

Mr. Chairman, as Americans, we pride ourselves in our electoral system, but the integrity of our elections is called into question when this outdated law bars States from ensuring those who come to the polls to vote are eligible to do so.

I should note that I'm not the only one who believes that section 5 is an antiquated provision. Earlier this very year, the U.S. Supreme Court reaffirmed its concern about what they stated: serious constitutional questions raised by section 5's intrusion into State sovereignty.

Mr. Chairman, we are supposed to be treated equal under the law. This section of Federal statute treats some States more equal than other States. There are States being discriminated against. My home State of Georgia is one of those. It's time for us to go to what the Constitution says is the way we should all be treated: equal under the law. It's long past time to put this provision to rest. I urge the support of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FARR. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

First of all, this is an appropriations bill. We're supposed to be discussing how we appropriate money to the Justice Department, Commerce Department, and State Department. People are just kind of cavaliering, coming in here and offering all kinds of amendments to make no funds available. That isn't the way you set policy, and that isn't the way you have a discussion on an issue like this. This is a very important issue. This is about enforcing the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. You don't think we had discrimination in this country? Don't you think we still have discrimination and are making it difficult for people to access the voting booth?

I come from a county, a district, that is under this section. I'm from California. The gentleman spoke about Georgia. There are States, even like California, that have counties that qualify to be under this act because they had so low of a percentage of adults registered to vote. Obviously, these counties were making it very difficult. What this says is that in those counties, when you draw political districts, you've got to have them reviewed by the Justice Department. What's wrong with that?

We have a history of discrimination. To come in to an appropriations bill and take a big whack out of it in the Voting Rights Act in an election year, what message are we sending—that these States that want to make it very difficult for people to vote are showing how democracy ought to be practiced around the world?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. No, I will not yield to the gentleman.

I think these and a lot of other amendments warrant some serious debate in Congress, but certainly not on this bill and not at this time—10 o'clock at night, in an election year, on a Voting Rights Act bill that deals with the basic fundamental rights of individuals being able to have access to the ballot. No, sir. This amendment is inappropriate at this time, and it ought to be voted down.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank my friend.

I would like to remind my good friend from California that Georgia's voter identification law has been upheld by the courts. The provision of voter identification is simply to ensure integrity at the polls: that the people who are voting are the people who are supposed to be voting.

We have all heard and have joked about the saying in Chicago about ''vote early and vote often.'' The only way we can ensure the integrity of the vote, the only way we can ensure that people who are voting are those who are supposed to be voting, is by having some identification. That's simply what this is all about. It's not to prohibit people from coming to the polls. It's not to prohibit or to discriminate against anybody. Who is being discriminated against here are the States, those jurisdictions that are falling under section 5.

We should all be treated equal under the law. I don't believe in discrimination for or against anybody. We have a history of discrimination in my State and throughout the country, and we still have discrimination. I find discrimination deplorable—and I reject it in any manner—but we should all be treated equal under the law. We need to make sure that we have integrity at the polls. We need to make sure that the people who are voting are truly the people who say they are.

I know, in some jurisdictions, a person just walks to the polling area and says, I'm Joe Smith.

Then they say, Fine. I see you here on the polls. Go vote.

We can't have this in this country. It's not right, and it's not fair. Joe Smith needs to have absolute assurance that the person he voted for won it fair and square—that elections are not stolen, that elections are fair, that whoever comes out at the top of the ballot is the one who really won.

So this is not about discrimination. It's not preventing anyone from voting. It's simply just to make sure we have integrity so that the people across this country can be sure that their votes count and can be sure that somebody else who may be an illegal in this country or who may not be qualified to vote for whatever reason or who may have already voted but who wants to vote a second time is not doing so.

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

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

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

Mr. WOLF. I was the only member of the Virginia delegation to vote for the Voting Rights Act in 1982. I attended school for 1 year in a State in which I saw things that were different than I had seen before. And there is a Simon and Garfunkel song called ''The Boxer'': ''The man hears what he wants to hear and disregards the rest.'' We really can't disregard what has taken place in the country.

Now, we may be reaching a point at which this should be looked at again. I believe there is no discrimination now in my State. I think the Judiciary Committee ought to look at this carefully, but this is not the place to do this, and it is such a sensitive issue.

Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act applies to jurisdictions determined to have had a history of discrimination against minority voters. Section 5 requires certain covered jurisdictions, based on the formula set forth in section 4, to pre-clear their congressional redistricting plans with either the Department of Justice or with the U.S. Court for the District of Columbia before implementation. In order to be granted pre-clearance, jurisdiction has the burden of proving that the proposed voting change neither has the purpose nor will have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color or membership in a language minority group.

Litigation is pending now in the Federal District Court, including the case of Texas v. Holder, which challenges the constitutionality of the coverage formula and pre-clearance requirements in sections 4 and 5. In its 2009 decision in Northwest Austin Municipal Utility District No. 1 v. Holder, the Supreme Court may have signaled a willingness to reconsider the constitutionality of the pre-clearance regime and coverage formula.

But this is not an amendment that, I think, is appropriate here. Again, as we deal with this thing, we have to be very, very sensitive because, quite frankly, I remember in 1982, when I voted for this, there were editorials in the Richmond Times-Dispatch that were ripping me apart for this vote.

□ 2210

But because I do believe that everyone should have the right to vote, I voted for it.

But I would also say, to end, we may be approaching a time that this would go because we want a Nation where no one is discriminated against, and we may have reached that point. But I think the Judiciary Committee should hold extensive hearings and we should see what the Supreme Court does. I don't think this is the place to do it, and I strongly rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I've enjoyed a great relationship with the gentleman during his tenure in the Congress.

You mentioned several times in your remarks that there might be an appropriate time. How do you objectively determine when there is an appropriate time for not extending Section 5 to the covered jurisdictions?

Mr. WOLF. I am not a legal scholar, and at 10:10, I don't think I can do it, but there may be a time.

I believe now in my State there is not discrimination with regard to voting. I think our Governor is a good, decent guy, and I don't think he wants to discriminate against anybody. The members of the general assembly are of that same mind. Yet there had been in a case in previous times in the State of Virginia, so I'm not going to be the—I went to Georgetown Law School. It's an accredited law school, but I'm not going to sit here tonight and lay it out.

I don't think this is what we ought to do tonight. I initially wasn't going to speak, but I just feel strongly. Again, I go back. I remember in 1982 voting for this, and people felt it and I just felt in my heart this was the right thing to do. As of now in my heart, it tells me we ought not adopt this amendment, and we can have the Judiciary Committee hold hearings both in the House and the Senate. We can see what the Supreme Court will do. I just don't think this is the place for this amendment, and I strongly oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. It is hard and difficult and almost unbelievable that any Member, especially a Member from the State of Georgia, would come and offer such an amendment.

There is a long history in our country, especially in the 11 States that are old Confederacy—from Virginia to Texas—of discrimination based on race, on color. Maybe some of us need to study a little contemporary history dealing with the question of voting rights.

Before the Voting Rights Act of 1965, it was almost impossible for many people in the State of Georgia, in Alabama, in Virginia, and in Texas to register to vote, to participate in the democratic process. The State of Mississippi, for example, had a black voting age population of more than 450,000 and only about 16,000 were registered to vote. In one county in Alabama, the county was more than 80 percent and there was not a single registered African American voter. People had to pass a so-called ''literacy test''; interpreting sections of the Constitution. One man was asked to count the number of bubbles on a bar of soup and another man was asked to count the number of jelly beans in a jar.

It's shameful that you would come here tonight and say to the Department of Justice that you must not use one penny, one cent, one dime, one dollar to carry out the mandate of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. We should open up the political process and let all of our citizens come in and participate. People died for the right to vote—friends of mine, colleagues of mine—to speak out against this amendment. It doesn't have a place.

I agree with the chairman.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. No, I will not yield.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, let me first associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), who paid the price for this Voting Right Acts of 1965 on the Edmund Pettus Bridge. He paid beyond measure. He sacrificed beyond measure to make this a reality for every American.

This near midnight attack is an unprecedented attack on the implementation legislation of the 15th Amendment to the Constitution, the 1965 Voting Rights Act. It took this Congress 95 years from the moment that the 15th Amendment was added to the Constitution of the United States for this Congress to wake up after Selma to Montgomery to pass legislation to implement the Voting Rights Act.

For me to stand here and listen to my distinguished colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the subcommittee, for him to argue that there may be a time and we may be approaching a time when the Voting Rights Act preclearance provision of Section 5 is no longer necessary couldn't be further from the truth.

Here's how the State legislative process works within most of the State legislatures. First, whoever is in the political majority, Democrat or Republican, usually draws legislative lines consistent with their political advantage, whether it's the Democratic Party or whether it is the Republican Party.

Such is the case in Illinois. Such is the case of every State in the Union.

Almost never before the 1965 Voting Rights Act had racial minorities or language minorities ever been considered as a factor in the ongoing partisan debate for the last 150 years between Democrats and Republicans. Only the Voting Rights Act of 1965 says that if a language minority or a racial minority in a protected jurisdiction can draw a congressional district or can draw a State Representative district or can draw a State Senatorial district to give a racial minority an opportunity to represent their own people in a legislative body, the State legislative body must take that into account.

For us to be standing here on the floor of the Congress arguing about the right to vote, we're not discussing at that level the right to vote. We're discussing whether or not legislators will be effective in representing their constituents by protecting Section 5, the preclearance provision, because most of us can't go to our Governors or our State legislatures to protect the franchise from minorities.

I know that the First Congressional District, the Second Congressional District, the Seventh Congressional District, the Fourth Congressional District of Illinois are all Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act congressional districts, from Virginia around to Texas, because we still cannot trust Democrats, because we still cannot trust Republicans in Virginia, all the way around to Texas, to consider racial minorities in the drawing of congressional districts. Sure, those States must implement their plans by submitting their plans to the Federal Government for preclearance.

Look at the language minorities. Look at what's taking place in Texas. Look at what's taking place in New Mexico. New Mexico, a State that is 25 percent Latino, and the State legislature played games with what constitutes an effective congressional district that might give a Latino an opportunity to represent a congressional district in Congress. It plays both sides against the middle.

Both Democrats and Republicans, through history, Mr. Chairman, have used race as a partisan advantage in trying to draw congressional districts and legislative districts.

I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, to reject this amendment at midnight; reject this unconstitutional, unprecedented attack on the civil rights of every American; reject efforts to undermine the implementation legislation of the 15th Amendment earned through an American Civil War, along with No. 13, 14, and 15; reject this effort to roll back the civil rights gains of 1965 by undermining the funding in the Federal Government's capacity to ensure that minorities have a chance to represent themselves in the Congress of the United States; reject this effort on this evening. Both Democrats and Republicans should reject it in a bipartisan manner.

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

□ 2220

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, one of the proudest moments of my experience here in the House is having worked on a bipartisan basis on the extension of the Voting Rights Act in the 1980s. I had been involved in the extension of the Voting Rights Act several Congresses ago. But also, as attorney general of the State of California, I was involved in the preclearance procedures by the Justice Department with several of the jurisdictions in my home State.

The Voting Rights Act has stood as one of the great efforts of progress in this country; but as the U.S. Supreme Court said, as it reviewed the preclearance requirements some years ago, There will come a time when this unprecedented power of the Federal Government versus the sovereignty of the States will end.

The preclearance requirement contained in the Voting Rights Act is an anomaly, a necessary anomaly over history, but it is an anomaly. And we should understand that the Court viewed it as such.

The problem I have with the current status of the Voting Rights Act is that it gives no opportunity for an escape clause by those jurisdictions that have proven, over the decades, that they have, in fact, changed their practices. There is no means by which a jurisdiction can come forward and show that over a decade, they have not, in fact, discriminated but have acted appropriately and, therefore, this tremendous Justice Department authority will be no more there.

But this is not the place to deal with it, I would say. A funding resolution is not the place to deal with it. This is an important issue that ought to be addressed; and I would hope that my friends on the other side of the aisle would recognize that when you have a jurisdiction that has for 10, 20, 30, 40 years followed the law, perhaps we ought to reward them and provide incentives for other jurisdictions to do the same. Also, historically, there is a reason—almost a historical accident by which some of the jurisdictions in California are covered. It had to do with a low turnout election in which a large percentage of the people who were considered citizens happened to be military folks who didn't vote in that area in that particular election. And there's been a static analysis which has resulted in those jurisdictions continuing to be covered under that section of the law which allows this unprecedented authority of the Justice Department to preclear.

And I would hope that we would have the courage to stand up and look at the changes that have taken place and give credit to the consensus of conscience of civil rights that I think has prevailed in this country and has aided us greatly.

But I would just say, this is not the time nor the place for us to, within a short period of time on the floor of the House, try to make a significant change in that. And, therefore, with all due respect to my friend from Georgia who points out some of the problems here, I would have to oppose this amendment. But I would hope that we would have the courage to come to the floor and recognize that changes may be necessary.

This is an unprecedented authority that is granted to the Justice Department. No other jurisdictions are required to come before the Justice Department and ask for their permission as to whether they could make a change as simple as changing a date or making any change with respect to any election process in that jurisdiction.

So I would hope my friends on the other side who have, I think, appropriately opposed the gentleman's amendment would also recognize that there is a large area in which we should discuss the current status, vis-a-vis the current fact situations that exist with all jurisdictions.

Let us hope that as bad as the conduct has been in the past, that we believe in redemption and that we believe that there can be changed hearts, and we believe that we can change practices and that we believe that, in fact, maybe the good will of our fellow citizens will prevail. And when it has done so, let us recognize that, give them credit for it, and in the law provide incentives for other jurisdictions to also change their ways.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I ask that we not support this amendment, but at the same time recognize the legitimacy of the shortcomings of the law, as applied currently, and the failure of the Congress to make the changes to give credit to those jurisdictions that have, in fact, acted in good faith.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. Let me just make a couple of comments. I think that we've seen why this is not the process for these types of riders on a bill. In States that are not covered by section 5, there have been outrageous circumstances as it relates particularly to African Americans and access to the franchise. In Philadelphia, Octavius Catto was beaten to death just a few blocks from my childhood home when he tried to exercise his right to vote.

But our country has come a long way. We've made a lot of progress. But section 5 is there for a reason. In these States in the South, Nazi prisoners of war were treated better than African Americans who had served in the war.

For the party of Lincoln to be on the floor of the House today on this issue, when there were really Republicans that had joined in in the passage of the Voting Rights Act, where Members of my party refused to be willing to grant these rights to African Americans and to others, I think, is unfortunate. But I think we may be at a point where we can move forward.

To my friend from Georgia, who we are going to be in worship together tomorrow morning at 8 a.m., I yield to you.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I apologize to my dear friend from Georgia if he's gotten angry with this amendment. It was never my intent to do so. And I am going to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

I deplore discrimination of any kind. As far as I am concerned, I believe in the Bible. I think it's the only standard of truth that we have. As far as I am concerned, there is only one race of people: it's the human race because we all came from Adam and Eve. And no one—no one should be discriminated against for any reason.

I have the same dream that Martin Luther King had, where people are accepted for their character and are not discriminated against for their skin or their forefathers or anything else. And any insinuation that I would ever believe in any kind of discrimination or that I would try to suppress anyone from having their constitutionally given rights, I detest that accusation, frankly.

Mr. FATTAH. The hour is late. Reclaiming my time, I want to thank you for withdrawing your amendment. And I thank the chairman for his previous statements in this regard.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I apologize for any hurt feelings that anyone has because I certainly wasn't meaning to try to hurt anybody's feelings.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, I thank you very much.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. HUELSKAMP

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available under this Act, may be used in contravention of the Defense of Marriage Act (Public Law 104 199).

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I know the hour is late; but as I think many of us believe, our Nation is not a Nation of men; it's a Nation of laws. When a Congress passes and a President of any party signs a bill into law, Mr. Chairman, it is the law of the land. And if a new President or a new Attorney General does not like an existing law when they come into office, it's not his or her prerogative to decide whether or not to enforce that particular law.

□ 2230

It is his or her constitutional obligation to defend it. But somehow, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry to say this fact is lost on the current administration. In a very clear and flagrant violation of its responsibilities, the U.S. Department of Justice, under the direction of Attorney General Eric Holder, and with the blessing of the President, have decided not to enforce the Defense of Marriage Act, which has been the law of the land since JOE BIDEN voted for it in 1996 and it was signed into law by President Bill Clinton.

Tonight, I'm offering an amendment to prevent the Department of Justice from spending taxpayer money to undermine the Defense of Marriage Act and stop the Department of Justice from ultimately undermining the rule of law.

As many of us know, just last night the 30th State actually passed an amendment to amend its Constitution to protect traditional marriage. That would be the State of North Carolina. In my opinion, it likely becomes an easy target for the administration. My amendment would also prevent the Department of Justice from interfering in North Carolina, or any other State, over its marriage amendments and marriage laws.

We have 30 States that have marriage amendments: Alaska, Nevada, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Oregon Colorado, Tennessee, Arizona, California, Nebraska, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Utah, Texas, my favorite State, Kansas, Alabama, Idaho, South Carolina, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Florida, North Carolina, Michigan, and Virginia.

The population of each of these States passed the marriage amendment to define marriage as they saw fit, and this amendment would protect those definitions from any contribution by this Department.

The Department of Justice and the President of the United States do not have to agree with the law, Mr. Chairman, but they certainly have to enforce it and respect it.

Even though I believe it would be in their political best interest to do so, 30 States have constitutional amendments, again, defining marriage between one man and one woman. We have current officials of this administration that have expressed their political preferences against traditional marriage, against the Defense of Marriage Act, and against various marriage amendments. But whatever the platform contains, whatever their personal preferences are, unless those laws are changed, unless those amendments are repealed by the people of these States, they stand to remain the law of their States and they remain the law of the land.

It's clear, in my opinion, the administration is turning the Justice Department into a legal mouthpiece for its campaign rather than its purpose: to enforce the law. Most concerning is the fact that in turning the Justice Department into an instrument for legislating political favors rather than enforcing the rule of law, this becomes the Department of Politics, in my opinion—not the Department of Justice.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, support the folks of 30 States, the citizens who have made decisions, and also the citizens of 50 States that have passed their marriage laws. These are protected under the Defense of Marriage Act under contravention by those of us in Washington.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, to begin, I have read this amendment. And if it were to be law in an hour, it does not appear that it would affect anything that's now happening in the Federal Government.

The gentleman said that they were trying to undermine the act and that they should enforce it. In fact, the administration has been very clear: while they disagreed with the act, they would like it repealed, they in fact believe it's unconstitutional, it is now on the books, and nothing is being done in contravention of the Defense of Marriage Act. That is, there are no things now going on where the Federal Government recognizes the rights of same-sex marriage.

So I guess my main opposition to this is that the bill is already big enough, but it doesn't add anything in substance. It adds a few words. I would yield if anyone can tell me what the reference is to not enforcing the act.

Now it is true the administration declined to defend the act in court, but not defending an act in court in no way means that you are contravening any enforcement. Going to court is a different story. As a matter of fact, the House Republican leadership has voted to go to court to defend it.

So I, again, would be glad if someone would tell me. The Defense of Marriage Act says the Federal Government will grant no rights to same-sex married couples that come from marriage. It's not doing that. I agree the administration doesn't like that, but the suggestion that they are undermining the law is simply wrong.

Now I understand—and this may be the confusion—that the gentleman

originally planned to offer a different amendment, and that amendment, he was told, was not in order. Maybe he changed the amendment and somebody forgot to change the speech, because the speech he gave may apply to the earlier amendment, but it doesn't apply to this one. So it seems to me kind of a waste. It's late in the evening. But the evening is shot anyway.

It does not say the administration shouldn't go to court. That is not contravening the Defense of Marriage Act. Contravening the Defense of Marriage Act would be extending benefits. And I want to reassure the gentleman, when I get married in July to Jim, I will not be looking for any Federal benefits. He wouldn't be eligible for my pension, even if I got one—I won't get one. But he wouldn't be eligible if I got one. I am very familiar with this.

In fact, nothing being done now by the Federal Government or contemplated by this administration contravenes the Defense of Marriage Act. What the administration says is: We think it's unconstitutional, and we are going to oppose it.

Now I know there are some who say—the gentleman from Kansas, I agree, didn't say that—some have said, How dare you to ask the court to throw out a law passed by Congress. You've heard that rhetoric. After all, Congress passed this. How does the court dare to overthrow it? Well, that's an argument I used to hear from my conservative friends a lot more before the health care bill came up.

So let's be clear, there are now two major pieces of legislation passed by this Congress—not this particular one—that are being contested and people are asking the U.S. Supreme Court to throw them out. One is the Defense of Marriage Act, one is the health care bill. You can be against, in principle, the court's throwing out an act of Congress as unconstitutional. You can be for it in principle and differ as to the application. But there isn't any way that you can say it is perfectly legitimate to cancel the health care bill through judicial intervention but not to challenge the Defense of Marriage Act.

So I assume they're going to want a roll call because they went through all this effort, they'd like to be able to talk about it in campaigns. It literally means nothing because there is no contravention going on now. So I'll be glad to vote against it. If other people vote for it, they can do so.

Again, the Defense of Marriage Act says you don't grant benefits to same-sex couples as if they were married. Nobody is doing that. That isn't happening. It isn't planned. It won't happen until and unless the Supreme Court finds unconstitutionality. And refusing to defend an act in court, in the English language, is not contravention. As a matter of fact, it says none of the funds made available may be used in contravention. Well, not going to court is not using funds. Maybe he meant to say none of the funds under this act may be not used in contravention, because we certainly aren't spending by not spending any money. So maybe he meant to say we should spend the money, I don't know.

But I understand his original intention was ruled out of order. He had a place in the agenda, so he offered an amendment. But it doesn't mean very much.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I had anticipated and we had been told that the gentleman was going to offer an amendment that said none of the funds in this Act may be used by the Justice Department to argue for the Defense of Marriage Act in court. And I was going to object on the same grounds that I have in some other such amendments earlier day—that we should not be politicizing the Justice Department. We should not be telling them: Do defend this in court; don't defend that in court.

□ 2240

But as the gentleman from Massachusetts says, this amendment seems to do nothing at all. None of the funds made available under this act may be used in contravention of the Defense of Marriage Act. Well, none of the funds are being use in contravention of the Defense of Marriage Act. The only circumstance I can envision under which funds might be used in contravention of the Defense of Marriage Act would be after the Supreme Court declared the Defense of Marriage Act unconstitutional. If the Court declared the Defense of Marriage Act unconstitutional, then the Constitution frankly would demand under the equal protection clause that funds be spent against the will of what had been the Defense of Marriage Act.

If the Defense of Marriage Act is unconstitutional, then someone who is married under the laws of some State that permits same-sex marriage will demand to have joint filing of income taxes or demand the tax benefits that a spouse gets, and it would be unconstitutional not to grant that.

So this amendment is frankly silly and shouldn't clutter the statute books because until and unless the Defense of Marriage Act is declared unconstitutional, it means nothing. And once the Defense of Marriage Act is declared unconstitutional, if it is, then this itself would be unconstitutional as against the equal protection clause.

So I urge people to vote against it because, one, we shouldn't pass meaningless statutes, which this is or would be, unless DOMA is declared unconstitutional. And we shouldn't pass clearly unconstitutional statutes which this would be if DOMA is declared unconstitutional. So it is either meaningless and unnecessary in the one case or unconstitutional in the other and, frankly, ought to be withdrawn, but certainly should not be voted for; and so I urge my colleagues not to vote for this, whatever you think of DOMA, frankly. Because if DOMA is declared unconstitutional, this would be unconstitutional; and if it's not, it's unnecessary and has no effect in any event. So I don't know what the point of wasting our time with it is, but we should oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very strange amendment, as my colleagues have pointed out. We are obviously a very diverse country. Some States allow same-sex marriages; others do not. Some have civil unions. My home State of Colorado is currently discussing this issue in the State legislature. It is certainly very contentious, and I wish them well in coming to a speedy resolution.

What this amendment does is simply contravene something that doesn't occur. It talks about funds being used in contravention to the Defense of Marriage Act. There are no such funds. This administration, as the last administration, has followed the Defense of Marriage Act.

Certainly out of political convenience, I would say would that it were, if only this administration had been granting immigration rights or inheritance and survivorship rights to committed same-sex couples that were married in the States that have them; but it is simply not the case.

Now, I understand that there might be fears that perhaps some day a future administration might seek to violate the law in this area, but I think it shows a fixation to try to single out this area. I mean, a future administration or any administration might try to violate the law in any one of any number of areas. But to have a fixation on and support for a government takeover of the institution of marriage is a very dangerous precedent. And I wish my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would help preserve the integrity of marriage in this country and its importance to all families, including mine, and my colleague from Massachusetts and many others.

We do not currently use any funds in contravention of the Defense of Marriage Act. There are a number of us in this body who seek to repeal this act. This House as a whole has not repealed this act. It very much has the rule of law. But just like other laws, the administration and the executive branch are charged with implementing that law.

I think it is a bizarre step to single out one particular area of law with many, many, many laws that the executive branch operates under and say we

don't want them to violate this law when there is of course no evidence, no sign, no indication that any administration, Democratic or Republican, has any desire to violate this law.

The decision not to defend this law is unaffected by this amendment. To be clear, if this amendment passes, it has no bearing on the administration's decision not to defend the undefensible, namely, the government takeover of marriage that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to support.

Marriage is a very personal relationship between two people who are in love. And, of course, it's precise definition is up to each State in terms of who they allow and under what conditions they allow to marry. And to have the Federal Government enter this debate is very contrary to the definition of marriage itself and frankly debases the thousands of same-sex marriages that have occurred in this country.

So again, while this amendment would do nothing and certainly wouldn't jeopardize the administration's decision not to defend the undefensible, namely, the government takeover of marriage, I still urge opposition to this measure because I think it is bizarre to single out one particular area or one particular type of marriage that some Members of this body may not personally approve of.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. I rise in support of the Huelskamp amendment. I listened to the gentleman from Colorado say at least three times, a government takeover of marriage. Yes, the faith and the church and the churches have been the ones who have established marriage over the centuries and over the millennia. But when it comes to civil marriage, the government writes the rules. If the government is writing the rules, it's not a takeover of marriage. The definition of marriage from the beginning of time has been a man and woman joined together, hopefully in holy matrimony, for the purposes of encouraging a family unit and raising children and pouring our values down through that crucible of marriage into the next generation because that's the most successful and effective way that we can advance civilization.

Government has an interest in promoting marriage for the purposes of holding together the continuity of our culture and our civilization. It is not a nefarious thing. It's not the government taking over marriage. It is the voice of the American culture and the American people seeking to advance into the following generations the best values that we have.

And those that say it is discrimination to determine what marriage is, I would argue instead, Mr. Chairman, that government provides a license. The States provide licenses for marriage. A license is a definition to do that which is otherwise illegal. A license to hunt, a license to carry a gun, a license to fish, for example.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I want to finish my statement, but if I have time, I will yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

States issue marriage licenses because they want to promote and encourage an activity and a behavior, not because they want to punish another behavior. It is because there is something that they have determined has value, and so they give a permit to do that which is otherwise illegal, and that's what a definition of a license is.

With regard to the President and the executive branch, the Constitution and the oath that's implied in the Constitution, the oath that the President takes that is implied that he adheres to in the Constitution says he shall take care that the laws are faithfully executed.

And so the law of the United States is DOMA, the Defense of Marriage Act. The President's obligation, and his appointees and all of those in the executive branch of government, is to take care that the laws are faithfully executed. The appointments of the President and the executive branch are bound by his oath, and they take their own oath to uphold this Constitution. And when the President of the United States decides he is going to flip on his position, or maybe let it evolve into a condition, and then direct, and I believe it is direct, the Department of Justice to first refuse to support and have the Solicitor General no longer support Federal law passed by a majority of this Congress, the House and Senate and signed by President Clinton and then turn around, and now we're concerned that they are going to use taxpayer resources to defy a legitimate law that is the will of the people and on the books in the Federal Register.

That's what the amendment does that Mr. HUELSKAMP has offered. It says it's bad enough that you don't keep your oath to take care that the laws of the United States are faithfully executed, and we want to say to you, Don't at least turn a 180 on us and go against the will of the American people and use taxpayer dollars to work against the will of the American people, against your oath of office and against the statute.

So out of courtesy, I would yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Just for a brief question, the gentleman's home State of Iowa does allow same-sex couples to marry, and I would just like to ask in reference to the first part of your remarks whether your home State of Iowa in any way, shape, or form, whether civilization is in jeopardy or if any of the things that you mentioned in the early part of your remarks have, in fact, hurt your home State of Iowa?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, civilization is in jeopardy. It's in jeopardy when you have seven supreme court justices in the State of Iowa who declare that they have found rights in the Constitution that were up to this point ''unimagined.'' If you have justices that find unimagined rights in the Constitution, they are completely unqualified to legislate from the bench or determine what's constitutional and what's unconstitutional; and three of the seven were up for a retention ballot a year ago last November, and they were all three voted off the bench, the first time in the history of the State, partly because people disagreed with the policy they sought to impose by legislating from the bench, mostly because the people in the State understood that you cannot have judges that will find rights in the Constitution that were up to this point unimagined.

Judges that can imagine rights in the Constitution will take your rights away. A President that will change his position, that will not uphold his oath of office to take care that the laws are faithfully executed, that will direct the Department of Justice to work against and the Solicitor General to work against Federal law will turn this thing 180 and use the Federal resources against the will of the people of the United States, and that's the Huelskamp amendment, and I support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I didn't plan to speak on this amendment; but I have to tell you, I find it to be an unfortunate amendment. I find it to be an unfortunate amendment not for what some people might suspect. I was here for the Defense of Marriage Act. I supported the Defense of Marriage Act. I believe the Defense of Marriage Act is constitutional.

But this amendment is symptomatic of what I think the problem of this Congress has been since it convened last January, and that is first the CR and then some other bills, and now the appropriations bills. Some folks have decided that they should just be a pinata, filled with all kinds of extraneous issues that have nothing to do with the core mission.

This issue that is the subject of this amendment, I would tell the author who was not here when DOMA was passed, is being resolved. The Justice Department, I think wrongly, made a decision not to defend the lawsuit. But as Mr. NADLER said in a previous amendment, and I commend him for saying it, that's the executive's prerogative. But once they make that decision, the Congress is not powerless, and the Congress has taken action. And so the committee that exists here in the House voted to employ outside counsel. Outside counsel is vigorously defending the House's position in the Defense of Marriage Act, and I think there are 30 lawsuits across the country.

□ 2250

This matter will be resolved, and the courts will either say that it's constitutional or unconstitutional, and then we will all abide by that decision.

Now, where I find fault with my Democratic friends is that we've had a couple of markups in the legislative branch, and they're all exercised about the money that it's costing us for outside counsel. Well, you can't have it both ways. Either the administration is going to defend it through the Justice Department, or we're going to avail ourselves of our constitutional responsibilities, hire outside counsel. So you can't criticize the speaker for paying a lawyer to defend their position.

Likewise, I would suggest to my side of the aisle that this doesn't belong on Mr. WOLF's bill. There is not a problem. This matter will be resolved; it is being resolved. I think that this entire string of limitation amendments is disturbing because they continue a pattern now that's gone on for 18 months, and I don't think that's what an open rule is all about.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio who just spoke on the floor of the House. He's an appropriator, and he sees this litany of limitations as being challenging. I know that Members are probably drafting some more limitations as we speak, and I certainly respect their prerogative.

I would just add this point: as I listened to my good friend from Iowa—who I know is certainly a civil libertarian and believes in individual rights, and I would imagine the proponent of this amendment does as well—I would ask the proponent of the amendment, as he has listened to the debate, to simply withdraw the amendment.

There are several factors that would contribute to that: one, the query that was made by the gentleman from Massachusetts as to whether the amendment even does anything. But as well, if we look at the 10th Amendment—which my friends on the other side of the aisle have always paraded before us—that even though there is a Federal law, the DOMA law, that there are matters that should be left to the States.

As recounted by the gentleman from Colorado, there are many different positions on this issue throughout the different States. Some have positions, some do not. Now we have an amendment that simply seems to deal with actions stated by the executive on this very day.

My friend from Iowa wanted to speak about what the President has said and what he has not said. What are we discussing here, the views of the President or the actions of the executive? The actions of the executive, as has been stated, are their prerogative. And clearly, there have been no actions by the government that should be contravened.

More importantly, I believe in the civil liberties of all people and the rights of all people. I believe that this amendment undermines the rights of all people and would graciously ask this Member to look at it from both the perspective of individual rights, of civil liberties, of the 10th Amendment, and whether or not the executive has done anything that relates to his amendment.

I, lastly, will say that the President of the United States, who commented today, has every right to speak either his conscience, his heart, or his mind. An amendment on the floor attempting to question that has no relationship to speech today versus actions which need to be contravened. There are no actions to be contravened, so I ask the gentleman to respectfully withdraw his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I wasn't going to speak, but I have heard this argument made time and time again that it's the prerogative of the executive branch to decide whether it's going to defend a law legally passed by the Congress and signed by the President. That is hyperbole. That is incorrect.

There is an obligation, by tradition and by the law, that the Attorney General is duty bound to defend duly constituted laws of the United States so long as he or she can find a constitutional basis for it. It is not the purpose, nor has it been in the past, in Democratic and Republican administrations, for a Justice Department to arrogate to themselves the responsibility of deciding which laws they like and which laws they did not like. You are supposed to be the attorney for the United States and recognized as such.

I recall as Attorney General of California I was required at times to defend laws that I had voted against, but I could find a constitutional basis for it. My real problem with this administration is they strained to find any constitutional basis to not defend. That is turning it on its side.

The point of fact is when the executive branch does not do what they should do, it requires us to make a decision as to whether we should now pay for outside counsel. That has not been the tradition of the United States.

This Justice Department, in my judgment, based on the experience I've had here in this Congress, 18 years, my years as the chief legal officer of the State of California, and 35 or 40 years as a practicing attorney, tells me that this administration has fundamentally failed in its obligation to attempt to faithfully carry out the laws of the United States, not to wake up every morning and decide: I think I can find an unconstitutional basis for a law passed by the Congress.

Think of what that would mean. It would mean that you have an administration in every instance deciding what laws they want and what laws they don't want that are on the books, instead of coming here to the Congress and attempting to change what the law is. If we believe that we have an obligation when we hold up our hands to uphold the Constitution, that means we don't just turn over things to the courts and say you decide whether it's constitutional.

We are duty bound to pass what we think are constitutional laws. And the administration—of whatever stripe—is obligated to attempt to defend those laws unless they can't find a constitutional basis for it, not to seek every possible unconstitutional basis so they don't have to defend. That's what the problem is here.

And so while I understand many of the arguments made here and I understand what my friend from Ohio said—and I agree with much of what he said—let's not just say, well, it's the prerogative of the executive branch to decide if they want to defend laws passed by the United States. That has not been the tradition of this country. It has not been the experience. It has not been the legacy of Democratic and Republican administrations going back to the founding of this Republic.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I yield to the gentlelady.

□ 2300

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman from California. I'm not sure if he misinterpreted comments that have been made on the floor of the House, but I will just speak to this point.

That is too broad a statement to say about the present Department of Justice when every single day lawyers in the Department of Justice, including the Attorney General, go out and defend the laws of this land. And so I'd ask the gentleman to reflect on that broad statement because that is not accurate.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I take back my time.

I will not accept the gentlelady's argument that I was condemning the actions of those people in the Justice Department who are excellent civil servants.

I am specifically talking about the Attorney General of the United States who, evidently, made the decision or, if he didn't make the decision, failed to make the proper decision to uphold the laws of the United States duly enacted by this Congress.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I rise to engage in a colloquy with the esteemed subcommittee chair.

First of all, I wanted to support the inclusion of $47 million in the National Science Foundation Educational and Human Resources Account. This is going to really further the effort to help educate Americans in the area of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. It will help inspire many of our young people to study math and science and then go into these engineering and technology fields as careers.

Some of the most engaging ways to inspire young people to study math and science involve informal education settings, such as our science centers throughout this country, most notably, the Detroit Science Center, which engages in programs that inspire many inner-city youth and metro-Detroit youth to get involved in education in science and mathematics.

So I wanted to thank the chair and the ranking member for including the resources in the National Science Foundation's budget to help provide competitive grants to many organizations such as the Detroit Science Center to help further inspire and engage our young people to study math and science.

And we have a lot of jobs available, even in metro Detroit in manufacturing and technology. We just need the people trained in those areas. This effort, this funding will help encourage many of our young people to enjoy the intellectual stimulation of math and science, and then encourage them to go into careers that are not only fruitful for them, but will help our country's economy become more competitive in the global marketplace.

Mr. WOLF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for his interest in and advocacy for STEM education. I share his belief that STEM education must be a national priority, and I think the more we invest in it, it is very important for this country so the 21st century is the American century and not the Chinese century. And I look forward to working with him on this issue as we move forward.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. 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. WESTMORELAND) having assumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5326) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5652, SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2012

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112 472) on the resolution (H. Res. 648) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5652) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 643 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5326.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) kindly resume the chair.

□ 2305

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5326) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, with Mr. PRICE of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 101, line 10.

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

Amendment No. 24 by Mr. HUELSKAMP of Kansas.

An amendment by Mr. LANDRY of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 32 by Mr. GARDNER of Colorado.

An amendment by Mr. ROHRABACHER of California.

An amendment by Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. CRAVAACK of Minnesota.

Second amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Third amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. HUELSKAMP

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes 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 245, noes 171, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

AYES—245

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

NOES—171

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bono Mack
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
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
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—15

Braley (IA)
Cantor
Carnahan
Connolly (VA)
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Kucinich
Langevin
Lummis
McCaul
Meeks
Quayle
Reichert
Slaughter
Yarmuth

□ 2330

Mrs. BONO MACK and Ms. RICHARDSON changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. LIPINSKI, RAHALL, BARLETTA and FITZPATRICK changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 235 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 235, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANDRY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 201, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 236]

AYES—218

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

NOES—201

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch

West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Berman
Cantor
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Franks (AZ)
Johnson (OH)
Kucinich
McCaul
Meeks
Slaughter
Sullivan
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2333

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 236, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 236, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. GARDNER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 357, noes 68, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 237]

AYES—357

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

NOES—68

Ackerman
Andrews
Baldwin
Berman
Bonamici
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Carson (IN)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Deutch
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
McCollum
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Nadler
Olver
Pastor (AZ)
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Towns
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—6

Cantor
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Kucinich
Meeks
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2336

Ms. BASS of California changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 237, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 262, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 238]

AYES—163

Ackerman
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Broun (GA)
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Flake
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Garrett
Green, Al
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Langevin
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano

Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rehberg
Ribble
Richardson
Rohrabacher
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—262

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
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)
Walberg
Walden
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Cantor
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Kucinich
Meeks
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2341

Ms. DELAURO and Messrs. CLARKE of Michigan, BURTON of Indiana, and LOEBSACK 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 238, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 235, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 239]

AYES—189

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
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
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Renacci
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
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—235

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Capuano
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
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
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
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
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Tipton
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Cantor
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Kucinich
Meeks
Slaughter
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2344

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 239, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 232, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 240]

AYES—193

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

NOES—232

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
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
Higgins
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
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
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Cantor
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Kucinich
Meeks
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2347

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 240, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CRAVAACK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 188, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 241]

AYES—238

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
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
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm

Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
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
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—188

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
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)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
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
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Cantor
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Kucinich
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2351

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 241, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 209, noes 217, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 242]

AYES—209

Adams
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
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
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marino
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
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—217

Ackerman
Aderholt
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Ros-Lehtinen
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
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—5

Cantor
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Kucinich
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2354

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 242, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 208, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 243]

AYES—218

Adams
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
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
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Turner (NY)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—208

Ackerman
Aderholt
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hurt
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Renacci
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
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—5

Cantor
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Kucinich
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2357

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 243, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013''.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM) having assumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5326) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 643, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 5326 is postponed.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 743. An act to amend chapter 23 of title 5, United States Code, to clarify the disclosures of information protected from prohibited personnel practices, require a statement in nondisclosure policies, forms, and agreements that such policies, forms, and agreements conform with certain disclosure protections, provide certain authority for the Special Counsel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform; in addition, to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and to the Committee on Homeland Security for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1302. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property in Tracy, California, to the City of Tracy.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Thursday, May 10, 2012, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first quarter of 2012 pursuant to Public Law 95 384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Terri Sewell	2/18	2/21	France		498.00		[3]				498.00
	2/21	2/23	Slovakia		186.00		[3]				186.00
	2/23	2/23	Belgium				[3]				
	2/23	2/25	Hungary		200.00		[3]				200.00
Committee total					884.00						884.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. FRANK D. LUCAS, Chairman, Apr. 26, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Harold Rogers	1/6	1/7	United States		199.00						199.00
Hotel taxes			United States						24.71		24.71
	1/8	1/10	New Zealand		570.50						570.50
	1/10	1/13	Australia		1,616.18						1,616.18
	1/13	1/15	Philippines		576.12						576.12
	1/15	1/16	United States		[3] 642.04						642.04
Hotel taxes, porterage charges			United States						73.53		73.53
Misc. delegation expenses									2,864.25		2,864.25
Return of unused per diem					−65.40						−65.40
Hon. Norm Dicks	1/6	1/7	United States		199.00						199.00
Hotel taxes			United States						24.71		24.71
	1/8	1/10	New Zealand		570.50						570.50
	1/10	1/13	Australia		[3] 1,616.18						1,616.18
	1/13	1/15	Philippines		576.12						576.12
	1/15	1/16	United States		[3] 627.25						627.25
Hotel taxes, porterage charges			United States						73.53		73.53
Misc. delegation expenses									2,864.25		2,864.25
Hon. Ander Crenshaw	1/6	1/7	United States		199.00						199.00
Hotel taxes			United States						24.71		24.71
	1/8	1/10	New Zealand		570.50						570.50
	1/10	1/13	Australia		1,616.18						1,616.18
	1/13	1/15	Philippines		576.12						576.12
	1/15	1/16	United States		[3] 627.25						627.25
Hotel taxes, porterage charges			United States						73.53		73.53
Misc. delegation expenses									2,864.25		2,864.25
Hon. Rodney Alexander	1/6	1/7	United States		199.00						199.00
Hotel taxes			United States						24.71		24.71
	1/8	1/10	New Zealand		570.50						570.50
	1/10	1/13	Australia		1,616.18						1,616.18
	1/13	1/15	Philippines		[3] 576.12						576.12
	1/15	1/16	United States		570.58						570.58
Hotel taxes, porterage charges			United States						73.53		73.53
Misc. delegation expenses									2,864.25		2,864.25
Hon. Steven LaTourette	1/6	1/7	United States		199.00						199.00
Hotel taxes			United States						24.71		24.71
	1/8	1/10	New Zealand		570.50						570.50
	1/10	1/13	Australia		1,616.18						1,616.18
	1/13	1/15	Philippines		576.12						576.12
	1/15	1/16	United States		[3] 571.25						571.25
Hotel taxes, porterage charges			United States						73.53		73.53
Misc. delegation expenses									2,864.25		2,864.25
Hon. Tom Cole	1/6	1/7	United States		199.00						199.00
Hotel taxes			United States						24.71		24.71
	1/8	1/10	New Zealand		570.50						570.50
	1/10	1/13	Australia		1,616.18						1,616.18
	1/13	1/15	Philippines		576.12						576.12
	1/15	1/16	United States		[3] 611.00						611.00
Hotel taxes, porterage charges			United States						73.53		73.53
Misc. delegation expenses									2,864.25		2,864.25
Hon. Mike Simpson	1/6	1/7	United States		199.00						199.00
Hotel taxes			United States						24.71		24.71
	1/8	1/10	New Zealand		570.50						570.50
	1/10	1/13	Australia		1,616.18						1,616.18
	1/13	1/15	Philippines		576.12						576.12

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2012—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	1/15	1/16	United States		[3] 550.00						550.00
Hotel taxes, porterage charges			United States						73.53		73.53
Misc. delegation expenses									2,864.25		2,864.25
Will Smith	1/6	1/7	United States		199.00						199.00
Hotel taxes			United States						24.71		24.71
	1/8	1/10	New Zealand		570.50						570.50
	1/10	1/13	Australia		1,616.18						1,616.18
	1/13	1/15	Philippines		576.12						576.12
	1/15	1/16	United States		[3] 615.58						615.58
Hotel taxes, porterage charges			United States						73.53		73.53
Misc. delegation expenses									2,864.25		2,864.25
Return of unused per diem					−64.57						−64.57
BG Wright	1/6	1/7	United States		199.00						199.00
Hotel taxes			United States						24.71		24.71
	1/8	1/10	New Zealand		570.50						570.50
	1/10	1/13	Australia		1,616.18						1,616.18
	1/13	1/15	Philippines		576.12						576.12
	1/15	1/16	United States		[3] 634.33						634.33
Hotel taxes, porterage charges			United States						73.53		7.53
Misc. delegation expenses									2,864.25		2,864.25
Return of unused per diem					−58.00						−58.00
Anne Marie Chotvacs	1/6	1/7	United States		199.00						199.00
Hotel taxes			United States						24.71		24.71
	1/8	1/10	New Zealand		570.50						570.50
	1/10	1/13	Australia		1,616.18						1,616.18
	1/13	1/15	Philippines		576.12						576.12
	1/15	1/16	United States		[3] 634.33						634.33
Hotel taxes, porterage charges			United States						$73.53		73.53
Misc. Delegation Expenses									$2,864.25		2,864.25
Return of unused per diem					−128.45						−128.45
Paul Juola	1/6	1/7	United States		199.00						199.00
Hotel taxes			United States						$24.71		24.71
	1/8	1/10	New Zealand		570.50						570.50
	1/10	1/13	Australia		1,616.18						1,616.18
	1/13	1/15	Philippines		576.12						576.12
	1/15	1/16	United States		[3] 597.50						597.50
Hotel taxes, porterage chares			United States						$73.53		73.53
Misc. delegation expenses									$2,864.25		2,864.25
Mike Ringler	1/3	1/4	New Zealand		619.98						619.98
	1/5	1/9	Antarctica								
	1/9	1/10	New Zealand								
Part Commercial aircraft							14,044.40				14,044.40
Part Government Aircraft			.								
Jennifer Hing	1/3	1/4	New Zealand		730.00						730.00
	1/5	1/9	Antarctica								
	1/9	1/12	New Zealand								
Part Commercial Aircraft							14,044.40				14,044.40
Part Government Aircraft			.								
Mike Robinson	1/3	1/4	New Zealand		592.93						592.93
	1/5	1/9	Antarctica								
	1/9	1/12	New Zealand								
Part Commercial Aircraft							14,044.40				14,044.40
Part Government Aircraft											
Diana Simpson	1/3	1/4	New Zealand		592.93						592.93
	1/5	1/9	Antarctica								
	1/9	1/10	New Zealand								
Part Commercial Aircraft							14,044.40				14,044.40
Part Government Aircraft			.								
Stephanie Gupta	1/3	1/4	New Zealand		640.00						640.00
	1/5	1/9	Antarctica								
	1/9	1/10	New Zealand								
Part Commercial Aircraft							14,044.40				14,044.40
Part Government Aircraft											
Kathleen L. Kraninger	1/15	1/16	Guatemala		414.54						414.54
	1/16	1/18	Panama		506.00						506.00
	1/18	1/21	Colombia		1,356.50						1,356.50
Commercial Aircraft							1,373.90				1,373.90
Misc. transportation costs							262.00				262.00
Jeffrey H. Ashford	1/15	1/16	Guatemala		414.54						414.54
	1/16	1/18	Panama		506.00						506.00
	1/18	1/21	Colombia		1,356.50						1,356.50
Commercial aircraft							1,373.90				1,373.90
Misc. transportation costs							262.00				262.00
Michael Friedberg	1/8	1/14	Brazil		2,948.82						2,948.82
Commercial aircraft							4,493.60				4,493.60
Misc. delegation costs									1,294.41		1,294.41
Misc. transportation costs									77.40		77.40
Hon. Kay Granger	1/6	1/7	Ghana		428.00						428.00
Return of unused per diem					−165.78						−165.78
Commercial Aircraft									3,612.15		3,612.15
Hon. Betty McCollum	1/4	1/10	Bangladesh		1,759.00						1,759.00
Misc. transportation costs									306.22		306.22
Misc. delegation costs									1,441.23		1,441.23
Hon. Mario Diaz Balart	1/25	1/28	Switzerland		1,787.90						1,787.90
Misc. delegation costs									1,111.96		1,111.96
Commercial aircraft							2,024.50				2,024.50
Return of unused per diem							−374.00				−374.00
Hon. Nita Lowey	1/25	1/30	Switzerland		2,328.33						2,328.33
Misc. delegation costs									1,051.56		1,051.56
Commercial aircraft									1,270.50		1,270.50
Return of unused per diem							−748.00				−748.00
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	2/19	2/20	Japan		1,175.47						1,175.47
	2/23	2/26									
	2/20	2/23	Korea		1,344.00						1,344.00
Misc. delegation costs									198.02		198.02
Commercial aircraft									13,371.40		13,371.40
Misc. transportation costs									.57		.57
Return of unused per diem							−175.00				−175.00
Hon. Ken Calvert	2/19	2/20	Japan		1,175.47						1,175.47
	2/23	2/26									
	2/20	2/23	Korea		1,344.00						1,344.00
Misc. delegation costs									198.02		198.02
Commercial aircraft									13,371.40		13,371.40
Misc. transportation costs									.57		.57
Return of unused per diem							−175.00				−175.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2012—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Tom McLemore	2/19	2/20	Japan		1,175.47						1,175.47
	2/23	2/26									
	2/20	2/23	Korea		1,344.00						1,344.00
Misc. delegation costs									198.02		198.02
Commercial aircraft							13,371.40				13,371.40
Misc. transportation costs									.57		.57
Return of unused per diem							−25.50				−25.50
BG Wright	2/19	2/20	Japan		1,175.47						1,175.47
	2/23	2/26									
	2/20	2/23	Korea		1,344.00						1,344.00
Misc. delegation costs									198.02		198.02
Commercial aircraft							13,371.40				13,371.40
Misc. transportation costs									.57		.57
Return of unused per diem							−38.00				−38.00
Ms. Brooke Boyer	2/19	2/20	Japan		1,175.47						1,175.47
	2/23	2/26									
	2/20	2/23	Korea		1,344.00						1,344.00
Misc. delegation costs									198.02		198.02
Commercial aircraft							13,371.40				13,371.40
Misc. transportation costs									.57		.57
Jennifer Miller	2/18	2/20	Egypt		469.19						469.18
	2/20	2/22	Lebanon		394.00						394.00
	2/22	2/24	Jordan		889.01						889.01
Hotel Taxes									151.82		151.82
Misc. transportation costs							240.00				240.00
Commercial aircraft									8,734.60		8,734.60
Adrienne Ramsay	2/18	2/20	Egypt		469.19						469.18
	2/20	2/22	Lebanon		394.00						394.00
	2/22	2/24	Jordan		889.01						889.01
Hotel Taxes									151.82		151.82
Misc. transportation costs							17.60				17.60
Commercial aircraft									8,734.60		8,734.60
Hon. Frank Wolf		2/17	United States								
	2/18	2/21	Kenya		339.93						339.93
	2/19	2/21	South Sudan		540.00						540.00
	2/21	2/21	Kenya								
Misc. transportation costs							1,269.25				1,269.25
Misc. embassy Costs									112.82		112.82
Commercial aircraft							13,753.00				13,753.00
Return of unused per diem					−425.00						−425.00
Ann Reese	3/9	3/14	Bahrain		1,322.85						1,322.85
	3/14	3/15	Qatar		340.57						340.57
Misc. transportation costs							162.00				162.00
Commercial aircraft							8,713.05				8,713.05
Donna Shahbaz	3/9	3/10	Japan		192.25						192.25
	3/10	3/12	Korea		700.00						700.00
Misc. transportation costs							50.32				50.32
Commercial aircraft							6,571.70				6,571.70
Dale Oak	3/9	3/10	Japan		192.25						192.25
	3/10	3/12	Korea		700.00						700.00
Misc. transportation costs							50.32				50.32
Commercial aircraft							6,571.70				6,571.70
Sarah Young	3/9	3/10	Japan		192.25						192.25
	3/10	3/12	Korea		700.00						700.00
Misc. transportation costs							50.32				50.32
Commercial aircraft							6,571.70				6,571.70
Matthew Washington	3/9	3/10	Japan		192.25						192.25
	3/10	3/12	Korea		700.00						700.00
Misc. transportation costs							50.32				50.32
Commercial aircraft							6,571.70				6,571.70
Committee total					78,163.76		218,148.30		38,970.51		335,282.57

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. HAROLD ROGERS, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ETHICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JO BONNER, Chairman, Apr. 16, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Bill Huizenga	1/13	1/15	Afghanistan		56.00		11,967.70				12,023.70
Hon. Rubén Hinojosa	2/18	2/21	France		2,153.97		(3)				2,153.97
	2/21	2/23	Slovakia		587.65		(3)				587.65
	2/23	2/25	Hungary		529.27		(3)				529.27
Committee total					3,326.89		11,967.70				15,294.59

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. SPENCER BACHUS, Chairman, Apr. 27, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Steve Chabot	1/9	1/11	Israel		802.00				[5] 8,268.69		9,070.69
	1/11	1/12	Qatar		291.00						291.00
	1/12	1/13	Romania		262.00						262.00
	1/13	1/15	Albania		503.00						503.00
							[4] 10,754.90				10,754.90
Kevin Fitzpatrick	1/9	1/11	Israel		814.00						814.00
	1/11	1/12	Qatar		296.00						296.00
	1/12	1/13	Romania		267.00						267.00
	1/13	1/15	Albania		493.00						493.00
							[4] 11,630.20				11,630.20
Sajit Gandhi	1/7	1/8	Turkey		373.00		[3]				373.00
	1/8	1/10	India		1,100.00		[3]				1,100.00
Commercial airfare	1/10	1/11	Thailand		215.00						215.00
	1/11	1/12	Burma		208.00		[3]				208.00
Commercial airfare	1/12	1/13	India		340.00						340.00
Commercial airfare	1/13	1/14	Slovak Republic		318.00		[3]				318.00
							[4] 598.00				598.00
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	1/7	1/8	Turkey		642.82		[3]				642.82
	1/8	1/10	Qatar		679.48		[3]				679.48
	1/10	1/11	Saudi Arabia		399.66		[3]				399.66
	1/11	1/13	United Arab Emirates		1,051.30		[3]				1,051.30
	1/13	1/14	France		565.25		[3]				565.25
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	1/7	1/13	Germany		1,910.14				[5] 25,860.88		27,771.02
							[4] 10,611.70				10,611.70
Paul Berkowitz	1/7	1/13	Germany		2,071.14						2,071.14
							[4] 3,096.40				3,096.40
William Hawkins	1/7	1/13	Germany		2,071.14						2,071.14
							[4] 2,248.70				2,248.70
John Lis	1/10	1/14	Kyrgyz Republic		1,484.00						1,484.00
							[4] 10,178.00				10,178.00
Christina Jenckes	1/10	1/14	Kyrgyz Republic		1,419.00						1,419.00
							[4] 10,143.10				10,143.10
Brent Wollfork	1/10	1/14	Kyrgyz Republic		1,474.00						1,474.00
							[4] 10,143.10				10,143.10
Diana Ohlbaum	1/16	1/18	Haiti		304.00						304.00
							[4] 1,190.50				1,190.50
Hon. Jeff Fortenberry	1/26	1/28	Switzerland		1,100.00		[3]				1,100.00
	1/28	1/30	France		392.76		[3]				392.76
Hon. Ted Deutch	2/3	2/5	Germany		624.00		[6]				624.00
							[6] 951.70				951.70
Hon. Dan Burton	2/18	2/21	France		2,126.00		[3]		[5] 16,750.00		18,876.00
	2/21	2/23	Slovak Republic		576.10		[3]		[5] 10,929.96		11,506.06
	2/23	2/25	Hungary		532.00		[3]		[5] 1,696.48		2,228.48
Hon. Gregory Meeks	2/18	2/21	France		2,125.44		[3]				2,125.44
	2/21	2/23	Slovak Republic		575.93		[3]				575.93
	2/23	2/25	Hungary		470.50		[3]				470.50
Hon. Federicka Wilson	2/18	2/21	France		1,973.49		[3]				1,973.49
	2/21	2/23	Slovak Republic		531.11						531.11
	2/23	2/25	Hungary		449.14						449.14
Brian Wanko	2/18	2/21	France		1,973.93						1,973.93
	2/21	2/23	Slovak Republicv		550.09						550.09
	2/23	2/25	Hungary		506.00						506.00
Edmund Rice	2/18	2/21	France		1,927.00						1,927.00
	2/21	2/23	Slovak Republic		480.00						480.00
	2/23	2/25	Hungary		410.00						410.00
Christina Jenckes	2/20	2/25	Zambia		3,057.00						3,057.00
							[4] 10,513.10				10,513.00
Kristal Quarker	2/20	2/25	Zambia		1,639.00						1,639.00
							[4] 10,523.10				10,523.10
Algene Sajery	2/20	2/25	Zambia		1,629.00						1,629.00
							[4] 10,546.10				10,546.10
Diana Ohlbaum	2/20	2/25	Zambia		1,626.00						1,626.00
							[4] 10,624.10				10,624.10
Matthew Zweig	3/9	3/11	Saudi Arabia		767.00						767.00
	3/11	3/13	United Arab Emirates		485.00						485.00
	3/13	3/14	Yemen		152.50						152.50
	3/14	3/15	Qatar		331.35						331.35
	3/16	3/16	Bahrain		284.00						284.00
							[4] 4,939.50				4,939.50
Riley Moore	3/9	3/11	Saudi Arabia		820.00						820.00
	3/11	3/13	United Arab Emirates		573.60						573.60
	3/13	3/14	Yemen		227.98						227.98
	3/14	3/15	Qatar		280.67						280.67
	3/16	3/16	Bahrain		293.56						293.56
							[4] 8,109.70				8,109.70
Ed Stein	3/9	3/11	Saudi Arabia		884.04						884.04
	3/11	3/13	United Arab Emirates		520.60						520.60
	3/13	3/14	Yemen		156.04						156.04
	3/14	3/15	Qatar		247.59						247.59
	3/16	3/16	Bahrain		230.22						230.22
							[4] 4,432.10				4,432.10
Robert Marcus	3/9	3/11	Saudi Arabia		889.00						889.00
	3/11	3/13	United Arab Emirates		528.00						528.00
	3/13	3/14	Yemen		161.00						161.00
	3/14	3/15	Qatar		250.35						250.35
	3/16	3/16	Bahrain		235.22						235.22
							[4] 3,796.90				3,796.90
Alan Makovsky	3/11	3/13	United Arab Emirates		348.00						348.00
	3/13	3/14	Yemen		186.00						186.00
	3/14	3/15	Qatar		286.35						286.35
	3/16	3/16	Bahrain		28.18						28.18
							[4] 3,730.60				3,730.60
Eddy Acevedo	3/11	3/13	Guatemala		389.87						389.87
	3/13	3/15	Honduras		346.00						346.00
	3/15	3/16	El Salvador		146.45						146.45
							[4] 1,236.63				1,236.63
Greg McCarthy	3/11	3/13	Guatemala		369.87						369.87
	3/13	3/15	Honduras		316.00						316.00
							[4] 1,147.00				1,147.00
Kristen Jackson	3/11	3/13	Guatemala		127.44						127.44
	3/13	3/15	Honduras		416.51						416.51
	3/15	3/16	El Salvador		185.45						185.45
							[4] 1,412.63				1,412.63
Hubbell Knapp	3/11	3/13	Guatemala		359.87						359.87
	3/13	3/15	Honduras		390.66						390.66
	3/15	3/16	El Salvador		172.45						172.45
							[4] 1,236.63				1,236.63

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2012—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Jacqueline Quinones	3/11	3/13	Guatemala		374.87						374.87
	3/13	3/15	Honduras		366.00						366.00
	3/15	3/16	El Salvador		187.45						187.45
							[4] 1,236.63				1,236.63
Janice Kaguyutan	3/11	3/13	Guatemala		355.00						355.00
	3/13	3/15	Honduras		366.00						366.00
	3/15	3/16	El Salvador		182.00						182.00
							[4] 1,236.63				1,236.63
Kevin Ditzpatrick	3/11	3/12	UAE		405.00						405.00
	3/12	3/13	Maldives		144.00						144.00
	3/14	3/15	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
							[4] 17,499.40				17,499.40
Daniel Silverberg	3/11	3/12	United Arab Emirates		405.00						405.00
	3/12	3/13	Maldives		414.00						414.00
	3/14	3/15	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
							[4] 17,499.40				17,499.40
Committee total					71,783.66		170,753.35		63,506.01		306,0943.02

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[4] Roundtrip airfare.
[5] Indicates delegation costs.
[6] One-way airfare.

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Chairman Apr. 30, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Cedric Richmond	1/7	1/7	Ireland				[3]				
CODEL Warner	1/7	1/8	Turkey		386.59		[3]				386.59
	1/8	1/11	India		1,434.68		4,777.90				6,212.58
Per diem returned					(142.00)						(142.00)
Hon. Peter T. King	2/19	2/22	United Kingdom		1,497.00		732.30				2,229.30
Per diem returned					(200.26)						(200.26)
Lauren Wenger	2/17	2/22	United Kingdom		2,495.00		1,032.30				3,527.30
Per diem returned					(711.83)						(711.83)
Jonathan Duecker	2/17	2/23	United Kingdom		2,994.00		1,033.30				4,027.30
Per diem returned					(745.96)						(745.96)
Kevin Carroll	2/17	2/22	United Kingdom		2,495.00		1,033.30				3,528.40
Per diem returned					(351.73)						(351.73)
Nick Palarino	3/11	3/12	Dubai		300.68		12,097.90				12,398.58
	3/12	3/13	Maldives		699.00						699.00
	3/14	3/15	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	3/15	3/16	Dubai		357.99						357.99
Committee total					10,536.16		20,707.10				31,243.26

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. PETER T. KING, Chairman, Apr. 16, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
James Fleet	1/19	1/22	Middle East		1,063.39		9,834.20				10,897.59
Committee total					1,063.39		9,834.20				10,897.59

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Chairman, Apr. 26, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Darrell Issa	1/25	1/30	Switzerland		2,828.71		1,961.30				4,790.01
Hon. Christopher Hixon	1/25	1/30	Switzerland		1,929.47		1,990.50				3,919.97
Delegation expenses									4,689.35		4,689.35
Hon. Peter Welch	2/22	2/24	Cuba		444.00						444.00
	2/24	2/27	Colombia		1,992.00						1,992.00
Committee total											15,835.33

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Rachael Leman	1/10	1/14	Kyrgyzstan		1,575.00		10,176.20				11,751.20
Hon. David Dreier	1/26	1/28	Switzerland		374.00		[3]				374.00
	1/28	1/30	France		356.00		[3]				356.00
Brad Smith	1/26	1/28	Switzerland		358.00		[3]				358.00
	1/28	1/30	France		356.00		[3]				356.00
Committee total					3,019.00		10,176.20				13,195.20

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. DAVID DREIER, Chairman, Apr. 26, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If thee were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JOHN L. MICA, Chairman, Apr. 16, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2012.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Geoffery Antell	3/26	3/29	Switzerland		1,270.96		1,956.20				3,227.16
Jason Kearns	3/26	3/29	Switzerland		1,310.91		1,956.20				3,267.11
Hon. Jim McDermott	3/22	3/25	Belgium		1,305.33				256.14		1,561.47
Hon. Joseph Crowley	1/11	1/12	Thailand		210.13		53.05		103.15		366.33
	1/12	1/13	Burma		248.00		718.20		195.95		1,162.15
	1/7	1/8	Turkey		373.00		58.00		22.00		453.00
	1/8	1/14	India		1,382.23		428.00		4.42		1,814.65
	1/14	1/15	Slovakia		360.95		143.00		300.00		803.95
Hon. Xavier Becerra	2/22	2/24	Cuba		344.00						344.00
	2/24	2/24	Haiti								
	2/24	2/27	Colombia		1,992.00		222.00		727.00		2,941.00
Committee total					8,797.51		5,534.65		1,608.66		15,684.68

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DAVE CAMP, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Darren Dick	1/8	1/10	South America		529.76						
	1/10	1/12	South America		192.00						
	1/12	1/14	South America		186.00						
Commercial aircraft							1,603.14				2,510.90
Chelsey Campbell	1/8	1/10	South America		529.76						
	1/10	1/12	South America		192.00						
	1/12	1/14	South America		186.00						
Commercial aircraft							2,377.64				3,285.40
Sarah Geffroy	1/8	1/10	South America		529.76						
	1/10	1/12	South America		192.00						
	1/12	1/14	South America		186.00						
Commercial aircraft							2,377.64				3,285.40
Hon. Frank LoBiondo	1/10	1/14	Africa		249.00						
Commercial aircraft							11,557.20				11,806.20
George Pappas	1/10	1/14	Africa		249.00						
Commercial aircraft							11,557.20				11,806.20
Carly Scott	1/10	1/14	Africa		249.00						
Commercial aircraft							11,557.20				11,806.20
Darren Dick	1/25	1/28	South America		315.00						
Commercial aircraft							1,864.90				2,179.00
Chelsey Campbell	1/25	1/28	South America		315.00						
Commercial aircraft							1,864.90				2,179.00
Kathryn Whelbarger	1/25	1/28	South America		315.00						
Commercial aircraft							1,864.90				2,179.00
Alonzo Robertson	1/25	1/28	South America		315.00						
Commercial aircraft							1,864.90				2,179.00
Kathryn Wheelbarger	2/19	2/23	Asia		3,526.38						
	2/23	2/25	Asia		278.00						
Commercial aircraft							15,239.10				19,043.48
Ashley Lowry	2/19	2/23	Asia		3,526.38						
	2/23	2/25	Asia		278.00						
Commercial aircraft							15,239.10				19,043.48
Carly Scott	2/19	2/23	Asia		3,526.38						
	2/23	2/25	Asia		278.00						
Commercial aircraft							15,239.10				19,043.48
Jamil Jaffer	2/19	2/20	Africa		107.00						

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2012—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	2/20	2/22	Africa		480.02						
	2/22	2/23	Africa		86.00						
	2/23	2/24	Africa		78.00						
Commercial aircraft							10,175.92				10,926.94
Linda Cohen	2/19	2/20	Africa		107.00						
	2/20	2/22	Africa		480.02						
	2/22	2/23	Africa		86.00						
	2/23	2/24	Africa		78.00						
Commercial aircraft							10,175.92				10,926.94
Hon. Mike Rogers	2/20	2/23	Middle East								
Commercial aircraft							8,303.30				8,303.30
Hon. Dutch Ruppersberger	2/20	2/23	Middle East								
Commercial aircraft							10,181.20				10,181.20
Michael Allen	2/20	2/23	Middle East								
Commercial aircraft							9,241.10				9,241.10
Mike Shank	2/20	2/23	Middle East								
Commercial aircraft							10,181.20				10,181.20
Hon. Mike Thompson	3/9	3/11	Europe		308.00						
	3/11	3/12	Africa		226.00						
Commercial aircraft							7,740.40				8,274.40
Linda Cohen	3/9	3/11	Europe		308.00						
	3/11	3/12	Africa		226.00						
Commercial aircraft							7,740.40				8,274.40
Hon. Michele Bachmann	3/11	3/15	Middle East		1,992.00						
Commercial aircraft							9,356.70				11,348.70
Chelsey Campbell	3/11	3/15	Middle East		1,992.00						
Commercial aircraft							9,356.70				11,348.70
Alonzo Robertson	3/11	3/15	Middle East		1,992.00						
Commercial aircraft							9,088.50				11,080.50
Committee total											220,437.72

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MIKE ROGERS, Chairman, Apr. 19, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Christopher H. Smith	2/23	2/25	Austria		457.93		2,496.30				2,954.23
	2/25	2/26	Macedonia		254.00						254.00
Mark Milosch	2/23	2/25	Austria		481.44		2,496.30				2,977.74
	2/25	2/26	Macedonia		254.00						254.00
Robert Hand	2/22	2/25	Austria		1,038.65		1,580.80				2,619.45
Allison Hollabaugh	2/22	2/25	Austria		893.35		1,580.80				2,474.15
Janice Helwig	1/12	1/18	Kazakhstan		2,205.00		10,766.00				12,971.00
	3/11	3/17	Austria		2,418.00		1,582.00				4,000.00
Winsome Packer	3/05	3/08	Austria		970.84		1,615.90				2,586.74
Mischa Thompson	3/22	3/25	Belgium		456.99		1,888.60				2,345.59
Shelly Han	2/11	2/18	Thailand		1,373.00		13,641.30				15,014.30
Alex Johnson	1/19	1/31	Austria		4,608.00		1,578.10				6,186.10
	2/01	2/29	Austria		10,701.00						10,701.00
	3/01	3/31	Austria		11,439.01						11,439.01
Committee total					37,581.21		39,226.10				76,777.31

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

MARK MILOSCH, Apr. 30, 2012.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5919. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding identifying core depot-level maintenance and repair capability requirements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5920. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to South Korea pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5921. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to China pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5922. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, China, Philippines, Japan, and South Korea pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5923. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Chile pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5924. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Brazil pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5925. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergency Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia in Executive Order 12987 of October 21, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5926. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning compliance by the Government of Cuba with the U.S.-Cuba Migration Accords (October 2011 to April 2012); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5927. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period December 1, 2011 through January 31, 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5928. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-

month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Burma that was declared in Executive Order 13047 of May 20, 1997; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5929. A letter from the Honorary Secretary, Foundation of Japanese Honorary Debts, transmitting the 208th petition to the Prime Minister of Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5930. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 101126522-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XB077) received April 16, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5931. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 Feet (18.3 Meters) Length Overall Using Hook-and-Line or Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 101126521-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XB024) received April 16, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5932. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Greater Than or Equal to 50 Feet (15.2 Meters) Length Overall Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 111207737-2141-02] (RIN: 0648-XB112) received April 16, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5933. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 111207737-2141-02] (RIN: 0648-XB111) received April 16, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5934. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 111207737-2141-02] (RIN: 0648-XB102) received April 16, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5935. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland Model EC135 Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0453; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-16-AD; Amendment 39-16942; AD 2012-03-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5936. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CPAC, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1128; Directorate Identifier 2011-CE-031-AD; Amendment 39-16933; AD 2012-02-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5937. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Aviation Communication & Surveillance Systems (ACSS) Traffic Alert and Collision Avoidance System (TCAS) Units [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1204; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-147-AD; Amendment 39-16931; AD 2010-02-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5938. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1245; Directorate Identifier 2011-CE-033-AD; Amendment 39-16925; AD 2012-02-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5939. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1171; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-101-AD; Amendment 39-16932; AD 2012-02-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5940. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Thielert Aircraft Engines GmbH (TAE) Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0201; Directorate Identifier 2008-NE-47-AD; Amendment 39-16972; AD 2010-11-09R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5941. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0997; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-043-AD; Amendment 39-16963; AD 2012-04-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5942. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0190; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-033-AD; Amendment 39-16979; AD 2012-05-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5943. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc (RR) Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0562; Directorate Identifier 2009-NE-29-AD; Amendment 39-16969; AD 2012-04-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5944. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc (RR) Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0959; Directorate Identifier 2011-NE-25-AD; Amendment 39-16970; AD 2012-04-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 18, 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. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on the Budget. H.R. 4966. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to replace of sequester established by the Budget Control Act of 2011; with an amendment (Rept. 112 469, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on the Budget. H.R. 5652. A bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 f the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013 (Rept. 112 470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BACHUS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4235. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Commodity Exchange Act to repeal the indemnification requirements for regulatory authorities to obtain access to swap data required to be provided by swaps entities under such Acts; with an amendment (Rept. 112 471, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 648. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5652) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013 (Rept. 112 472). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Rules discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4966 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 Mr. DOLD:

H.R. 5650. A bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to provide for no discrimination under the family planning program under such title on the basis of separate provision of abortion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 5651. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and for medical devices, to establish user-fee programs for generic drugs and biosimilars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

H.R. 5653. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide dental care to veterans awarded the Purple Heart, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 5654. A bill to remove the testing provisions in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5655. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on 1-Propanone, 2-hydroxy-2-methyl-1-phenyl-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5656. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on methyl-4-trifluoro methoxyphenyl-N-(chlorocarbonyl) carbamate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5657. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on mixtures of indoxacarb and inert ingredients; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5658. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Reactive Red 264; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5659. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Ethanone, 2,2-dimethoxy-1,2-diphenyl-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5660. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Reactive Red 267; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5661. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on 1-Hydroxy cyclohexyl phenyl ketone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5662. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on 2,4-Bis(2-hydroxy-4-butyloxyphenyl)-6-(2,4-bis-butyloxyphenyl,2, 4-Bis (2-hydroxy-4-butyloxyphenyl)-6-(2, 4-bis-butyloxyloxyphenyl)-1,3,5-triazine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5663. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on mixtures of certain types of Triazin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5664. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Phosphine oxide, phenylbis(2,4,6-trimethylbenzoyl)-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5665. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on 1-propanone, 2-methyl-1-[4-(methylthio)phenyl]-2-(4-morpholinyl)-(9ci); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5666. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Topramezone technical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5667. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 5-bromo-3-sec-butyl-6-methyluracil (Bromacil); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5668. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on isomeric mixtures of substituted hydroxy phenyl triazines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5669. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Bis(2,2,6,6-tetramethyl-4-piperidyl)sebacate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5670. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Bis(2,2,6,6-tetramethyl-4-piperidyl)sebacate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5671. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on methyl-4-trifluoro methoxyphenyl-N-(chlorocarbonyl) carbamate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5672. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Reactive Red 238; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5673. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Reactive Blue 235; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5674. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Butane, 1-chloro; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5675. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on benzyl carbazate (hydrazinecarboxylic acid, phenylmethyl ester); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5676. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Hexane, 1,6-dichloro-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5677. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Vat Black 25; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5678. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on dimethyl 2,3,5,6-tetrachloro-1, 4-Benzenedicarboxylate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5679. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on mixtures of 5-methyl-5-(4-phenoxyphenyl)-3- (phenyl-amino)-2,4-oxazolidinedione](famoxadone), 2-cyano-N-[(ethylamino)- carbonyl]-2-(methoxyimino)acetamide (Cymoxanil) and application adjuvants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5680. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Ethyl pyruvate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5681. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Reactive Yellow 7459; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5682. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 1,3,5-triazine, 2,4,6- tris (2-propenyloxyl)-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:
H.R. 5683. A bill to authorize the President to establish the Veterans' Job Corps as a means of providing gainful employment to unemployed veterans and widows of veterans through the performance of useful public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. SCHIFF):
H.R. 5684. A bill to prohibit employers from compelling or coercing any person to authorize access to a protected computer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULTGREN:
H.R. 5685. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pigment Yellow 151; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULTGREN:
H.R. 5686. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Pigment Yellow 154; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULTGREN:
H.R. 5687. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Pigment Red 185; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULTGREN:
H.R. 5688. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Pigment Yellow 175; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULTGREN:
H.R. 5689. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pigment Orange 74; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. RANGEL):
H.R. 5690. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make grants to eligible entities to train elementary and secondary school nurses on how to respond to a biological or chemical attack or an outbreak of pandemic influenza in a school building or on school grounds; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MORAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CHU, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. HAHN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BECERRA, and Ms. BASS of California):
H.R. 5691. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish fair and transparent practices related to the marketing and provision of overdraft coverage programs at depository institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PAULSEN:
H.R. 5692. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on Interam mats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN:
H.R. 5693. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on perfluorocarbon amines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN:
H.R. 5694. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on certain fluoropolymers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN:
H.R. 5695. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on certain cathode-ray tubes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN:
H.R. 5696. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on certain cathode-ray tubes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN:
H.R. 5697. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on 9-Anthracenecarboxylic acid, (triethoxysilyl)methyl ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. GERLACH):
H.R. 5698. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on S-(2-benzothiazolyl)-2-(2-aminothiazol-4-yl)-2-acetoxyimino thioacetate (Thioester); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN:
H.R. 5699. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain yarn of carded wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN:
H.R. 5700. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain cotton yarn of combed fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN:
H.R. 5701. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain cotton yarn of combed fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN:
H.R. 5702. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Diiodomethyl-*p*-tolylsulfone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN:
H.R. 5703. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with diethenylbenzene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN:
H.R. 5704. A bill to renew the temporary suspension of duty on Methyl Hydroxyethyl Cellulose; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 5705. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently modify the limitations on the deduction of interest by financial institutions which hold tax-exempt bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHILLING (for himself and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 5706. A bill to provide strategic workload to Army arsenals in their function as a critical component of the organic defense industrial base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself, Mr. HECK, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 5707. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reform Medicare payment for physicians' services by eliminating the sustainable growth rate system and providing incentives for the adoption of innovative payment and delivery models to improve quality and efficiency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H. Res. 647. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America in 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

198. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 720 urging the federal government take no action to redeem, assume, or guarantee State debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

199. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 87 calling for an amendments convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to have the federal debt be increased by approval from a majority of the legislatures of the separate states; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

200. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Maine, relative to House Joint Resolution, H.P. 1397 memorializing the President and the Congress to review portions of the National Defense Authorization Act; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

201. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Maine, relative to Joint Resolution H.P. 1390 urging the Congress to Adequately Fund the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DOLD:

H.R. 5650.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 5651.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

H.R. 5653.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 5654.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5655.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts 7 and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5656.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5657.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5658.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5659.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5660.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5661.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5662.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5663.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5664.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5665.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5666.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5667.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5668.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:
''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5669.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:
''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5670.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:
''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5671.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:
''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5672.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:
''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5673.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:
''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5674.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:
''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5675.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:
''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5676.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:
''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5677.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:
''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5678.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:
''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5679.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:
''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5680.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:
''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5681.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:
''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BONNER:
H.R. 5682.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:
''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:
H.R. 5683.
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.

By Mr. HEINRICH:
H.R. 5684.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. HULTGREN:
H.R. 5685.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. HULTGREN:
H.R. 5686.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. HULTGREN:
H.R. 5687.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. HULTGREN:
H.R. 5688.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. HULTGREN:
H.R. 5689.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. ISRAEL:
H.R. 5690.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. MALONEY:
H.R. 5691.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 the Commerce Clause

By Mr. PAULSEN:
H.R. 5692.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 5693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 5694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 5695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 5696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 5697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 5698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 5699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 5700.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 5701.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 5702.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 5703.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 5704.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 5705.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. SCHILLING:

H.R. 5706.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12.

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 5707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 and Clause 18 of Section 8, of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 104: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 436: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.

H.R. 493: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 531: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 544: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 718: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 719: Ms. BUERKLE.

H.R. 733: Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 750: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 777: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 807: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 860: Ms. BUERKLE.

H.R. 885: Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 930: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1044: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1057: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.

H.R. 1145: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1167: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 1204: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1238: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1244: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 1265: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1327: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 1397: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1416: Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 1515: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1614: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1620: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1639: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 1648: Mr. DINGELL, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1666: Ms. HAHN, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 1681: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1687: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1697: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 1704: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1718: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1777: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1860: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1865: Mr. CARTER and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1936: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1940: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1955: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1956: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 1957: Mr. AKIN.

H.R. 2077: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2082: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2085: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2115: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 2140: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 2145: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 2198: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2245: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2267: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2299: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2499: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2502: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 2513: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2514: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 2524: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2568: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 2595: Mr. MEEHAN and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2600: Mr. PAUL and Mrs. BONO MACK.

H.R. 2639: Ms. WATERS and Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 2746: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2810: Mr. LANKFORD and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2827: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 2951: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 2962: Mr. GRIMM and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 3057: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 3067: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SIRES, Mr. WELCH, Mr. COHEN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HIMES, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BACA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3145: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 3173: Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 3185: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 3187: Mr. KING of New York, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 3242: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3264: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 3286: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 3324: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 3395: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 3420: Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 3444: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 3487: Mr. BERG, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. MACK.

H.R. 3497: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 3541: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 3596: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 3627: Mr. OLVER, Mr. SARBANES, and Mrs. BONO MACK.

H.R. 3643: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 3679: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 3702: Mr. AMASH.

H.R. 3713: Mr. WOLF, Mr. SHULER, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 3728: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 3766: Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 3776: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 3798: Mr. DINGELL and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 3803: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 3843: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3877: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3895: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 3905: Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 4004: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 4005: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 4057: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 4066: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 4082: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 4091: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 4093: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 4094: Mr. HURT.

H.R. 4103: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 4104: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. COLE, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. WELCH, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BARROW, Mr. TONKO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. STARK, Mr. REYES, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. HAHN, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. KIND, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 4122: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 4132: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 4133: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. POE of Texas, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 4134: Mr. HURT.

H.R. 4155: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 4157: Mr. ROSS of Florida.

H.R. 4169: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 4174: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 4209: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 4227: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 4229: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BERG, Mr. LANCE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. RIVERA.

H.R. 4254: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 4255: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 4269: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 4282: Mr. CRITZ.

H.R. 4293: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 4305: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.

H.R. 4332: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 4336: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 4341: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 4350: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 4367: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HURT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DOLD, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. CARTER, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 4372: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 4379: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 4386: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 4390: Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 4405: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 4609: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 4643: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 4816: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 4965: Mr. LATTA, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. CRAVAACK.

H.R. 5284: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 5303: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Ms. BUERKLE, MR. ROHRABACHER, MR. AUSTRIA, and Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 5331: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 5344: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 5647: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.J. Res. 104: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. ISSA.

H. Res. 271: Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. RENACCI.

H. Res. 490: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H. Res. 507: Mrs. MYRICK.

H. Res. 568: Mr. HOYER.

H. Res. 644: Mr. COOPER, Ms. WATERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SCHILLING, and Ms. HOCHUL.

H. Res. 645: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H. Res. 646: Mr. PITTS.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 5326

OFFERED BY: MR. LANDRY

AMENDMENT NO. 47: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Executive Office of Immigration Review, the Board of Immigration Appeals, or an immigration court to provide any alien with relief under section 212(d)(5)(A) or 240A(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of the United States if that alien has been determined to be removable under section 237 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 5326

OFFERED BY: MR. LANDRY

AMENDMENT NO. 48: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of any individual under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 5503(a) of title 5, United States Code.

H.R. 5326

OFFERED BY: MR. LANDRY

AMENDMENT NO. 49: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the requirement for fishing vessels in a fishery under the jurisdiction of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council to carry onboard an observer under sections 222 and 223 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations.

H.R. 5326

OFFERED BY: MR. LANDRY

AMENDMENT NO. 50: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement a proposed rule for turtle excluder devices as described in the Southeast Fishery Bulletin published by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration on May 8, 2012.

H.R. 5326

OFFERED BY: MR. WALSH OF ILLINOIS

AMENDMENT NO. 51: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program under the heading ''Department of Justice—State and Local Law Enforcement Activities—Office of Justice Programs—State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance'' may be used in contravention of section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373).

H.R. 5326

OFFERED BY: MR. SCHWEIKERT

AMENDMENT NO. 52: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Justice to bring any action against any State for implemention of a State law requiring voter identification.

H.R. 5326

OFFERED BY: MR. TIERNEY

AMENDMENT NO. 53: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. For ''Department of Justice, State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance'' for the John R. Justice Prosecutors and Defenders program, as authorized by the first section 3001 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797cc 21) (relating to loan repayment for prosecutors and public defenders), there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Science'' for Mars Next Decade is hereby reduced by, $10,000,000.

H.R. 5326

OFFERED BY: MR. LANDRY

AMENDMENT NO. 54: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Executive Office of Immigration Review, the Board of Immigration Appeals, or an immigration court to provide any alien that has been determined by that entity to be deportable under section 237 of the Immigration and Nationality Act with relief under section 212(d)(5)(A) or 240A(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 2012 *No. 65*

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, our refuge, help us to never doubt Your generous love. You gave us Heaven's best gift and desire to freely give us more than we can ask or imagine. Even when we sin, You still love us. Great is Your faithfulness.

Give to our lawmakers gifts that only You possess. Give them this day the gifts of courage to admit mistakes, grace to rise when they fall, and peace that the world cannot give. Give them this day the gifts of forgiveness for the past, courage for the present, and hope for the future. Keep them calm in the quiet center of their lives so that they may be serene in the swirling stresses of life.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUYE).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2012.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

STOP THE STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATE HIKE ACT OF 2012—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move that the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2343, and I ask unanimous consent that the time until 2 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the second 30 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S. 2343, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for Federal Direct Stafford Loans, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, the clerk just read the matter before the Senate, which is to prevent the interest rate on loans students receive to go to school—the money they borrow—from doubling from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. That is the pending matter before the Senate.

Yesterday the Republicans continued to filibuster our plan to prevent that from happening. We do not want the rates to double. We don't want them to go up at all. There are 30,000 people in Nevada who are depending on our doing something to freeze those rates. But what is worse, in my estimation—and I think that of the American people—is that Republicans seem proud of blocking this legislation. Not a single Republican voted to allow the debate to go forward.

This isn't an issue of saying: OK, if I vote for this, this will be the legislation. They would not even let us go forward to debate it. They have said they like the bill, except they do not like the way it is paid for. Fine. Let's get on the bill and offer amendments to pay for it. But no—every single Republican voted no. Every single Republican said: We are not going to allow a debate.

The American people certainly shouldn't be surprised because this has been going on for 3 years, almost 4 years. Everything is a fight. They are blocking legislation that would allow us to stop the increase of the rate on student loans. That is wrong. And the person who signed this legislation into law, making this interest rate such as it is, was President Bush. So I hope Republicans will come to their senses and work with us to accomplish this, but I am not holding my breath because, as I indicated, they seem proud they have stopped another piece of legislation altogether.

Now, what does this mean, that they are hanging together to stop legislation, to stop progress? Well, as we work to create jobs and make college affordable, our colleagues—my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle—operate under a different set of priorities.

In the House, for example, there are efforts now underway to undo a hard-fought agreement of last August to cut more than $2 trillion from the deficit over the next decade. That agreement came after threats by the tea party-

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

driven House—and now 40 percent of the people over here are tea party advocates—to shut down the government. And they wanted to do that in a couple of different ways: not allowing us to continue funding for government programs, and then, for the first time ever, there was a knockdown, drag-out fight over weeks and weeks as to whether we should increase the debt ceiling in this country. During President Reagan's time in running the country, this had been done dozens of times. But, no, these folks will do nothing without a big fight. As a result of that, we came to an agreement that was bipartisan. Now, some say the agreement was forced upon the Republicans, but they voted for it, an agreement to reduce the deficit, and the deficit we couldn't reduce before August of last year. We said: OK, fine, if we don't do something about it this year, then there will be automatic cuts called sequestration.

Now the House is doing everything they can to walk away from the agreement we made and the bipartisan vote we took. They are doing everything they can. They have a Republican budget, the so-called Ryan budget. And I say ''so-called'' because they are trying to make a reconciliation bill, but they can't do it because they are not following the law to do that. So they not only have reneged on this bicameral, bipartisan agreement to reduce spending, but they have fundamentally skewed priorities because they hand out even more tax breaks to multimillionaires and shield corporate defense contractors, all at the expense of hard-working, middle-class families, the elderly, and those who can least afford it. That is what they are doing in the House. They are going to have a so-called rule today and vote on it shortly thereafter. They would slash investments to strengthen our economy and just shred our social safety nets.

I want to quote from President Dwight Eisenhower. And let me remind everybody that he was a Republican. He was a tremendous President, and each day that goes by, people are looking at him more favorably. Here is what he said:

> Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies in the final sense a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and not clothed.

This isn't some leftwing, socialistic-leaning liberal. That was Dwight Eisenhower—a five-star general who led the invasion of Normandy and did many other things, such as starting the National Highway System. Let me repeat what he said:

> Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies in the final sense a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and not clothed.

I didn't make that up. That is what he said. In a balanced world—one where a strong national defense and a strong social safety net are both valuable pillars of a successful society—that need not necessarily be true, is what President Eisenhower said. But the Republican plan would enshrine into law a set of unbalanced priorities and ensure the kind of terrible math General Eisenhower envisioned.

Unlike defense contractors and billionaires, ordinary Americans don't have high-priced lobbyists to protect them. That is our job. That is our job. There is not a person on this side of the aisle who doesn't believe it is good that we have wealthy people in America. We have Senators here, Democrats, who are wealthy—certainly not all Democrats, but there are some. We don't look down on people who are rich, but we do have to look out for people who are in need of our help. Most of these rich people have all kinds of lobbyists here to help them, but the people in Henderson, Ely, and Winnemucca, NV, don't have people here to help them. They have us. So Republicans are going after those who can't fight back—hard-working Americans and struggling families.

Let's review a little bit of history again. The sequester isn't the first bipartisan agreement to reduce the deficit. When I became the Democratic leader, I thought—having served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives and being very interested in America's involvement in foreign affairs, I took a trip to Central and South America. That was so necessary. And I took Democratic and Republican Senators with me. I was very careful in picking two Senators whom I wanted on that trip. One was Judd Gregg, a very fine Senator from New Hampshire, who has retired, I am sorry to say. I recommended that Senator Gregg be a part of President Obama's initial Cabinet. He agreed to take the job, but something came up, and he didn't do it. But he is a wonderful man. I also wanted KENT CONRAD on that trip. And I don't know which one knows more about the inner workings of the finances of this country, Gregg or CONRAD, but they are both good, and I wanted them to go together, and they did.

Senators Gregg and CONRAD spent hours and hours seated in that airplane working on doing something about the deficit. They both believed it needed some really difficult, hard work, and they decided to do what the base-closing commission did; that is, prepare legislation and give it to a commission that would send it back to us. There would be no amendments, no filibuster, just an up-or-down vote. That was their legislation. They wrote that and brought it to the floor.

As the leader, I decided I would move to proceed to it, and so I did move to proceed to it, thinking it should be a slam dunk. But seven Republicans, who had cosponsored the legislation, voted against it. I couldn't bring it to the floor. That was where Bowles-Simpson came from, as a result of the Republicans walking away from their own efforts to reduce the deficit.

Now, Bowles-Simpson was very difficult. There were 18 members, and they had to get 14 of the 18 to approve it. That didn't work. They couldn't get that many people to vote for it.

In the meantime, President Obama was working as hard as he could with the lead spokesman of the Republicans, the Speaker of the House, JOHN BOEHNER. JOHN BOEHNER said: I didn't get elected to do small things, I want to do big things. And President Obama, to his detriment with his base, said: I will do something to change Social Security and Medicare. And all these things he agreed to do publicly. But the Republicans—JOHN BOEHNER—could never go against Grover Norquist. The Republicans shake in their boots. They will not do anything, even though the American people by a more than 70 percent majority say people making more than $1 million a year should contribute to what the problems are in this country. So that fell apart.

Then we had the Gang of 6 Senators—three Republicans, three Democrats—who had been on the Bowles-Simpson Commission, who said we should do something about this. They were in the press, they had press conferences, and this was going down the road and doing all kinds of great things. While that was going on, there was a decision made, and a law was passed to create a supercommittee, to which I appointed Senator PATTY MURRAY of Washington to run. No one in the Senate, Democrat or Republican, has more respect than PATTY MURRAY. She worked so hard with the other 11 Members of Congress to come up with something.

A few days before they were to arrive at a decision—and the Gang of 6 members are out here doing all this stuff all the time—I get a letter signed by virtually every Republican Senator saying: We are not going to raise revenue for anything. The supercommittee didn't work there. The Gang of 6 is gone. So we passed this last August to fund government for 2 years and to say if we don't arrive at another $1.2 trillion in deficit reduction during this year, it automatically kicks in at the end of this year or the beginning of next year.

So that is where we are, and the Republicans in the House are trying to change that. So that is what this little history lesson has been all about.

I don't like to sequester. I wish we didn't have to do it. It was a hard pill to swallow, but it was the right thing to do. If we are ever going to reduce the staggering deficit, we are going to have to make some hard decisions. So that is what this is all about. But that is the point: It is hard to do; therefore, we have to do it, to sequester—which, in effect, would take almost $500 billion from domestic programs and almost $500 billion from defense programs. They were designed to be tough enough to force two sides to reach a balanced deal. It hasn't happened yet.

As I said earlier with General Eisenhower's statement, I didn't make that

up. That is what he said. My complaint about the Republicans being so unreasonable about everything is something where I am not a lone wolf crying in the wilderness. We have two long-time nonpartisan watchers of Congress, one from the American Enterprise Institute, which is a conservative think tank, another from Brookings Institute that wrote an article saying: It is the Republicans. Can't you see what they are doing? Here is one thing they said:

We have been studying Washington politics in Congress for more than 40 years, and never have we seen them this dysfunctional. In our past writings, we have criticized both parties when we believed it was warranted. Today, however, we have no choice but to acknowledge that the core of the problem lies with the Republican party.

They further said:

The GOP has become an insurgent outlier in American politics. It is ideologically extreme; of scornful compromise; unmoved by conventional understanding of facts, evidence and science; and dismissive of the legitimacy of its political opposition.

What brave men to do that, to write these comments—which are true. I have been saying that I don't want to fight about everything. Republicans insist on balancing the budget on the backs of the middle class, seniors, students, single mothers, and those who could least afford it. That is what they are doing over there today. It is their refusal to compromise that leaves us facing the threat of sequester, and it is difficult but it is balanced.

Going back to the August budget agreement now in order to protect wealthy special interests is no solution. Neither is refighting the battles of last year. Democrats agree we must reduce our deficits and make hard choices, but we believe in a balanced approach that shares the pain as well as the responsibility.

Is the sequester the best way to achieve that balance? No. But Republicans refuse to consider a more reasonable approach—one, for example, that asks every American to pay his fair share while making difficult choices to reduce spending. Democrats will not agree to a one-sided solution that lets the superwealthy off the hook while forcing the middle class and those in greatest need to bear all the hardship.

Democrats believe we can protect Americans' access to health care, create jobs while investing in the future, and protect the poor and elderly. But we can't do it alone. It will take work and compromise, and so far Republicans have been unwilling to make a serious effort to achieve that result.

Republicans have rejected our balanced approach. Their one-sided solution to across-the-board cuts would take away from the many to give to the few.

Here is what the plan would do—not all of it, but here is what their plan would do. Remember, they are taking it up over there in the House today.

It would cut Medicaid benefits, increasing the number of uninsured children, parents, seniors—and that is in addition to people with disabilities—by hundreds of thousands, just eliminate them. It would also put seniors in nursing homes at risk. Some of them would have to move out of the nursing home, I guess.

It would punish Americans who receive tax credits to purchase health insurance when their financial circumstances change, causing 350,000 Americans to have no coverage. This would add to the tens of millions who already exist that way.

It would weaken Wall Street reforms, protecting big banks at the expense of consumers. Their legislation would once again target middle-class workers, food inspectors, air traffic controllers, Border Patrol agents, drug enforcement, and FBI agents. They would have to be laid off.

It would cut funding for preventive health care programs that fight chronic illnesses—such as heart disease, cancer, strokes, and diabetes—that cause 70 percent of the deaths in America. Preventive care would be reined in.

It would slash block grant funding in the United States to help 23 million children, seniors, and disabled Americans live independently and out of poverty.

No segment of the population is immune from this painful, absurd Republican plan—except maybe millionaires, billionaires, and wealthy corporations. The Republican proposal cuts Meals on Wheels and reduces food assistance for almost 2 million needy people. One of the Republican candidates running for President said President Obama is the Food Stamp President.

There are more poor people. Our economy has been in bad shape. People are struggling. The millionaires are doing fine. And in addition to what I have already mentioned, this thing that they are taking up in the House today cuts off almost 300,000 children from free school lunches at a time when one in five children lives in poverty.

The U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops said the Republican plan fails ''a basic moral test.'' This budget sets very clear priorities. The problem is what they are taking up in the House sets up the wrong priorities.

President Franklin Roosevelt said:

Human kindness has never weakened the stamina or softened the fiber of a free people. A nation does not have to be cruel to be tough.

So Republicans would do well to remember our Nation is judged not only by the strength of its military, but also by the strength of its values, so says General Eisenhower and President Roosevelt.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

SKEPTICAL AMERICANS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, with President Obama officially on the campaign trail now, it is hard not to be reminded of the kind of candidate he was the last time around and to marvel at the difference.

At some point the postpartisan healer who pledged to unite Red and Blue America became the ''divider in chief,'' a deeply divisive President who never seems to miss an opportunity to pit one group against another and who is now determined to win reelection not by appealing to America's best instincts but all too often to its worst.

Even the New York Times editorial page, this very morning, says the country is more divided than it was 4 years ago under this President. Some have argued that the transformation we have witnessed proves that the President was a liberal ideologue all along, that the task of governing revealed his true instincts. That may be true. But there is an even simpler explanation than that, and one that in some ways is even more disappointing. It is the idea that the President said what he needed to say to get elected then and that he will say whatever he needs to say to get reelected now.

It encapsulates why the American people are so very skeptical of politicians. The President's policies may have disappointed. A health care bill that was supposed to lower costs is causing them to rise. A stimulus bill that was supposed to create jobs was better at generating punch lines. But one of the greatest disappointments of this Presidency is the difference between the kind of leader this President said he was and the kind he has turned out to be.

How did that happen? Well, I think the President just put too much faith in government. Let's face it; there isn't a problem we face that this President didn't think the government could solve. Despite all the evidence to the contrary, he still can't seem to shake the idea that more government is the answer for what ails us.

When the stimulus failed, it wasn't the government's fault; it was the Republicans. When the health care bill caused health care costs to rise, the same thing. When trillions are spent and jobs don't come, it is ATM machines, it is the weather, it is bankers, it is the rich, it is Fox News—it is anything other than the government.

This is why the sickening waste of taxpayer dollars we have seen so many times over the last 3 years—whether it was at a solar company such as Solyndra or at a lavish party that Federal bureaucrats threw for themselves in Vegas—is viewed not as a symptom of a larger problem in Washington but as a problem to be managed, something to acknowledge and then move beyond because they just don't seem to see it. The President seems to view government the way some parents view their children: It can do no wrong.

So if there is a problem to solve, a challenge to tackle, the solution is always the same: more government, more government. And the results are always the same: a disappointment to be blamed on somebody—anybody—else.

I think the President summed it up pretty well during a speech he gave in New York just yesterday. This is what he said:

The only way we can accelerate job creation that takes place on a scale that is needed is bold action from Congress.

Really? The only way to accelerate job creation is through Congress? Not the private sector? Hasn't the experience of the last 3½ years taught this President anything at all about the limitations of government action?

Madam President, 3½ years and $5 trillion later, there are nearly a half million fewer jobs in the country than the day the President took office. That is not what most people would describe as a good return on investment. Yet that is all we get—the same government-driven solutions he has been pushing for 3½ years.

Nearly 13 million Americans who are actively looking for jobs can't find one. Millions more have given up looking for a job altogether as the worker participation rate is the lowest it has been in 30 years.

More than half of all college graduates—the best prepared to enter the workforce—can't find a good job. More than half of college graduates can't find a job. And this President is proposing the same old ideas that have failed before. Some government action failed? Then just do it again on a larger scale. That is the approach this President has taken. It is his approach still. It is the clearest sign he is literally out of ideas.

But he is unwilling to try something different. He is unwilling to confront the fact that a government that might have worked well a half century ago is outdated and in desperate need of reform. So he is resorting to the same old political gimmicks and games that he criticizes others for using.

Earlier this year the President mocked those who, every time gas prices go up, dust off their three-point plans to lower them, especially in an election year. That was the President. Yet yesterday he was proposing a five-point plan of his own to revive the economy, a to-do list in effect for Congress.

The cynicism is literally breathtaking. Here is a President who, in the morning, worked hand-in-hand with Senate Democrats to ensure that legislation to freeze interest rates on student loans wouldn't pass, and in the afternoon gave a recycled speech in which he pleaded for an end to the very gridlock he was orchestrating. There is perhaps no better illustration of how far this President has come from the heady days of his last campaign.

Look: Americans voted this President into office on a promise of bipartisan action.

Orchestrating political show votes on student loans and giving Congress a post-it note checklist of legislative items to pass before the election is not what the American people expected.

They expected us to work together and they still do.

The President knows as well as I do that the solution to our economic problems lies not in a Post-It-Note congressional agenda dictated from a lectern in New York, but through a sound limited-government pro-growth plan, which includes comprehensive tax reform, a true all-of-the-above energy policy and the elimination of burdensome regulations that are hurting business and hindering job creation.

Republicans have been calling for these policies for years and the President at one time or another has claimed to support them. These are proposals where Republicans and Democrats can find common ground. In other words, a plan designed not to control free enterprise from Washington but to liberate it. We just need the President to show some courage and leadership.

We will get this economy going not by handing out more special favors and credits to favored industries and groups, but by simplifying the code, clearing out the loopholes, and lowering rates for everybody.

In less than 8 months, Americans will be hit with the biggest tax increase in history—unless we act.

The President knows as well as I do how devastating this would be for the American people—for everyone.

People who are already struggling will have to do with even less. Businesses that are already struggling just to keep afloat will see Washington getting an even bigger take than it already is.

This looming tax hike will be absolutely devastating. Yet here we are less than 8 months away from it, and the President is busy orchestrating failure in the Senate and waving around some 5-point plan cooked up by some high-paid political consultant in Chicago.

Now, I am not in the business of giving the President campaign advice. But I am in the business of trying to get the best possible outcome for the American people. And here is an issue—tax reform—where I know the two parties have a shot at working together to help this economy, and restore the American Dream for all those who've started to doubt whether it will even be there in a few years.

So I would respectfully ask the President to ignore his campaign consultants for once and do what's right for the nation as a whole. Republicans in Congress are ready to work with you, Mr. President, on the kind of comprehensive reforms that you yourself have called for in the past.

Working together might not help your campaign, but it would help the country. So my message to you is this: We are ready when you are.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. I ask consent to address the Senate as in morning hour.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STARTUP ACT

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, once again, it is that time of year when many proud parents will watch their children walk across the graduation stage to receive their diplomas. Two years ago, I watched my oldest daughter saunter across her college graduation stage and it was one of those moments for me in which I realized our country faces tremendous, enormous challenges, and if we fail to act our children's future will be at significant risk.

I believe all Members of Congress, in fact every American, has the responsibility to be a good steward of what has been passed on to us. At that graduation event, I renewed my commitment to do my part to turn our country around.

My fear is we are not doing enough, that we as Americans and especially we as Members of this Congress are not doing enough to offer our children a bright future. In the last 2 weeks, I have read headlines that caught my attention. They would catch every American's attention.

First, the amount of student loan debt has surpassed $1 trillion for the first time in American history. Americans now have more combined student loan debt than combined credit card debt.

Second, the AP recently reported that one out of every two college graduates this year will be unemployed or underemployed. Unfortunately, it is not just college graduates who are having trouble finding a job and paying their bills. The Department of Labor reported just last week that more than 12 million Americans are still looking for work and our economy only added 115,000 jobs in April, the lowest number of jobs added in 5 months. This makes 39 straight months of unemployment rate over 8 percent.

Our first priority in Congress must be to strengthen our economy so more jobs can be created, more Americans can get back to work, and more graduates can pursue their dreams. Data tells us that for close to three decades, companies less than 5 years old created almost all the new net jobs in America, averaging 3 million jobs each year. While startups provide the gasoline to fuel America's economic engine, new businesses are hiring fewer employees than in the past and make up a smaller share of all companies than in previous years.

Troubling data out last week from the Census Bureau shows that the startup rate fell to the lowest point on record for new firm births in 2010. While startup companies are so important to job creation, their numbers are now falling too. Given the disproportionate impact new businesses have on

the economy, it makes sense to craft targeted policies that help entrepreneurs start businesses and that make it easier for these young businesses to grow.

A former NASA engineer now in the technology field gave me a useful analogy. He described the process of designing a rocket or an airplane, in which there are two forces at play that determine whether the rocket will launch or plane will fly: thrust and drag. So much of what we want to do around here tends to focus on the thrust, spending money and creating programs, when what we ought to be doing is focusing on reducing the drag.

Rather than spend money on government programs, Congress must and should enact policies that create an environment in which many entrepreneurs and their young companies have a better shot at success, and in the process of pursuing success they put people to work—reduce the drag so the private sector can create jobs.

To create this environment where these startup companies can be successful, I have introduced the Startup Act with Senator WARNER. The Startup Act reforms the Federal regulatory process to ensure that the cost of compliance does not outweigh the benefits of regulations. The Startup Act alters the Tax Code to create incentives that will facilitate the financing and growth of new businesses. The Startup Act accelerates the commercialization of university research so more good ideas move out of the laboratory and into the marketplace, where they can create jobs for Americans.

Perhaps most important, the Startup Act helps America win the global battle for talent.

On a recent trip to Silicon Valley, I met with startups, entrepreneurs, and some of the leading technology companies in the world—and they were just startup companies a few years ago. While I heard many encouraging stories of success, their No. 1 concern was attracting and retaining highly skilled employees. One business I met said they had plans to hire dozens—I think the number was 68—foreign-born but U.S.-educated individuals and to hire them here in the United States, but they were unable to get the visas necessary to have these workers work in the United States. Rather than lose that talent, this company hired the employees but placed them at various international offices in countries with immigration policies that encouraged the retention and attraction of highly skilled foreign-born workers.

Another company told me that with the talent increasing overseas, it will soon be easier for them to open offices and plants in other countries rather than have the work done in the United States.

The last thing we want is for American businesses to have a better business climate in places outside the United States. It is not just the loss of those dozens of jobs to some other country; many of those people in those businesses will become entrepreneurs themselves and create their own businesses, hiring even more people down the road. So we lose this talent, this skill on two occasions—first, the direct jobs today and ultimately the jobs these entrepreneurs will create in the future.

The future of our economic competitiveness depends upon America winning the global battle for talent. Foreign-born Americans have a strong record of creating businesses and employing Americans. Data shows us that 53 percent of immigrant founders of U.S.-based technology and engineering companies completed their highest degree at an American university, and rather than send these talented, highly educated individuals who have been educated in the United States back home once they graduate, we should do much more to allow them to remain in the United States, where their skills, their talents, and their intellect, as well as their new ideas, can fuel U.S. economic growth.

We are not talking about illegal immigration; we are talking about legal immigration. It makes no sense to educate these talented, foreign-born students in America and then send them to their home countries to compete against Americans for jobs.

The Startup Act will help America win this global battle for talent. The Startup Act creates entrepreneur visas for foreign entrepreneurs who register a business and employ Americans in the United States. By encouraging more entrepreneurs to stay in America, they will not only start more businesses but they will employ more Americans and strengthen our economy. The Startup Act also creates a new STEM visa for foreign students who graduate from an accredited U.S. university with a master's or Ph.D. in science, technology, engineering or mathematics. Our own Department of Commerce projects that STEM jobs will grow by 17 percent in the years ahead. We have to retain more highly skilled and highly talented and educated individuals, the ones we educate in America, for us to remain competitive in a global economy. We are going to make sure our own U.S.-born and educated citizens have those job opportunities as well. We do not want to risk the loss of the next Mark Zuckerberg to Brazil or India. Doing so will fuel America's economic growth and result in the creation of jobs here in America by retaining these folks.

Despite the overwhelming evidence, Congress should address this issue. Congress's conventional wisdom says not much will get done. My guess is 80 percent of my colleagues in Congress would agree with the proposals contained in this legislation. Particularly, 80 percent I think would agree with the aspect of the legislation dealing with STEM visas. But we are told that because we cannot do everything, we cannot do anything. That excuse is no longer a good one and should not be accepted. We cannot continue to operate under the sentence that always says we can't do anything in an election year. Our country desperately needs us to act now, not later. In fact, in the short time I have been a Member of the Senate—about 14, 15 months—six other countries have changed their laws to encourage these types of individuals to work in their countries, to create jobs, to support entrepreneurship, innovation, and job creation in those countries. In just the little over 1 year I have been a Member of the Senate, six other countries have advanced further than we have while we have waited because we cannot do anything because it is an election year.

America cannot turn a blind eye to those developments or to use the upcoming elections as an excuse to do nothing, yet again, on an issue that is so critical to our future. Congress should work to make it easier for companies to grow because in a free market, when people have a good idea and work hard, they not only enhance their own with success but the lives of so many others through the products and jobs they create.

If we do not take the steps now to win the global battle for talent, our country's future economic growth will be limited. That means college grads and young people will have fewer opportunities, and higher rates of unemployment may become the norm instead of the exception. Allowing talented, foreign-born U.S. students and entrepreneurs to remain in the United States will create jobs for more Americans.

I will continue to work with my colleagues in the Senate to implement policies such as those contained in the Startup Act so more entrepreneurs can turn their ideas into reality, that they will have the chance for success. We owe the next generation of Americans the opportunity to pursue their dreams—that those who this month walk across the graduation stages in high schools and colleges and universities, technical colleges and community colleges across our country, will have the opportunity to pursue what we all know as the American dream.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I come to the floor again to urge all of us to join together on a bipartisan basis and to reauthorize the national flood insurance program, to do it now, to do it quickly because time is running out. On May 31 the entire National Flood Insurance Program will expire. When the clock strikes midnight that day, it will be gone unless

we act, and act we must. This is an important program for the country.

In my neck of the woods, in south Louisiana in particular, almost every real estate closing is dependent on this program because those properties need flood insurance for there to be a closing, which is very typical in many other parts of the country. So here we are trying to get out of a real estate-led recession, trying to bolster the economy, and we are on the verge of letting the entire National Flood Insurance Program expire yet again.

What is so frustrating about this is there are not big disagreements about how to get this done. This is not an overly partisan issue; we are not bitterly divided. This is merely an issue of getting floor time in the Senate.

The House acted last year in a bipartisan way, and the Senate committee on which I serve has acted. I have worked very closely with my subcommittee chair JON TESTER, and we have acted in a bipartisan way. We have put together a good 5-year reauthorization bill, but we need to move this on and off the Senate floor to get this done before the end of the month.

Again, I urge the distinguished majority leader, Senator REID, to give this important matter floor time. We all come here and talk about needing to improve the economy. We all come to the floor and talk about jobs. Well, it is absolutely necessary in all of those categories, with all of those issues in mind, to extend the National Flood Insurance Program. And let's not just put a bandaid on it again and let it limp along with a very short-term extension. Let's do the full 5-year reauthorization, which we can do, which is well in sight.

Groups around the country, particularly those working in the real estate industry and in this part of the economy, strongly support this effort.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several items, including a letter to Senator REID and Senator MCCONNELL signed by dozens of associations all along the political spectrum, urging this action.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 7, 2012.

Hon. HARRY REID,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: On behalf of the undersigned associations, we respectfully urge the Senate to move quickly to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and avoid a costly lapse in the program on May 31, 2012.

As you know, more than 5.6 million policyholders in 21,000 communities nationwide depend on the NFIP as their main source of protection against property losses that result from flooding. Without flood insurance, many residential and commercial real estate transactions across the country will come to a stop, as federally backed mortgage loans cannot legally be secured without this critical protection. Failing to reauthorize the NFIP could jeopardize nearly 40,000 mortgage closings per month, according to the National Association of REALTORS.

In 2011, Hurricanes Irene and Lee caused significant flooding from North Carolina to Maine. Those storms followed more than one hundred natural catastrophe events and significant spring 2011 flooding in several states across the country. We are about to enter hurricane season again, and America cannot afford a lapse of the program. Failure to reauthorize the NFIP would further stress already struggling real estate markets, potentially cost the government billions of dollars in uncompensated relief efforts, and put millions of consumers at risk.

In July 2011, the House of Representatives passed a bi-partisan measure, H.R. 1309, by a vote of 406-22. On September 9, 2011, the Senate Banking Committee unanimously approved its version of the 5-year bill. Both proposals include a long-term reauthorization and important reforms that will optimize the current program, make needed improvements to the floodplain mapping and appeals processes, and other key reforms that will encourage program participation and put the NFIP back on the path to sound financial footing.

We urge the full Senate to act now to reauthorize this program and avoid the costly consequences that would result in a lapse from failure to act.

Sincerely,

American Bankers Association; American Bankers Insurance Association; American Insurance Association; American Land Title Association; American Resort Development Association; Chamber Southwest LA; Consumer Bankers Association; Council of Insurance Agents and Brokers; Credit Union National Association; The Financial Services Roundtable; Houma-Terrebonne Chamber of Commerce; Independent Community Bankers of America; International Council of Shopping Centers; Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of America; Mortgage Bankers Association; NAIOP, Commercial Real Estate Development Association; National Association of Federal Credit Unions; National Association of Home Builders; National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies; National Association of REALTORS®; National Apartment Association; National Multi-Housing Council; National Ready Mixed Concrete Association; Property Casualty Insurers Association of America; Reinsurance Association of America; Risk and Insurance Management Society, Inc. (RIMS).

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD another letter along the same vein addressed to Senator TESTER, the subcommittee chair, and myself, the ranking member on the subcommittee, again strongly supporting this effort. Let's do it. Let's do it now. This is the SmarterSafer coalition, and this letter is dated May 9.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANS FOR SMART NATURAL CATASTROPHE POLICY,
May 9, 2012.

Hon. JON TESTER,
Chair, Economic Policy Subcommittee, Senate Banking Committee, Washington DC.
Hon. DAVID VITTER,
Ranking Member, Economic Policy Subcommittee, Senate Banking Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS TESTER AND VITTER: As a diverse coalition of taxpayer advocates, environmental organizations, insurance industry interests, housing groups and others, we thank you for your efforts to reauthorize and reform the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The hearing you are holding today is a positive step to getting the full Senate to consider and pass the Banking Committee-passed bill to reform NFIP, which as you know is in need of serious reform. The program is currently almost $18 billion in debt to federal taxpayers and that amount is likely to increase if reforms to the program are not implemented. Without significant reform, the NFIP will not be sustainable and American taxpayers will continue to be asked to bailout the program time and time again.

The Senate Banking Committee has already unanimously reported out a bill that makes a number of needed reforms to put the flood insurance program on sound financial footing and the House passed NFIP reform with over 400 votes. The bill will phase out risky, unwarranted subsidies that have undermined the financial stability of the program; will allow NFIP to purchase reinsurance to help NFIP pay future claims while protecting taxpayers from these otherwise inevitable costs; will require FEMA to ensure maps are updated and accurate so that people understand and can better prepare for their risks; and will streamline and strengthen mitigation programs to help decrease flood risks and strengthen flood-exposed communities, homes, and businesses.

The Banking Committee has taken a needed step to reforming the nation's flood insurance program and Smarter Safer joins a range of stakeholder groups in applauding this legislation. We urge the full Senate to quickly pass this needed reform to NFIP so that the House and Senate can begin to resolve the differences and quickly get a bill to the President's desk.

We look forward to working with you on this issue and thank you for all of your efforts to pass this critical legislation.

Sincerely,

SMARTERSAFER.

Environmental Organizations: American Rivers, Ceres, Clean Air-Cool Planet, Defenders of Wildlife, Environmental Defense Fund, National Wildlife Federation, Republicans for Environmental Protection, Sierra Club.

Consumer and Taxpayer Advocates: American Conservative Union, American Consumer Institute, Competitive Enterprise Institute, Taxpayers for Common Sense.

Insurer Interests: Allianz of America, Association of Bermuda Insurers and Reinsurers, Chubb, Liberty Mutual Group, National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, Reinsurance Association of America, Swiss Re, USAA.

Housing: National Low Income Housing Coalition, National Leased Housing Association.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to also have printed in the RECORD an op-ed in Roll Call written by two representatives of this broad coalition again explaining the absolute importance and the critical nature of doing this full, longer term reauthorization.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Roll Call, May 8, 2012]

SAMPSON & VEISSI: END FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM UNCERTAINTY

(By David Sampson and Moe Veissi)

When Gerald Ford took the Presidential Oath of Office after Richard Nixon's resignation, he reminded Congress and the American people that ''even though this is late in

an election year, there is no way we can go forward except together and no way anybody can win except by serving the people's urgent needs.''

Congress would do well to heed his words as we approach a watershed election this November.

Despite widespread partisan gridlock on Capitol Hill, at least one opportunity for bicameral, bipartisan consensus exists: reauthorizing the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

The flood program sits in limbo, set to expire on May 31. Extending the NFIP must be a top congressional priority. The NFIP provides vital flood protection for more than 5.6 million home and business owners in 21,000 communities across the country. Furthermore, the housing market relies on a strong and stable flood insurance program.

A lack of flood insurance coverage creates uncertainty in the housing market and leaves homeowners dangerously vulnerable to devastating floods, which are not just a coastal issue. Flood disasters have been declared in every state and over the past century have claimed more lives and property than any other natural disaster.

In 2010, the NFIP was allowed to lapse for 53 days, halting tens of thousands of real estate transactions in areas where homebuyers are required to purchase flood insurance to obtain a mortgage. Long-term reauthorization of the insurance program would help provide the housing market with the certainty it needs for a recovery.

The National Association of Realtors estimates that another lapse in coverage could stall more than 1,300 home sales per day. And disruptions in flood insurance availability leave all taxpayers exposed to widespread, costly relief efforts.

We have witnessed encouraging signs from elected officials in recent months.

The Senate Banking Committee passed a five-year reauthorization bill at the end of 2011 and the bill now awaits floor time.

Last summer, the House passed its five-year reauthorization on a resounding, bipartisan vote of 406–22. Additionally, the Obama Administration has heralded the House legislation and urged Congress to adopt fundamental NFIP reforms.

This is progress, but it will be of little comfort to homeowners if Congress does not act soon to pass a long-term reauthorization for the NFIP.

As politics gets more polarized, Americans are looking for signs that our elected officials can work together to address real problems. Realtors and insurers stand together in calling for Congress to put aside partisan differences and bring much-needed certainty to a program on which so many Americans rely.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I keep coming to the floor urging this because it is so important and because it is so achievable. Again, there are not big issues dividing us. This is not a partisan issue. We just need Senate floor time to get it done. In that vein, I will be doing two things today and in the near future.

First, I will be passing around to all Members of the Senate a new letter addressed to Senator REID to urge that this matter be put on the floor as soon as possible. In a letter dated February 14, we urged this on a bipartisan basis, and 41 Senators, of both parties, signed that. This new letter restates that case, and, of course, now it is more urgent than ever as the clock ticks to May 31—just 3 weeks and 1 day away.

I will also be proposing an amendment to the next matter that comes on the Senate floor to incorporate the Senate bill with perfecting amendments that have been worked out toward the floor to incorporate that amendment on the next bill on the Senate floor. My understanding is that will either be the FDA user fee reauthorization or a small business tax bill. Neither of those bills is bitterly partisan or highly divisive. So I will be proposing as an amendment to either of those bills—whichever comes to the floor next—the full reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program along the lines the Senate committee has proposed.

Again, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support that effort. I urge Senator REID to use that as a mechanism to get that done now, this month, before the expiration of the program.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMISSIONS TRADING

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, in 2005 the European Union began their emissions trading scheme, which attempts to cap emissions of carbon dioxide from stationary sources within the EU.

Starting in 2012, civil aviation operators departing from or landing in Europe began to be included in this emissions scheme. Under this program, any airline, including non-European airlines flying into and out of Europe, will be required to pay for EU emissions allowances. This change comes at a time when EU allowance prices continue to decline to a little over 6 euros, and the commission is considering proposals to drive up the prices.

Allowances will be collected for the entirety of the flight, including portions in U.S. and international airspace. For example, this means a flight leaving from Los Angeles, CA, and flying to London would be taxed on the entirety of the flight, not just the fractional part of the flight that is over EU airspace. To put it another way, you would be taxed as if 100 percent of your flight was in EU airspace even though approximately only 7 percent of the flight actually was; that is, a flight originating in California here in the United States and flying to London.

Very simply, the unilateral imposition of such a scheme on the United States and other countries is arbitrary, unfair, and a violation of international law. Plus, it is being done without any guarantees for environmental improvements and at a huge cost to the aviation industry and constituents we serve here in this country.

According to the International Air Transport Association, the economic cost of this program for airlines is expected to be $1.3 billion in 2012. Let me repeat that: $1.3 billion in 2012. It is expected to reach as high as $3.5 billion by the year 2020. Those are revenues coming out of the airlines in this country that would be used to pay for this fee—this tax, if you will—imposed by the EU on U.S. airspace. By requiring commercial aviation to comply, the EU ETS also limits airline capital that could be available for other meaningful purposes, including their ability to invest in more fuel-efficient engines, alternative sources of fuel, and research and development.

No one in Congress is against the EU implementing ETS within their boundaries. However, I believe that any system that includes international and other non-EU airspace must be addressed through the International Civil Aviation Organization, the ICAO policies, of which the United States and 190 countries are members. In fact, under current ICAO standards, the aviation industry is targeted to achieve a 1.5-percent average annual improvement in carbon and fuel efficiency through 2020 and carbon-neutral growth from 2020 forward.

That is why the U.S. airline industry and those advocates in the industry also agree that a single global approach to greenhouse gas emissions set at the ICAO is preferred to the unilateral EU ETS system. Even the Obama administration testified before the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in July of 2011 that an EU ETS is inconsistent with international aviation law. The State Department and the U.S. Department of Transportation are also pressing this issue with their counterparts in Europe and are considering all legal and policy options to prevent further application of EU ETS to U.S. air carriers.

In addition, other nations have voiced opposition. Those nations include Argentina, Brazil, China, India, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Mexico, the Russian Federation, and South Africa. In fact, China's Ambassador to the EU recently suggested that they will begin canceling Airbus orders if the EU ETS remains in place. Also, countries such as Italy, the Netherlands, France, Belgium, and Spain—all EU member states—are calling for the postponement of EU ETS out of concerns raised by the international community. Even European manufacturers and airlines such as Airbus, Air France, and British Airways have urged their respective governments to stop the escalating trade conflict between the EU and the rest of the world.

The EU has no right to play policeman and undermine the ongoing work at the ICAO. As a result of this action by the EU, on December 7, 2011, I introduced the European Union Emissions Trading Scheme Prohibition Act, S. 1956, which now has seven cosponsors, both Democrats and Republicans. The bill gives the Secretary of Transportation the authority to take the necessary steps to ensure that America's aviation operators are not penalized by

any system unilaterally imposed by the EU. The bill also requires the Secretary of Transportation, the Administrator of the FAA, and other senior U.S. officials to use their authority to conduct international negotiations and take other actions necessary to ensure that U.S. operators are held harmless from the action of the European Union. The House of Representatives passed a similar bill by a voice vote on October 24, 2011. The U.S. commercial aviation community, including airlines and manufacturers, are all supportive of my bipartisan bill.

Next month, I am looking forward to the Commerce Committee hearing that is scheduled to take a closer look at this important issue and at my legislation.

Doing nothing is not an option. The unilateral imposition of the EU emissions trading scheme is a violation of international law and is hurting U.S. airlines, manufacturers, and consumers. Keep in mind that with near record oil prices, the EU ETS will add to the already high amount airlines and passengers pay for fuel.

We need to act now. We need to send a clear and unequivocal message and pass my bipartisan bill that addresses this scheme and protects the U.S. aviation industry and American sovereignty. I hope we will act on this legislation and make sure that this issue, once and for all, is put to rest and that the European Union is not able to assess a tax or a fee on American airlines operating in American airspace.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, here we are again in the Senate on yet another day when families and students across this country are wondering if we are going to do our duty. Are we actually going to move legislation that will keep the interest rate at 3.4 percent on subsidized student loans or are we going to let it go to 6.8 percent—double—on July 1?

We have legislation and we brought it to the floor. Yet yesterday my Republican colleagues voted to not even proceed to it. I think the people of America are saying that this shouldn't happen. We should be able to work these things out. We should move legislation, not obstruct it.

Everyone now agrees we should keep the interest rate at 3.4 percent. The Republicans say they want to keep it at 3.4 percent and we say we do. The Republicans were initially opposed to this, but they have gotten onboard. That is fine. I have been here on the floor listening to my colleagues talk about this since Monday. Everyone agrees we have to keep it at 3.4 percent and not let it go up, so it ought to be a bipartisan issue. We ought to be able to move this rapidly and move on to other matters. There are other issues confronting us in the Senate. Yet here we are on the floor again today discussing the student loan interest rate.

As I said, we had the vote yesterday to move it forward, but my Republican colleagues blocked us from doing that. They agree we should keep the interest rate at 3.4 percent, but not on how to pay for it. Well, OK, fine; that is a legitimate point of debate and discussion and votes. So why don't we move the bill forward, bring it to the floor, and let's have a debate and discussion on how we pay for it. If they want to offer an amendment, they can offer an amendment and we will vote on it. It seems to me—at least I think—that one of the responsibilities, and maybe privileges but responsibilities, of the majority party in the Senate, whichever party it might be, is to initiate legislation and bring it to the floor. The privilege and responsibility of the minority party is to be able to amend it, to try to make it better as they may see fit. I don't think it should be a privilege and responsibility of the minority party to block everything, but we have seen that happen more and more over the last few years. Republicans won't let us bring a bill to the floor because under the rules it requires 60 votes rather than 51 votes to bring a bill forward. So, again, we are stuck because we can't bring the bill forward.

I hope we have another cloture vote. Let's keep having these cloture votes and maybe Republicans then will say, OK, let's move it forward and let's debate it and move on. So I hope that is what we are going to be doing rather than stopping the process in its tracks.

It is interesting to note that House and Senate Republicans were silent on this issue until students from around the country became aware of the impending increase and made their voices heard. Democrats were already hard at work on the solution. I would remind my colleagues that earlier this year, in the budget debate in the House, an amendment was offered by Democrats during the House budget process to extend the current rate of 3.4 percent. That amendment lost by a straight party vote. Instead, the Republicans proposed to pay for this by taking money from the Prevention and Public Health Fund. That is not an appropriate solution, killing the fund that is preventing cancer and preventing unnecessary diseases in the United States.

My friends on the other side would have us believe that nothing bad will happen if we eliminate the Prevention and Public Health Fund. They call it a slush fund. There is no truth to that at all. The truth is that the elimination of this fund would have disastrous effects on the health of our kids and our families. To eliminate the Prevention and Public Health Fund will cost us billions in the future for taking care of people who have chronic illnesses and chronic diseases and obesity. We know that an investment in immunizing our kids—for example, for every dollar, it saves us $16 in saved health care costs. To eliminate this fund would lead to a resurgence of vaccine-preventable diseases in every State due to the expected loss of more than 1.5 million doses of lifesaving vaccines and nearly 1,100 skilled public health workers.

Again, eliminating the Prevention and Public Health Fund would mean eliminating vaccines for our kids, eliminating public health workers who know how to deliver these vaccines and respond to outbreaks. We would be losing public health staff at the State and local levels.

Eliminating this fund would end support for increased calls to the tobacco quitline, meaning smokers encouraged to quit by the fund's strategic and evidence-based investments thus far would not have the support to keep that quitline going. If current smoking rates persist, 6 million kids living in the United States today will ultimately die from smoking. If we eliminate the Prevention and Public Health Fund, we will be forced to reduce the availability of mental health and substance abuse services to very vulnerable Americans.

Eliminating the fund, as the Republicans want to do, would reduce investment in public health laboratory capacity at the State and local levels, thereby reducing the speed with which we can detect and respond to outbreaks and, yes, maybe even terrorist events. It would cut the number of disease detectives that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention can train and deploy. These disease detectives are our first line of defense against infectious diseases.

Eliminating this fund would result in layoffs, as I said, of public health officials in every State and community who are working on chronic disease prevention, immunization, health-care-associated infections, and other health problems.

An elimination of the prevention fund—again, I use the word ''elimination.'' The Republican proposal wouldn't just take some money from the prevention fund, it would kill the prevention fund. It would take every single penny out of it.

My friends on the Republican side say: Well, President Obama in his budget took money out of the prevention fund. In fact, Democrats joined with Republicans earlier this year in taking $5 billion out of the life of this fund to help pay for extending the unemployment insurance program for the remainder of this year, as well as extending the payroll tax cut. They use that example to say, Well, we can kill the whole thing. I must be very frank.

I was not in favor of that $5 billion cut, but be that as it may, as I used the analogy yesterday, it is one thing to take a couple of pints of blood and another to take all the blood. A person can live if a couple of pints of blood are taken; they can live and get healthy. That is what is happening to the prevention fund. The Prevention and Public Health Fund is alive and well and doing its job even though some money is taken out of it. What the Republicans want to do is take all the blood out and kill the whole program.

President Obama has said he will veto this bill if there are any cuts in the Prevention and Public Health Fund. So there has been a line drawn. We took some money out of it before, but no more. That is it; no more money is coming out of this prevention fund because of the good it is doing in this country.

An elimination of this fund, which the Republicans want to do, would stop in midstream across our country efforts to address the risk factors for heart disease, diabetes, obesity, and cancer—the leading causes of death and health care costs. Yesterday in this Chamber I read from a new Centers for Disease Control and Prevention report that finds that if we could prevent the obesity rate from increasing past its current 34-percent rate right now, we could save nearly $550 billion in the next 20 years.

In 1980, the obesity rate was right at about 15 percent in this country. Today, as I said, it is 34 percent. If it increases at the rate they expect, looking at all indicators now, 42 percent of all Americans will be obese by 2030 and one out of every four of them will be severely obese. That means a huge increase in adult onset diabetes and all the accompanying health care risks and costs, including heart disease and stroke, that accompany obesity.

We know how to address it. We have evidence-based programs that we know work in keeping the obesity rate down. That is what the prevention fund does. The Republicans want to kill it. They say no, get rid of it.

Cuts to our chronic disease prevention programs would mean 120 million Americans—1 in every 3 citizens—would lose access to preventive services. It would mean $103 million no longer available to States and counties and local jurisdictions to provide these services. Over 20 million Americans in rural areas in New York and in Iowa and all across this country would no longer have access to preventive services and programs.

The American people get it. Our citizens, whom we represent, get it. They understand. A poll was taken which said that voters overwhelmingly support more investment in prevention. This is from a 2009 public opinion poll: 71 percent of Americans polled said yes, do more, invest more in prevention. Our fellow citizens are crying out to us for help. They want help. They want to know what to do. How do they change? What can we do in our communities, our schools, our workplaces, our clinics, our community health centers? What can we do so that we don't get sick, so we don't get obese or diabetes, so we don't have heart disease? Most people don't know what to do. They need some help. They need information. They need support.

That is what this prevention fund does. We know it works. We know. We have evidence-based programs out there that work. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is doing an outstanding job across this country in these programs: from community programs, to public health infrastructure, to clinical preventive services, research, tobacco prevention programs, detection and prevention of infectious diseases, and training and preparing the public health workforce—all of this.

That is why prevention is not just something people go into a doctor's office to get a shot for or get a prescription for and people get a pill for. Prevention encompasses a lot of different things—everything from newborn screening, immunizations for children, school-based programs, and better food and nutrition in our school meals for kids.

Communities change the way they operate and do things—more walking paths, more bike paths. The other day there was something said about Illinois had used some of this for signage and walking paths for kids. I pointed out, yes, they did. What happened is the number of kids walking to school increased, and that cut down on the number of buses they had to use. It saved the school some money, and the kids got healthier.

I have often used the example that when I first moved to Washington in 1979, when I was in the House, my wife and I purchased a home in Virginia. We still live there. One of the reasons we bought it was because we were about a mile away from a school, a high school. We thought: That is great. The kids can just walk to school. Little did I know there were no walking paths to the school. It was a busy street. There was a sidewalk for a little ways, and then there was not one. The kids could not walk. So they had to take a bus just to go 1 mile.

So, again, communities putting in sidewalks, safe passages for kids to do that, that is healthy living. I have seen instances in my own State where communities have put in walking paths for the elderly, for senior citizens, so they do not have a lot of steps and things to go up and down. You would be amazed how many people use that and stay healthy.

Supporting systems in our workplaces, making our workplaces more healthy, helping businesses understand what they can do to provide a healthier workplace for people—examples abound all over this country.

I say to the Acting President pro tempore, I am sure I do not know all the instances in New York State, but I will bet you communities there have gotten together and thought about how to make life a little bit more healthy, how to support a more healthy infrastructure for their people.

Some communities are coming up with very ingenious ideas. I say more power to them. That is what the Prevention Fund is for—to help them, to encourage them, to give them the kind of support they need to provide that healthy living.

I have said many times, it is interesting that in America it is easy to be unhealthy and hard to be healthy. One would think it should be the other way around. It should be easy to be healthy and harder to be unhealthy. It is just the other way around.

So what we are trying to do with some part of the prevention fund—not all of it; part of it—is to make it easier to be healthy, to make that an easier option for people.

So if we both agree—Republicans and Democrats—on the fact that we need to keep the interest rate on student loans at 3.4 percent, then the debate is just on the offset. As I have said, Republicans want to kill the prevention fund. The American people have said loudly: No, we do not want to do that. We want more investment in prevention. We do not want to get sick. We do not want to get obese. We want to quit smoking. We want our kids to be healthy. We want them to have healthier food, better exercise. Republicans are saying: Well, we are just not going to do that. I guess we will pay more for it in chronic illnesses and diseases down the line.

Well, our offset is one that I think is legitimate and sound, closing a loophole in the Tax Code. That means more money would go into the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, and it would help us keep the interest rate at 3.4 percent.

Education has always, and I hope will always, remain a bipartisan issue here. I urge my Republican colleagues to come to the table with a serious offset—a serious offset. If they do not like what we have proposed, please come with something that is serious. Eliminating the prevention fund is a no-starter. As the President said, he would veto it. So why push it?

I think this is an opportunity for all of us to come together and show the American people this body is not broken; we can work with each other and get things done for the good of our people. Again, I encourage my Republican colleagues to allow us to move forward on the bill. Do not keep blocking it. If they want to offer a different offset, fine. Not this one, not the elimination of the prevention fund because that is not serious. That is not going anywhere. If they have some other ideas, bring them forward. As of yet we have seen nothing from my Republican colleagues other than stopping the bill—stopping it, stopping it, stopping it.

So I hope they will come to the table, and I hope we can move this bill forward.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, first, I commend my friend from Iowa for being such a phenomenal champion of preventive health care. He has been fighting for this as long as he has been in the Senate, and he has had some great victories. He has had some setbacks but mainly victories. It is because of his energy and effort that we are where we are today in terms of getting this money for preventive health care, and his continued effort to fight for it and to preserve this fund is notable. It is going to succeed. If it does, and when it does, it will be mainly because of our friend from Iowa.

Our Republican colleagues could have allowed us yesterday to begin debate on legislation to fix the looming increase in student loan interest rates. They could have helped us avoid adding to the already crushing weight of student debt that families in our country face. They could have joined us in taking a step toward letting parents do what parents desperately want to do, which is to help their kids to a better future.

American families are waiting for us to act. On July 1 the interest rate on student loans is going to increase from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. It is going to double unless we act. For every year we fail to act, it will cost the typical college student and their family $1,000. That is $1,000 that most families do not have to spare. More than 7 million students and their families nationwide would be affected. So the need to act is urgent.

Instead, in what has come to be a damaging ritual in the Senate, Republicans have filibustered a motion to proceed to important legislation. Republicans have voted against even allowing the Senate to begin to debate a bill. Why not debate it? Why not offer relevant amendments? Why not address this important issue?

No. By their filibuster, our Republican colleagues have refused to let the Senate even start this process. Republicans say they too want to prevent this increase in student loan interest rates. They differ with us, they say, on how to pay for it. Republicans say the only way they are going to support this legislation to prevent the rate increase is with cuts from a fund that helps to prevent infectious and chronic diseases.

The program Republicans seek to eliminate has provided more than $8 million to my State to help fight major health problems, such as influenza, diabetes, HIV, heart disease, and cervical cancer. These funds even helped to provide funding for childhood immunizations programs. So what the Republicans propose is this: choose between helping college students and their families and helping to prevent expensive and debilitating health problems, choose between education and health care. Choosing to allow more health problems in order to help students and their families is not a choice at all.

Democrats are offering a different alternative. We recognize the Tax Code is full of loopholes and special breaks that allow some individuals and some corporations to avoid paying taxes. In this case, what is identified is a tax break that allows some professional service providers such as lawyers to avoid paying their payroll taxes by organizing their businesses as so-called S corporations and then paying themselves in the form of dividends instead of salaries. The Government Accountability Office recently examined this issue and found widespread problems, costing taxpayers and the Treasury billions of dollars each year in uncollected revenues.

What our bill would do is require the professional service providers with incomes above $250,000 a year to pay payroll taxes on the income they derive from these S corporations. We would use the revenues from closing that loophole for those with incomes above $250,000 to prevent the interest rate hike that is going to hit middle-income families. At the same time we are going to be able to do that, we are also going to avoid increasing the deficit or slashing important programs.

Our Republican colleagues have accused us—to quote one of them—of raising taxes on ''the people that are doing some of the very serious job creation in this country.''

Well, not long ago Republicans were saying something different about this loophole. For starters, they actually called it a loophole. That is what former Vice President Cheney called it during his 2004 Vice Presidential debate.

He called it a ''special loophole.'' He accused his debate opponent of dodging $600,000 in payroll taxes using this loophole. Likewise, a Republican candidate for the Senate not long ago called this ''a deceptive tax scheme to get around the IRS.'' There were no Republican cries then about raising taxes on job creators.

The fact is this loophole ought to be closed, no matter who is taking advantage of it, Democrats or Republicans. Closing it, at least for those with incomes above $250,000, in order to avoid another blow in a long series of blows to middle-income Americans just makes sense and is fundamentally fair.

Hundreds of thousands of students in my State of Michigan depend on student loans to help afford college. They and their families know college is not going to get any cheaper. They do not need a doubled interest rate on top of tuition increases. For many an affordable loan is the difference between staying in school or giving up the dream of a college education. We should not let this loophole stand in the way of those dreams.

I urge our Republican colleagues to end their filibuster of this vital bill. If Republicans think they have a better way, let's debate their alternative and let's vote. Let's end this filibuster. Let's end it today.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WEBB. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAR POWERS

Mr. WEBB. Madam President, I rise today to address perhaps the most important constitutional challenge facing the balance of power between the Presidency and the Congress in modern times, and also to offer a legislative solution that might finally address this paralysis. It is an issue that has for far too long remained unresolved. And for the past 10 years, the failure of this body to address it has diminished the respect, the stature, and the seriousness with which the American people have viewed the Congress—to the detriment of our country and to our national security.

The question is simple: When should the President have the unilateral authority to decide to use military force, and what is the place of the Congress in that process? What has happened to reduce the role of the Congress from the body which once clearly decided whether the Nation would go to war, to the point that we are viewed as little more than a rather mindless conduit that collects taxpayer dollars and dispenses them to the President for whatever military functions he decides to undertake?

We know what the Constitution says. Most of us also know the difficulties that have attended this situation in the years that followed World War II.

We are aware of the debates that resulted in the war powers resolution of nearly 40 years ago in the wake of the Vietnam war, where the Congress attempted to define a proper balance between the President and this legislative body. I have strong memories of the policy conflicts of that era, first as a marine infantry officer who fought on the unforgiving battlefields of Vietnam, on which more than 100,000 U.S. marines were killed or wounded, and later as an ardent student of constitutional law during my time at the Georgetown University Law Center.

But it was in the decades following Vietnam that our constitutional process seems to have broken apart. Year by year, skirmish by skirmish, the role of the Congress in determining where the U.S. military would operate and when the awesome power of our weapons systems would be unleashed has diminished. In the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, especially with the advent of special operations forces and remote bombing capabilities, the Congress seems to have faded into operational irrelevance.

Congressional consent is rarely discussed. The strongest debates surround

the rather irrelevant issue of whether the Congress has even been consulted. We have now reached the point that the unprecedented—and, quite frankly, contorted—constitutional logic used by this administration to intervene in Libya on the basis of what can most kindly be called a U.N. standard of humanitarian intervention was not even subject to a full debate or a vote on the Senate floor. Such an omission, and the precedent it has set, now requires us to accept one of two uncomfortable alternatives. Either we as a legislative body must reject this passivity and live up to the standards and expectations regarding Presidential power that were laid down so carefully by our Founding Fathers or we must accept a redefinition of the very precepts upon which this government was founded.

This is not a political issue. We would be facing the exact same constitutional challenges no matter the party of the President. In fact, unless we resolve this matter, there is no doubt we someday will.

The conflict in the balance of power between the President and the Congress has always been an intrinsic part of our constitutional makeup. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution provides that the Congress alone has the power to declare war. Article II, section 2 of the Constitution provides that the President shall serve as Commander in Chief. In the early days of our Republic, these distinctions were clear, particularly since we retained no large standing army during peacetime, and since article I, section 8 also provides that the Congress has the power to ''raise and support armies,'' a phrase that expressed the clear intent of the Framers that large ground forces were not to be kept during peacetime but, instead, were to be raised at the direction of Congress during the time of war.

Our history confirms this, as our armies demobilized again and again once wars were completed. Only after World War II did this change, when our rather reluctant position as the world's greatest guarantor of international stability required that we maintain a large standing military force, much of it stationed in Europe and Asia, ready to respond to crises whose immediacy could not otherwise allow us to go through the lengthy process of mobilization in order to raise an army and because of that reality made the time-honored process of asking the Congress for a formal declaration of war in most cases obsolescent.

But any logical proposition can be carried to a ridiculous extreme. The fact that some military situations have required our Presidents to act immediately before then reporting to the Congress does not, in and of itself, give the President a blanket authority to use military force whenever and wherever he decides to do so, even where Americans are not personally at risk and even where the vital interests of our country have not been debated and clearly defined. This is the ridiculous extreme we have now reached. The world is filled with tyrants. Democratic systems are far and few between. I don't know exactly what objective standard should be used before the U.S. Government would decide to conduct a so-called humanitarian intervention by using our military power to address domestic tensions inside another country, and I don't believe anyone else knows either. But I will say this: No President should have the unilateral authority to make that decision either.

I make this point from the perspective of somebody who grew up in the military and whose family has participated as citizen soldiers in most of our country's wars, beginning with the American Revolution. I was proud to serve as a marine in Vietnam, and I am equally proud of my son's service as a marine infantryman in Iraq. I am also deeply grateful for having had the opportunity to serve 5 years in the Pentagon, first as a marine, then later as Assistant Secretary of Defense and as a Secretary of the Navy. I have also benefited over the years from having served in many places around the world as a journalist, including in Beirut during our military engagement there in 1983 and in Afghanistan as an embedded journalist in 2004. As most people in this body know, I am one of the strongest proponents of the refocusing of our national involvement in East Asia. I was the original sponsor of a Senate resolution condemning China's use of force with respect to sovereignty issues in the South China Sea.

The point is I am not advocating a retreat from anywhere. But this administration's argument that it has the authority to decide when and where to use military force without the consent of the Congress, using the fragile logic of humanitarian intervention to ostensibly redress domestic tensions inside countries where American interests are not being directly threatened is gravely dangerous. It is a bridge too far. It does not fit our history. To give one individual such discretion ridicules our Constitution. It belittles the role of the Congress. For anyone in this body to accept this rationale is also for them to accept that the Congress no longer has any direct role in the development, and particularly in the execution, of foreign policy.

There are clear and important boundaries that have always existed when considering a President's authority to order our military into action without the immediate consent of the Congress. To exceed these boundaries—as the President has already done with the precedent set in Libya—is to deliberately destroy the balance of powers that were built so carefully into the Constitution itself.

These historically acceptable conditions under which a President can unilaterally order the military into action are clear: If our country or our military forces are attacked; if an attack, including one by international terrorists, is imminent and must be preempted; if treaty commitments specifically compel us to respond to attacks on our allies; if American citizens are detained or threatened; if our sea lanes are interrupted, then, and only then, should the President order the use of military force without first gaining the approval of the Congress.

At least until recent months, the Congress has never accepted that the President owns the unilateral discretion to initiate combat activities without direct provocation, without Americans at risk, without the obligations of treaty commitments, and without the consent of the Congress. The recent actions by this administration, beginning with the months-long intervention in Libya, should give us all grounds for concern and alarm about the potential harm to our constitutional system itself. We are in no sense compelled—or justified—in taking action based on a vote of the United Nations or as a result of a decision made by a collective security arrangement, such as NATO, when none of its members have been attacked. It is not the prerogative of the President to decide to commit our military and our prestige into situations that cannot clearly be determined to flow from vital national interests.

Who should decide that? I can't personally and conclusively define the boundaries of what is being called a humanitarian intervention and, most importantly, neither can anybody else. Where should it apply? Where should it not? Rwanda? Libya? Syria? Venezuela? Bangladesh? In the absence of a clear determination by our time-honored constitutional process, who should decide where our young men and women or our national treasure should be risked? Some of these endeavors may be justified, some may not. But the most important point to be made is that in our system no one person should have the power to inject the U.S. military and the prestige of our Nation into such circumstances.

Our Constitution was founded upon this hesitation. We inherited our system from Great Britain, but we adapted and changed it for a reason. One of our strongest adjustments from the British system was to ensure that no one person would have the power to commit the Nation to military schemes that could not be justified by the interests and the security of the average citizen. President after President, beginning with George Washington, has emphasized the importance of this fundamental principle to the stability of our political system and to the integrity of our country in the international community. The fact that the leadership of our Congress has failed to raise this historic standard in the past few years, and most specifically in Libya, is a warning sign to this body that it must reaffirm one of its most solemn responsibilities.

I have been working for several months to construct a legislative solution to this paralysis. This legislation

would recognize that modern circumstances require an adroit approach to the manner in which our foreign policy is being implemented. But it would also put necessary and proper boundaries around a President's discretion when it comes to so-called humanitarian intervention, where we and our people are not being directly threatened. My legislation requires that in any situation where American interests are not directly threatened, the President must obtain formal approval by the Congress before introducing American military force. This legislation will also provide that debate on such a request must begin within days of the request and that a vote must proceed in a timely manner.

I remind the leadership on both sides of this body that despite repeated calls from myself and other Senators, when this administration conducted month after month of combat operations in Libya, with no American interests directly threatened and no clear treaty provisions in play, the Congress of the United States, both Democratic and Republican, could not even bring itself to have a formal debate on whether the use of military force was appropriate, and this use of military force that went on for months was never approved. The administration, which spent well over $1 billion of taxpayer funds, dropped thousands of bombs on the country and operated our military offshore for months, claimed that combat was not occurring and rejected the notion that the War Powers Act applied to the situation. I am not here to debate the War Powers Act; I am suggesting that other statutory language that covers these kinds of situations must be enacted. The legislation I will be introducing will address this loophole in the interpretation of our Constitution. It will serve as a necessary safety net to protect the integrity and the intent of the Constitution itself. It will ensure that the Congress lives up not only to its prerogatives, which were so carefully laid out by our Founding Fathers, but also to its responsibilities.

With that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I come down to talk about the issue of student loans, as someone who has two ends of this equation—one as the former chairman of the Student Loan Corporation for the State of Alaska for 7 years. I took that corporation from the brink of bankruptcy, junk bond rating, you name it—it was in dismal condition. We turned it around, and 7 years later the corporation ended up paying a hefty annual dividend to Alaska for higher education and had one of the lowest interest rates in the country and increased the capacity for students to borrow money not only for 2- and 4-year degrees and master's degrees but also for career education, something most people told me, when I became chair of that corporation, would never be able to be done. Good luck. We wish you the best. And off they went and most of them got off the board very quickly. We were able to bring it together. In the process, in my experience around the issue of education, in making sure young people had the capacity to borrow money at reasonable rates, it went down about 2 percent, which is a pretty incredible rate for a student or parent to borrow money at.

I was also chair of the Postsecondary Education Commission for 7 years, a copartner with the Student Loan Corporation, making sure we had strong educational institutions to provide career, college, and other types of education for young people. I come with that experience, and also I come from experience as a small businessperson, which I will get to in a minute, with regard to how we are trying to pay for this interest rate, controlling the interest rates and making sure they don't rise. The rate for subsidized interest loans will rise from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent in July. That will increase the average cost for students by $1,000 over the course of a loan. Students are truly waiting and families are waiting, as kids are graduating right now across this country from high school, getting ready to move on to higher education and making their plans—be they scholarships or grants or loans or whatever they need to cobble together the amount of money needed to move on to a higher education and to ensure they can afford it. And the interest rate is part of that equation. Doubling the interest rate would be damaging to our young families who are making sure their kids can get on and have an opportunity to be educated.

As you know, many of us have gone onto our Facebook page and Twitter accounts and asked constituents from our districts to tell us their stories—tell us what is happening: If this interest rate doubles, what will happen to you. One Anchorage resident says her granddaughter graduated from Charter College. I know this college well. This is a privately run college which has an incredible placement rate—almost 90-percent placement rate once they graduate with their degree. It is an intensive program. It is like a job. Students are there 8 to 5 every day, all day, for several months, and they consolidate the time. She has been working on her accounting degree, and now, 6 years later—because she had to work two jobs while going to school, trying to pay for this and borrowing money—her total debt is $72,000. She is 31 years old. Her family is truly wondering how she will ever get out of debt if this bill doesn't pass, because if the interest rates adjust, it is truly money that comes out of her pocket to literally pay off interest, and the net result is she gets deeper and deeper in debt.

We know the cost of college is more and more expensive every year, and one way we are going to make sure students can afford this is by making sure we do not double the interest rate. We had a vote earlier this week that did not succeed. We tried on this side to move it forward. It is important for us to make sure every kid has access to education—whether it is higher education, career education, voc education or whatever the new title is they like to use to describe it—because we are in a globally competitive economy, and we need to make sure our kids are well educated and have access to education, which means affordability.

Yesterday I was listening to the debate, and this is where my small business part comes in. I have been in the small business arena since the age of 14. I have operated and owned a variety of businesses—some successful, some not so successful. Hopefully, you learn from those that are not so successful, and I think I have. The Democrats' pay-for—the majority's pay-for—was to close a tax loophole used by high-income earners—basically lawyers, lobbyists, and consultants. No disrespect to their fields, but they basically use the system to avoid paying the Medicare taxes, for example, that all of us pay. All of us who sit in this Chamber, the people who work at the restaurants outside here, the people who drive the buses, and everyone else, pays that tax. But some use this to organize under an S corporation. It is a technical term under the IRS Code that allows those profits to go right to the individual. So they decided instead of paying it as a wage, they would take it as profit or a dividend, thus avoiding the Medicare taxes all of us pay. They are getting a free ride.

I heard the phrase used yesterday on the floor, ''a bunch of new taxes.'' These aren't new taxes. These are taxes that are owed. They just found a loophole—again, consultants, lobbyists and lawyers—through the writing of the laws. And they probably wrote them. Actually, they did, if you look at the history of it. They wrote the law so they could avoid the Medicare taxes everyone else has to pay. So when I hear people saying it is the restaurant owner, it is the retailer, the plumber, I think, that is a bunch of baloney. That is misinforming the public. It is unbelievable. I know this, because as a former retailer who had an S corporation, we paid our taxes. We paid with a wage. We paid it all.

This loophole is clear. All you have to do is look at it. They have to meet three standards: modified gross income above $250,000 for joint filers, $200,000 for individuals and shareholders, and an S corporation that derives 75 percent or more of gross revenues from services of three or fewer shareholders. Service is defined as lobbying, law, engineering, architect, accounting, actuarial science—which is a science—performing arts, athletes, and brokerage services. I am looking here, and I don't see where it says retailers. It doesn't say the mom-and-pop folks who work every day and pay their taxes.

So for Members to come to the floor and try to trick the public—because

that is what they tried to do by using convoluted words, knowing people are getting the 10-second sound bites—saying, oh, it is going to raise new taxes and cause all these small businesses not to hire, that is baloney. This is about lawyers, lobbyists, and consultants who wrote the law making sure they didn't have to pay a dime. That is what that is about. For people to come to the floor and say we are going to raise the interest rate on hard-working families who are trying to get their kids through college is unbelievable.

I hope we take this up again. I hope we vote on it and get this thing resolved, and make sure working families can afford to get their kids into college and can afford the high cost so they can become productive parts of this country, perhaps opening their own small business and paying their taxes, as every other small business does.

I was appalled when I heard some of the Members speaking on this, and they sounded so logical. But to be frank with you, there are not many in this body—no disrespect to my colleagues—who have owned and operated a true small business. I am talking about starting with a few nickels and dimes because you got turned down by the bank; where the banker told you your idea was a dumb idea. I can say this from personal experience. Three years later, I sold that business for three times what I had invested. I thought it was a good idea, but the banker didn't. But I had to scratch together two nickels to make that business successful. I had to work 12 to 15 hours every day to make sure it was successful. That is a small businessperson. There are not many in this body.

So when a Member comes to the floor and sounds so professional in their description of how it is going to affect certain people, it is incorrect. And one thing I wouldn't mind in this body is to have factual debates. That is what the public deserves, not this kind of 10-second media bite, where they can get away with anything and then say back home, we didn't raise taxes, we didn't do this. What they are doing is jacking up rates on students. That is what is going to happen at the end of the day here, by July 1, if we don't take action.

And we have taken action on this side. But the end result will be that families, hard-working families, middle-class families, will pay more for their students' education, and students will pay more for their education because of a simple law that we can correct. All we have to do is close the loophole that lobbyists, lawyers, and consultants are taking advantage of and wrote to their advantage to stick it to the middle class. I think it is time to reverse the trend, for once, around this place—just once—and give the middle class a break here. This is a break they deserve and it will help to build our economy in the future because we will have a highly educated workforce meeting this global economy.

I know there is another alternative out there. There is a new pay-for, and here is what that does: It takes away prevention funds for health—$226 million used to reduce diabetes and heart disease. I don't know about my colleagues, but if we don't prevent it, then we may have a higher cost later. Those are preventable diseases. This money is well invested. They also want to take away the $93 million used for anti-tobacco education and $190 million used for immunizations.

Our Republican friends do not like the plan that closes the loophole on lobbyists, lawyers, and consultants, but they do like the one that takes away prevention programs that help the middle class, that helps our young families who might be experiencing signs of a preventable disease—heart disease. And a little prevention might save their lives, but it will also save on health care costs in the future.

I see this proposal as crazy talk. I don't know how else to describe it. I am trying to keep it simple. Let's get on with closing the loopholes people took advantage of by lobbying and wheeling and dealing in the halls of Congress. Let's fix that and protect our working families, our middle-class families, and make sure we are doing the right thing. That is what they sent us here to do, and I think we have an obligation.

Again, I hope we move forward and make sure we are not going to allow the rates on these loans to double. I am not for doubling the rates; 3.4 percent is a good rate. We should ensure students can get that rate as they get prepared for the fall session and are borrowing money to get on with their higher education.

I thank the Chair, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEGICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues in calling for a real solution to the impending student debt crisis. Yesterday we had a chance to do the right thing and stand with millions of young Americans all across our country, to invest in their future by preventing these interest rates from doubling on Stafford loans 52 days from now. Instead, our colleagues across the aisle chose to stand in the way of a commonsense proposal. As a result, 7 million students are facing higher interest rates that will cost them each an extra $1,000 a year in interest, further pushing access to quality higher education out of reach for too many and saddling others with additional unmanageable debt when they get out of college and join the workforce.

But don't take it from me about how tough this is going to be, take it from the students and the families themselves. Just as the Presiding Officer has heard from thousands of families all across Alaska, we have been hearing the same online and through e-mail about what this would actually do to their families.

I heard from one New York parent who has a child in college and another heading there this fall. His older child spent a year in AmeriCorps, and his younger is there serving now. He said:

> These kids are serving America. Both of my kids will leave college with around $25,000 in debt, if we can afford to keep it down that much.

We should all be able to agree that adding another $1,000 or more per year to the debt of kids who are only looking to serve this country, get a good education, and help rebuild this economy is wrong.

I heard from a woman in the Bronx. She has a job as a social worker, and she is on track to pay off her student loans in the next 10 or 11 years—just in time for her twin daughters to start college. She said:

> Doubling my student loan interest will keep me in debt at a time when I am going to need every single penny to get my kids through college with as little debt of their own as possible. The more interest I pay, the more they'll have to borrow for their own educations, and the cycle will continue indefinitely.

I heard from a woman in Saratoga with a bachelor's degree in hotel, resort and tourism management. Despite making good money, she says that paying $800 a month in student loans on top of her everyday bills makes getting by nearly impossible. She said:

> My choice is to instead decide what bill I'm going to pay this month, making me fall behind on other payments, destroying my credit in the future. If my interest rate was any higher, I honestly do not know how I would survive at all. Pretty much all the money I am making is going straight into student loans. We need all the help we can get.

These are just a few of the stories I heard yesterday. And the families expect better from us.

When we price young people out of a college education, we all are going to pay the price. When we limit their opportunity, we rob ourselves of those future engineers, biologists, and small business owners. America's ability to lead the global economy relies on our ability to outeducate the global competition.

Let's open doors to higher education to anyone who is willing to work for it, and let's keep it affordable. Let's reward hard work and responsibility instead of risk taking. There is no excuse for inaction, so let's have a real debate, in good faith, to solve this problem we all know is within our reach. Students and families all across America can't afford any more delay.

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. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHARTER SCHOOLS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, this week is the 13th annual National Charter Schools Week. On Tuesday, Senator LANDRIEU of Louisiana and I joined with 10 other Senators in submitting a resolution praising teachers, administrators, parents, and students who are part of the charter school movement across our country.

Let me begin by explaining exactly what a charter school is because sometimes we stand here in the Senate and start talking without explaining the subject. A charter school is the Memphis Academy of Science and Engineering. I visited there 4 years ago during spring break. Most of the students in Memphis were somewhere else, but not the students at the Memphis Academy of Science and Engineering. These were sophomores studying advanced placement biology. These were children who had been in other schools the year before that were deemed to be low-performing schools. In other words, these were among the students in Memphis considered least likely to succeed. But they were fortunate. They were allowed to go to this charter school. Their parents had chosen this charter school.

Here is what was different about the school. The union rules, the State rules, and the Federal rules had been relaxed so that the teachers had the freedom to do what they thought those children needed in that school. In this case, many of these children didn't have as much at home as other children did, so the teachers decided that the school ought to be open 12 hours a day, that it ought to be open on Saturday morning, and that it ought to be open more weeks a year than other schools. And the students were there on spring break studying advanced placement biology, which is not what many sophomores do in many schools in this country. And these children were succeeding.

The charter school was able to pay some teachers more than others. It was able to have some classes that were smaller than others. It meant that some scheduled classes were longer than others and some children got special attention that needed it.

You may say: Well, that makes so much common sense. Why aren't teachers able to do that in every public school in America? That is a very good question because, in a way, every one of our 100,000 public schools in America should be a charter school in the sense that the real definition of a charter school is one that gives teachers the freedom to use their own good sense and judgment with the children whom parents choose to send to that school.

I have a personal interest in charter schools. Twenty years ago, I was the U.S. Secretary of Education. I was in my final year. The last thing I did in 1992 as Secretary was to write a letter to all the school superintendents in America urging them to try what a small number of Minnesota public schools were doing in what they were then calling startup schools. These were the first charter schools in America. Their origin was primarily from those who were part of the Democratic Farmer Labor Party in Minnesota. But at the same time, on the conservative side of the ideological spectrum, there were many who were calling for getting rid of teacher union rules and State rules and regulations that were making it harder for teachers to teach. So there was a happy convergence of support for this idea of startup schools.

I remember that Albert Shanker, the late head of the American Federation of Teachers, supported the idea from the beginning. But many of those in the teachers unions opposed him. Many of those in the education establishment didn't like it. They were afraid of what might happen.

Well, here is what has happened over the last 20 years. Instead of a handful of schools in Minnesota, we now have about 5,600 charter schools in America today. About 5 percent of all of our public schools are charter schools. The way they work is very simple. They are public schools, and the money the State and local government would ordinarily spend on their district school follows each child to the charter school. So it is just a public school organized in a different way.

The first one, as I said, was in 1992—City Academy High School in St. Paul, MN. In 1997, President Clinton called for creating 3,000 charter schools by 2002. This was after the first President Bush had called for creating ''break the mold'' schools in every school district in America—another name for what we call charter schools today. And then in 2002 the second President Bush called for $200 million to support charter schools. Today, 41 States have charter schools, and the schools serve more than 2 million students—about 4 percent of the 50 million students in our public schools today.

I am proud to say that our own State of Tennessee has had a strong charter school movement since 2002, and only recently has the State charter law been amended to remove the cap on the number of schools in the State and limitations on student eligibility. We currently have 40 charter schools operating in Tennessee—25 in Memphis and 11 in Nashville—with nearly 10,000 students attending these schools. Our First to the Top plan—Tennessee won the President's Race to the Top plan for education—included $14 million to expand high-performing charter schools. The Achievement School District, which Governor Bill Haslam created, has approved three charter operators to turn around priority schools that are failing, and we can expect more to be approved next year.

So the question often is asked, well, are charter schools really helping students? And in some ways the jury is still out. Charter schools are relatively new, and there are many factors that go into the success of a student in a school, the No. 1 factor being what happens at home. But there are good and encouraging indications.

A recent study by Stanford University found that two-thirds of the charter schools in Tennessee have been improving student performance in reading or math at a faster rate than competing traditional district public schools. Sixty-seven percent of charter schools in Tennessee have been improving the overall growth of their students for the last 3 years.

But that means that 30 percent of the charter schools weren't performing as well or were performing worse. So the fact is, not every charter school is going to be successful. Not every startup business is successful. But we have a model in our country that reminds us of what can happen when we have autonomous institutions where administrators and teachers have the privilege of using their own judgment and common sense to make things happen, and we call that higher education.

In the United States of America, we have around 6,000 institutions of higher education. There are all kinds—Yeshiva University, Nashville Auto Diesel College, Vanderbilt University, the University of Tennessee, Notre Dame, or Stanford. There are many different kinds—for-profit, nonprofit, public, nonpublic. But they are all largely autonomous and the students choose the schools they attend. And what has happened? Everyone in the world agrees that we have not only the best colleges in America, but we have almost all of the very best colleges.

So our goal should be to gradually increase the number of charter schools. At the same time, it is important that there should be some accountability. I know that in Tennessee they have a tough review board, and if a charter school is not working, it is closed down. That should be the case in many other places. You might ask: Why would you go through that struggle? Well, we should be doing that with some of the non-charter public schools as well, and we are beginning to that with so-called turnaround schools.

Charter schools should be held to the same standards as other public schools. And charter schools shouldn't be allowed to pick and choose; they should be required to enroll all eligible students. If more students want to come than they have room for, there could be some fair method for choosing the students, such as a lottery. That makes a very good case. If charter schools are so popular that more families want their children to go to them, then we need even more charter schools.

I am happy to come to the floor today to praise the teachers and the

innovators, Presidents of both parties, including President Obama and his Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, who have strongly supported charter schools, just as President Bush and President Clinton and the first President Bush did.

This is a movement that has broad bipartisan support. It has grown from a handful of schools in Minnesota 20 years ago to 5 percent of all of our public schools in the country today. What we have found is that when you give teachers more freedom to use good judgment and when you give parents more choices of schools, good things happen. The charter school movement is proving that. This is a week to salute their hard work and to hope that over the next year, 5 years, 10 years, more and more public schools become charter schools, where teachers are free to exercise their judgment and parents are free to choose the schools their children attend.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, in less than 2 months—53 days—the interest rate on subsidized student loans will double to 6.8 percent unless Congress acts. If the rate on subsidized Stafford loans is allowed to rise, as many as 7.4 million students across the Nation, including approximately 43,000 students in Rhode Island, will pay about $1,000 more for each year that they borrow, and that is on top of already significant debt.

Some have argued, even while claiming to support keeping interest rates low, that the increase would not be a significant financial burden. Students and families beg to disagree. This would be a significant impediment to completing their education. For younger students starting their education, for those seeking educational opportunities for job transition in midlife, those opportunities would be frustrated also. Right now students and their families are sitting around the kitchen table making tough decisions about next year and whether they can afford to go to school if interest rates double.

One Rhode Island mother wrote me:

> Please do not raise the interest rates on student loans. My son will be in his last year . . . I cannot afford to pay any more and fear that he will not be able to graduate and still have all the loans to pay back.

So in addition to frustrating educational advancement, it could leave many students across the country with lots of debt and no degree.

Hundreds of thousands of young people, parents, educators, and members of the faith community and other community leaders have come to us with one simple request: Don't double the rate.

Some on the other side have argued that low-cost Federal loans have contributed to rising college costs and increased student debt. This does not make sense. The maximum amount undergraduate students can borrow in subsidized loans has remained unchanged at $23,000 for the last 20 years. There are many causes that are accelerating tuition, but the amount of available, accessible subsidized Federal loans for students has remained unchanged for 20 years. But increasing the cost of these loans by doubling the interest rate will certainly make college more expensive for families and for students.

We need to address college costs, but having the Federal Government double the interest it charges for students, particularly the low- and moderate-income students, is not the solution. In fact, it complicates the problem dramatically.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say they want to stop this from happening. Governor Romney, the presumptive Presidential nominee, says he wants to stop this from happening. Yet they are blocking us from even moving forward procedurally so we can debate these things, so they could offer their proposals to pay for what we agree needs to be done, to stop the interest rate from doubling. They are blocking debate because they refuse as much on an ideological as on a practical basis to change the Tax Code and to close a loophole that is egregious and should be closed in order to allow us to help middle-income families. I think they have taken this pledge with respect to no new taxes to a degree that defeats a practical, pragmatic solution to a problem that they know has to be solved. It has to be solved before July 1.

This decision is fairly clear. It is a choice between allowing young people to get a college degree or fealty, to a pledge to never, ever raise anything that Grover Norquist says is remotely connected to a tax. It is that simple. Unfortunately, that simplicity is undercutting the hopes and dreams of thousands of American students, and that is what it is coming down to.

One of the other ironies in this debate is what we propose to do. Closing the subchapter S loophole for high-wage earners in professional endeavors is also something that has long been criticized by conservatives. In the 2004 Presidential campaign, the late conservative columnist Robert Novak described the subchapter S loophole as ''one of the last loopholes left in the Internal Revenue Service Code, and it is a big one.'' I don't think anyone would accuse the late Robert Novak as being anything but staunchly conservative in all his views.

The Wall Street Journal, calling out former Senator John Edwards for his use of this loophole in 2004, called it ''a clever tax dodge.''

Again we have a clever tax dodge pitted against helping students go to college. I think helping students go to college should win.

In fact, the Wall Street Journal editorial points out how in practice this loophole is used. In their words:

> While making his fortune as a trial lawyer [referring to Senator Edwards] in 1995, he formed what is known as a 'subchapter S,' corporation with himself as the sole shareholder. Instead of taking his $26.9 million as earnings directly in the following four years, he paid himself a salary of $360,000 a year and took the rest as corporate dividends.

Obviously at a much lower tax rate but also avoiding payroll taxes.

That is what we are trying to close here. I think it ought to be closed in fairness anyway, but the added benefit is that we are able, by closing this loophole, to prevent the doubling of the interest rate on student loans.

This is a loophole that should be closed. Again, this money will require people to pay directly to the Social Security trust fund and Medicare trust fund these funds which otherwise were avoided through subchapter S, so it doesn't weaken Social Security but it allows us, through the scoring mechanism, to prevent doubling of the interest rate on subsidized loans. It is a win-win proposition.

What they propose is going after the preventive care fund that was part of health reform. It seems to me it is sort of an unfortunate pitting of one program that benefits middle-income families versus another program that potentially benefits all, but particularly middle-class families. Frankly, I think there is another concept here which we all agree about in theory—if we do not enhance prevention opportunities, the cost of health care will be going up and up. What is unsustainable now will become more unsustainable. It is not an appropriate way to deal with this issue.

At a minimum, I hope we can at least get to a serious debate about this. If that is the proposal that Republicans have, let's get it on the table, let's take a vote. Let's take a vote whether you want to close loopholes for very specialized, very wealthy lobbyists and lawyers and professionals, or do you want to impact potential savings on health care through prevention.

I think and hope we can come to a bipartisan agreement. The clock is ticking. The time to act is now. Students and families are counting on us to do the right thing and fix this problem.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I enjoyed listening to the Senator from Rhode Island, as I always do. His passion for education is always on his sleeve and always front and center and I admire him for that.

There are a couple of things I wish to make clear. If you are a student and you already have a student loan, what we are talking about has nothing to do with your loan. In other words, your rate on that loan is not going up. What we are talking about only affects new loans. So before you think about not going to college next year because of all this talk about student loan rates going up, that is not a problem. We are only talking about new loans.

Second, for 60 percent of the students who get new loans, we are not talking

about you either. So you don't have to worry about student loan rates going up.

Third, for those of you about whom we are talking, the 40 percent who have these subsidized undergraduate student loans, what we are talking about saving you is $7 a month in interest payments over the next 10 years. Now $7 a month can add up, which is why Governor Romney as well as President Obama, Republicans as well as Democrats, wants to keep the interest rate at the rate it is now for new loans, 3.4 percent, for another year. But it is $7 a month in savings. It is important to know that.

It is also important to know that there is an easy way to get this done. The House of Representatives has already passed a bill that would keep the interest rate at 3.4 percent for these 40 percent of new loans for one more year. All the majority leader has to do is bring up the House-passed bill and enact it here in the Senate. In other words, we agree on extending the interest rate. We only have a difference of opinion about how to pay for it.

I have offered an alternative supported by many Republicans, which is the same as the House bill, which simply says we want to keep the interest rate where it is for another year, 3.4 percent, and we want to do the logical thing to pay for it. We want to give back to students the money that the government is taking from them to help pay for the new health care law.

You may think: what in the world does the health care bill have to do with student loans? That is what many of us thought when the health care law was being debated. Because, what our friends on the other side of the aisle did during the health care law debate was take over the whole student loan program and almost turn the U.S. Secretary of Education into the U.S. banking commissioner. He has the job of making more than $100 billion in new student loans every year. Their idea was the government can make these loans better than the banks. Our friends on the other side of the aisle said to the students: The banks are overcharging you. We are going to take it over and we will be doing you a favor.

What did the Democrats do? They took it over, but they didn't do the students a favor. According to the Congressional Budget Office, there was $61 billion of savings from taking over the loan program, much of which was money that the students should not have been paying. When the federal government took it over, what did the Democrats do? They spent it on other programs, all except for $10 billion, including $8.7 billion helping to pay for the new health care law.

The way the Congressional Budget Office looks at it, $61 billion in savings resulted from—and these are my words—the government borrowing money at 2.8 percent interest and loaning it to students at 6.8 percent interest. We now want to take that profit from overcharging students and give it back to students. That is the way to pay for extending the 3.4 percent interest rate that we are talking about for another year.

We are in agreement on this. Republicans as well as Democrats, Governor Romney as well as President Obama, say keep the 3.4 percent rate at 3.4 percent for another year. Students should know that it does not affect anybody who has a loan today and that it will save you $7 a month for a new subsidized loan. We want to do that. But the way we want to pay for it is by giving back the money that the other side of the aisle took from you to help pay for the health care bill. That is the right way to do it, instead of the typical reaction we often hear from the other side, which is we have something we want to do so we will simply raise taxes on people and businesses creating jobs in the middle of a recession.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. I have the utmost respect for the Senator from Tennessee. No one is as knowledgeable in education programs as he, the former Secretary of Education, and someone who has a deep commitment to education, not only with respect to his remarks on charter schools but on education in all ways. But he refers to what the House has done. The House, in the Ryan budget, maintains this increase, this doubling of the interest rate. They foresaw, anticipated, and supported the increase to 6.8 percent. Only recently have they apparently had a change of heart and decided that is not appropriate.

The other aspect I think is interesting to note about the House is they have proposed significant reductions in tax rates and they have said they would pay for them by closing loopholes. This is one of the most egregious loopholes that you can find and yet, of course, they will not use this to pay for something which makes a great deal of sense—which they now agree there should be no doubling of the student interest rate.

The Senator is absolutely right, this doubling will not apply to loans that are outstanding. It applies to loans going forward. But if we establish the principle which was embedded in the Ryan House budget, which I think was supported by most, if not all, of my colleagues on the other side, that this rate is going to be doubled to 6.8 percent going forward, that is going to have a significant impact on students who have years to go in college and on people who are contemplating going to college. So the $6 or $7 it may be per month becomes significant overall.

Again, we can get into a discussion about where does this money come from ultimately in terms of was it part of funds for health care, et cetera. But we are facing the choice today of helping students and closing an egregious loophole—one that benefits the wealthiest Americans; it has been criticized by the Wall Street Journal, criticized by Robert Novak, the late columnist—or practically going in and targeting prevention programs. I think we conceptually agree if we don't get a handle on prevention of diabetes, of cancer, of diseases that are costing us billions of dollars, then our task to deal with health care will be immensely more difficult. It is very clear.

What is also very clear is, I think, procedurally the answer is quite straightforward. Let's get on to the bill. Let us go ahead and put these two different proposals on the floor and take a vote. I hope the proposal to close the loophole would pass. But if it did not, at least we would be in a position of preventing the doubling of interest rates on student loans.

With great respect to the Senator from Tennessee, I hope we can move forward, have a vote on the different proposals to pay for it, and then move forward and let people know that their rates will not be doubled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I strongly support this legislation, S. 2343, the Stop the Student Loan Interest Rate Hike Act. I appreciate the leadership particularly of Senator REED of Rhode Island, who has been so eloquent on this subject. I also would note that Senator ALEXANDER and I have worked together on a host of issues. I think he brings great expertise to this discussion as well.

The bottom line for me is that millions of young people are hurting right now in America. They are up to their eyeballs in debt and they cannot find good-paying jobs.

For example, we have seen in our home State, according to the Oregon Employment Department, that the overall unemployment rate last year was 9.4 percent but was 19 percent for workers age 16 to 24. I also note we have seen that the labor participation for young people has declined as well.

We have an enormous array of challenges in front of us. The reason that this legislation, the Stop the Student Loan Interest Rate Hike Act, is so important is that it allows us to achieve two important objectives. First, it puts us in a position to hold the line on student debt. If you are a sophomore in college, for example, and you have already incurred some debt and you want to finish school, then you want to get a degree in a field where you will get a job that pays a good wage. Without this legislation you are going to incur still more debt. So this legislation ought to be supported because it holds the line on debt, and by doing so it helps us achieve a very important objective: to increase the opportunity for young people to access higher education across the country. And historically whether it has been through Pell grants or Stafford loans and the like, we've always said to young people, try

to get to college. Families sitting around kitchen tables and in their living rooms have said this for years. Work hard in high school and try to get into college. And I have supported, here in the Senate, policies that increase access to a good education. By holding the line on debt, we can take steps to achieve an important part of higher education policy, and that is expanding access to higher education.

The second benefit of this legislation, in my view, is that by holding the line on debt we increase the opportunity for young people to get more value out of their education. The reason I bring this up is because my sense is that future policy in the higher education field is going to be about marrying these two objectives. Let's support this important legislation, S. 2343, to expand access, and use it as a foundation to move on to the next step of education policy, which is to get more value out of the education a young person pursues.

The reason I feel that way is that all over my State I am going to high schools and community colleges and talking with students who are thinking about both of those principles, access and value.

For example, at Blue Mountain Community College in Pendleton I met a young man who is taking 20 credits at school, working at Arby's full time as a manager, and he is already concerned about the debt he is racking up. He said to me: As I get my education, how will I know that I have laid the groundwork for being able to get a good-paying job? I told him, just as I am suggesting to the Senate today, that I am going to support efforts to expand student aid and make sure we hold down debt for young people. I described what we are dealing with on the floor of the Senate.

I also told him I have introduced a piece of legislation with my colleague on the other side of the aisle, MARCO RUBIO, called the Student Right To Know Before You Go Act. This bill will make it possible for students all across the country to get information about the expected average annual earnings after graduation, the rates of remedial enrollment for a particular field at a particular college, the average costs both before and after financial aid, and the prospects of a student earning a good wage after achieving a particular degree at a particular school. With this legislation we lay the foundation for what I think will be the education policy of the future.

We will ensure that students have access and ensure that they get more value out of their education and get more value out of the loans and other debt that they have to pay back. And the two go hand in hand. I ran into students who were juniors, for example, at colleges in my State and already owe $60,000. Without this legislation, those juniors are probably going to reup for a loan, and they are going to have to pay more, and that has the effect of reducing access to higher education. Paying more, it seems, is also going to reduce the opportunity for students to buy a bit more value out of their education as we try to get them better information with respect to the value of specific degree programs at specific schools. This type of information is now impossible to find. Suffice it to say, these two judgments, both with respect to the debt and the value of what they have pursued in terms of their college degree, are going to color their decisions for the rest of their lives.

One of the students I met in Oregon recently as I talked about this issue was interested in getting a medical degree. And as we have talked about health care issues—which the President of the Senate and I have both been very interested in over the years—one of the questions he asked me was how was he going to be able to get a medical degree initially and what would happen to him when he got out of medical school with all of this debt hanging over his head. I didn't want to chill his enthusiasm, but we know that if a young person comes out of medical school with an enormous amount of debt, there is a pretty good chance at some point they are going to have to pass some of that debt on to their patients, which means we are going to see medical costs for a lot of people in our country escalate still higher.

So the fact that we have these debts and the fact that it is hard for young people to purchase value in their education is going to have remarkable ripples all through our country for years and years ahead.

I am going to close simply by way of saying this: We have seen young people contribute to our economy. The President of the Senate shares an interest with this Senator in technology. Technology has been a big source of jobs in States such as Minnesota and Oregon. This has been a real economic engine for our country. Think about who brought us Facebook and Google and Twitter and YouTube. A disproportionate amount of the creative talent has been young people.

So we must first take steps to hold the line on debt—and that is to pass Senator HARKIN's and Senator REID's bill—so we don't say to college sophomores and juniors, we don't care if they rack up any more debt when we know how much heartache it is going to bring to them. Then we can move on to the next step, which is empowering students and families to be able to get the maximum amount of value from their education. If we don't take these steps I think we will have let the country down in this area at a crucial time.

We understand that higher education is one of the principal paths, if not the best path, to success for many students. It is not for every student, but certainly for millions. And education has enabled many young people to contribute to technology which has been, as I described, a real spark for our economy.

So I see other colleagues waiting to speak, and I only urge colleagues to pass this legislation, S. 2343, to ensure that we don't heap more debt onto the backs of students in college now and who might be reupping on those loans and wondering if they can afford it. Then as we expand access, let's look at taking additional steps to ensure that our young people get more value for their college education.

Senator RUBIO and I have teamed up on a bill that I think addresses that question, the Student Right To Know Before You Go Act. Going to that next step and adding more value to a young person's education when they are armed with the facts requires that we lay the foundation of access to a good education, which I think should be required when so many young people are hurting.

I went through the statistics, and it requires that we pass S. 2343.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to also speak about preventing student loan interest rates from doubling from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. I am disappointed that partisan gamesmanship is threatening the financial futures of students in North Carolina and around the country.

In North Carolina we are very proud of our 16 excellent public universities and 58 outstanding community colleges. In addition, dozens of the best private colleges and universities in the Nation also call North Carolina home. Our excellence in higher education sets North Carolina apart.

Business owners I talked to routinely told me that our highly educated and highly skilled workforce is what attracted their companies to North Carolina. There is no doubt that the strength of our economy going forward depends on the continued strength of our educational system. However, the cost of college continues to rise in North Carolina and across the country. If Congress does not act before July 1, more than 160,000 North Carolina students will be saddled with an additional $1,000 in student loan debt.

According to the project on student debt, more than half of North Carolina's 300,000 students at 4-year colleges and universities borrowed money to pay for their education. On average these students graduated with more than $21,000 in debt. That debt has real consequences for our graduates and for North Carolina's economy. With this debt to pay off, young entrepreneurs are less likely to take a chance starting a small business. They are less likely to buy a new car, and they are less likely to buy a home. This only hurts our economy. Keeping interest rates low will go a long way to ensuring that young people can afford their student loan payments when they graduate.

I recently heard from a freshman at UNC Charlotte about how concerned

she already was about the debt she was piling up when she graduates in 4 years. She cannot imagine what would happen if interest rates double. Perhaps she would have to drop out altogether.

A student at Western Carolina University recently wrote to me, while studying for finals, asking that we please prevent a doubling of his student loan interest rates. So in the midst of preparing for final exams, this young man was worrying about the final bill that he will receive after graduating. He said doubling the Stafford loan interest rate would severely hurt his ability to continue his education. He wants to study cell biology.

In a global 21st-century economy, the sciences are exactly the types of fields that we need our students to excel in so we can compete with China and other foreign countries. We should be helping these young people succeed, not throwing up barriers that get in the way.

I am also hearing from parents. A mom with three children e-mailed me recently. Her oldest child will be starting college in 2 years. She is already worried about the debt that her children will incur, and she certainly is requesting that we not double the interest rate on this debt.

Our students deserve a fighting chance when they graduate. We shouldn't put them thousands of dollars behind before they even reach the starting line. I will do my part to ensure students in North Carolina have the chance to thrive after graduating.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation that will prevent student interest rate loans from doubling.

I yield the floor and notice the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I understand we are debating the motion to proceed to S. 2343, the Stop the Student Loan Interest Rate Hike Act of 2012; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to urge my colleagues to vote to proceed to this important legislation. I was disappointed to see many of my Republican colleagues voted against allowing debate and amendment on this legislation. I have heard Senators from both sides of the aisle acknowledge the need to prevent the July 1 rate increase on the Stafford loans, the subsidized loans. So it is difficult to understand their unwillingness to even consider the bill and have a thoughtful debate and an opportunity for amendment which will allow us to keep these interest rates low for college students in all of our States.

Members may disagree about the best way to pay for keeping the rates at 3.4 percent, but we need to go ahead and proceed to the legislation and pass legislation to accomplish this. If Senators have different proposals, they can offer them. But by blocking debate, we, obviously, cannot get to a solution of this problem.

The Democrats have proposed to pay for the legislation by closing a tax loophole that people use to avoid paying Social Security and Medicare taxes. That is the so-called S corporation payroll tax loophole. This proposal would close the loophole for S corporations for which 75 percent of the corporation's income is attributable to the services of three or fewer shareholders.

This loophole allows, for example, an individual lawyer or a lobbyist to set up an S corporation to make millions of dollars in fees and to not pay payroll taxes on nearly all that income. All he has to do is give himself a cash dividend from the corporation instead of paying himself wages. This is not a fair arrangement.

To be clear, not all small businesses are gaming the system in this way and are not permitted to game the system in this way. This loophole is not available to businesses that are organized as sole proprietorships or as partnerships. Those small businesses are paying their fair share of taxes.

By contrast to this way of paying for the continuation of the low interest on student loans, my Republican colleagues have opted for a very different approach. They offset the cost by using the Prevention and Public Health Fund. In my view, this is a misguided approach. The prevention fund is not a slush fund, as it has been called by many. Instead, it is a fund used to help reduce chronic disease such as diabetes and heart disease and to fund immunization programs for children. This is a critical fund that is used to lower long-term health costs and improve health outcomes. In my view, eliminating this fund would simply increase health risks and, ultimately, increase health care costs in this country.

It is very clear Democrats and Republicans have a fundamental difference in our approach to how we should maintain student loan interest rates. However, as I said before, it is important we get to the bill, we proceed to vote for cloture on this bill, so we can discuss a path forward and consider amendments, if individual Senators wish to propose amendments.

Preparing students for an education is essential for this country's global competitiveness. It is imperative we provide students the tools they need to succeed in this very fast changing economy. This includes access to a high-quality education, which will enable us to train the next generation of Americans for jobs in high-technology fields.

This past Tuesday I spoke at a luncheon that was put on by a foundation that supports one of our community colleges in New Mexico. It is clear we have many students who are working very hard to make ends meet and to stay in school so they can obtain the skills they need to earn a good wage, to pursue a constructive career. There are many areas of our economy where these types of trained workers are needed.

One area which is obvious in my State and nationwide is in health care. We need to train more nurses. One statistic used in this talk last Tuesday was that over the next 8 years, between now and 2020, we are going to have to add 700,000 more nurses to the health care field to meet the needs of the baby boom generation. In addition to those 700,000, we are going to have to hire an additional 500,000 just to replace those who retire from the nursing profession. So we have 1.2 million nurses who are going to have to be hired in this country over the next 8 years. We need to train those people.

There are many young people in this country who would like to have that training. They need student loans in order to be able to cover the costs of that training. That is why this is such an important debate.

Student loan debt has, for the first time in our history, surpassed credit card debt. Today this debt exceeds $1 trillion. The average college graduate leaves school with more than $25,000 in loans.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, college costs at State schools are rising and have been rising at an alarming rate. These increased costs far outpace the increased costs of medical care. We are often giving speeches on this Senate floor about the high increase, the excessive increase in medical care costs. In fact, the cost of college for many students is rising even faster. The same thing can be said about gasoline. I see my colleagues rush to the floor whenever the price of gasoline begins moving up—and with good reason. It is a major burden on U.S. families and Americans everywhere. But the growth in these costs pale in comparison to the growth we are seeing in the cost of education.

The cost of tuition and fees has nearly sextupled since 1985. This is particularly troublesome for students from low-income families.

If we allow interest rates to double, there are 7.4 million students nationwide who will see an increase in the cost of their student loans beginning on the 1st of July. This has a direct impact on students and on families because subsidized Stafford loans are need based, and they are typically designed and focused on helping low- and moderate-income students.

In my State of New Mexico, about 40,000—the specific number I have been given is 39,875 but about 40,000 students will see an increase in interest rates if we do not take action before the 1st of July.

There are nearly 10,000 undergraduates at New Mexico State University who will feel the effects of doubling rates and there are thousands of students at the University of New Mexico who will also see these increases.

This is true of our smaller schools in New Mexico as well. The school I was speaking at last week was Eastern New Mexico University in Roswell. There are 222 students there who took out Stafford student loans during this current academic year.

The Department of Education estimates that the average student would pay as much as an additional $1,000 per year for their student loans unless we can keep this interest rate where it is. Not only would incoming students be affected, current students would also feel the increase as they originate a new loan for the new academic year. The additional burden on our students would be substantial.

Students and families understand the additional increase in costs. In the last few weeks, I have been hearing from constituents all over my State asking us to prevent this rate increase.

One student from Gallup, NM, wrote to me saying:

> Give a break to the future of this country and to the millions of students and families who need the relief from the debt of college.

Another family from Albuquerque wrote to me saying:

> I write to urge you to vote so that student loan interest rates DO NOT go up. In this recession, more than ever, people of all ages are depending on education as a means of gaining employment, and depending at least in part on student loans.

So our constituents are asking us to take action. By doing so we can continue to provide students with stability as they enter and complete their education.

A high-quality educational system unleashes the potential of our students. We need world-class problem solvers and thinkers if we are going to remain competitive. By investing in American students, we can grow our economy and build the middle class.

Let's move ahead with consideration of this bill. If a majority of Senators wish to change the way the bill is paid for, then we can consider that amendment. But we should not refuse to allow the bill to come to the Senate floor for debate and amendment.

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. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A SECOND OPINION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today, as I have week after week since the health care law has been passed, with a doctor's second opinion about the law that I have great concerns with. I do that as a doctor who practiced medicine for 25 years, took care of families in Wyoming, was involved with programs aimed at prevention of disease, early detention of disease, and early treatment of disease. I come to the floor to talk specifically about a portion of the health care law that has been discussed quite a bit in the last week or two on the Senate floor.

Congress has talked a lot about the so-called Prevention and Public Health Fund included in the President's health care law. When I looked at this health care law initially—and I continue to do so—I asked the question, is this health care law the best way to give patients the care they need, from a doctor they want, at a cost they can afford? I believe it has failed in so many ways to do that, which is why I continue to work to try to repeal and replace this health care law.

When we get to the specifics of this Prevention and Public Health Fund, the President and Democrats have claimed that the purpose of the fund was to promote wellness, prevent disease, and protect against public health emergencies. All of us want to promote wellness, prevent disease, and protect against public health emergencies. I know how important those things are as a doctor. I know how important it is to the point that for over two decades in Wyoming, I was medical director of a program called Wyoming Health Fairs, where we provided low-cost health care screenings to people all across the Cowboy State. It is a very important program. People have continued to write letters to me over the decades about the fact that going to a health fair and learning about how to prevent diseases, about early detection of problems, and how they feel either they or members of their families have had their lives saved as a result of the services provided all throughout those communities aimed at prevention and early detention of problems—tests such as blood pressure, PSA tests, people learning about how to examine themselves, how to get a mammogram—a lost-cost or free mammogram—all of these things that are aimed at prevention. These gave people the tools they needed to make decisions about their health and their health care—not just for the patient but also to help their medical providers.

Instead of helping Americans prevent health problems, the President's new law actually uses this so-called prevention fund as a Washington slush fund. In fact, the new health law provided about $15 billion for this fund from 2010 to 2019, and then beyond that about $2 billion every year in annual appropriation of funds to go toward this same slush fund—$2 billion a year forever.

Who will control the fund? The Secretary of Health and Human Services. Even though this law has only been in place for 2 years, we have already witnessed how the Obama administration officials have allowed this money to be wasted. Among other things, we hear of a health clinic using the funding to spay and neuter pets. That is right, to spay and neuter pets.

The Minnesota Department of Health used $3.6 million to create at least four regional food policy councils. And taxpayers will be happy to learn—or will not be so happy to learn, of course—that their hard-earned money helped a county in California secure a ban on new fast food restaurants.

I have nothing against food policy councils or spaying and neutering pets, but when the U.S. Government is borrowing approximately 40 cents out of every dollar that we spend, and when we have a national debt in the area of $15 trillion, Washington should not waste Americans' hard-earned taxpayer dollars. But we continue to do it, and this fund is a key example.

According to the nonpartisan CBO, eliminating the prevention fund would save about $13.6 billion over the next 10 years. The fact is Congress already funds many prevention programs—prevention programs with a proven track record of success. Examples include cancer prevention, tobacco prevention, and a host of other programs.

Republicans have supported, and will continue to support, these critical prevention programs—cancer prevention, tobacco prevention, and working on heart disease. However, the record is clear that the so-called prevention fund in the health care law is wasteful and duplicative. It doesn't help people stay well or become well.

Senator ALEXANDER from Tennessee introduced legislation that would eliminate this slush fund and use the savings to maintain student loan interest rates at 3.4 percent.

Under current law, students who receive subsidized Stafford student loans will see rates increase shortly to 6.8 percent, unless, of course, Congress acts. I am ready to act. Whether you are Republican or Democrat, liberal or conservative, people generally agree that preventing this rate increase is an important priority. The difference is how do we pay for it.

The majority leader wants to raise taxes on small business owners. He says that is the better way forward. But there is a better way forward than raising taxes on the people who create jobs, at a time when we have over 8-percent unemployment and last month's job numbers are abysmal. Only 125,000 new jobs were created, but 3 times that amount of people quit looking for jobs completely. For every one new job, three people quit looking for jobs at all. To raise taxes on the people who are creating jobs in this country is the wrong way to go.

Senator ALEXANDER's proposal stops the rate increase by eliminating this prevention slush fund. His bill uses the rest of the funding for deficit reduction. I have cosponsored that legislation.

I think it is also important to know that the President has already agreed

to use his slush fund to offset other spending. In September of 2011, the President proposed reducing the slush fund by $3.5 billion. In February, part of the payroll tax cut signed by the President contained a $4.5 billion cut from his slush fund. Finally, in March, the President's 2013 budget proposed cutting the fund by another $5 billion.

It is ironic that the President of the United States and Washington Democrats now oppose using money from their so-called prevention slush fund. If the White House and Democrats in Congress want to ensure that student loan rates stay low, they will cut this wasteful program and use the money to help the next generation of Americans.

We do know that young people coming out of college today are, on average, having a debt of about $25,000; and whether the interest rate is zero or 3.4 percent or 6.8 percent, they are still coming out with a huge debt, at a time when we know 53 percent of the people coming out of school can't find a job or cannot find a job consistent with their level of education. We also read that 40 percent are going back home to live; some are returning home instead of going out into the workplace.

It is time to focus on the economy, on getting people back to work, and it is time to agree that we need to keep the interest rates low; that we ought to pay for it with money that is there, which can easily be used. We should not raise taxes on job creators at a time when the country is in this sort of economic condition.

I continue to come to the floor week after week to talk about findings in the health care law. Some things are unintended consequences, and some things are money tucked away for other purposes. It is hard for Americans to ever forget NANCY PELOSI saying that first you have to pass the health care law before you get to find out what is in it. The more the American people find out what is in it, the less they like it—to the point that 67 percent of Americans feel that the health care law should be totally or at least partially found unconstitutional, as the Supreme Court looks to make their ruling in the next months ahead.

This is a health care law that, in my opinion, is bad for patients, bad for providers—the nurses and doctors who take care of the patients—and it is terrible for the American taxpayers. This is a time when we need to repeal and replace this health care law. Now there is a way to use one of the provisions within it to fund and make sure that we do not raise interest rates for the students in this country, so they can get the education they need and, hopefully, find a job and not punish those who have tried to provide jobs to these graduates.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are on a motion to proceed to S. 2343.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to proceed as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, later I want to speak for a few minutes about our colleague Senator LUGAR.

First, I want to comment about what the Senator from Wyoming was saying on the health bill.

Very quickly, I could not disagree more with the Senator from Wyoming in his comments with respect to the health care bill. This morning we had a meeting with Secretary Kathleen Sebelius, who was outlining to us all of the gains we are making with respect to health care in America as a result of the legislation.

What is interesting is that our colleagues who keep coming to the floor and saying repeal the health care bill never offer alternatives to Americans. I hope Americans who are buying into this notion that somehow the health care bill doesn't serve them because they are angry about one thing or another will look at what the health care bill does because, in point of fact, if you were to repeal the health care bill, and they have no alternative to replace it, here are some of the things that happen: One, you immediately add $2 trillion to the deficit of our Nation. Bang, done deal. That goes right away on that. The health care bill is judged by the CBO to reduce the deficit. It has specific savings in it. If you get rid of it, those savings go away and, bang, the deficit goes up.

No. 2, 47 million to 50-some million Americans who have no health care or didn't have it before the bill will return to the status of having no health care.

Now, does everybody in America think it is better to have 50-some million Americans walking around without health care who, when they walk into a hospital—perhaps they get hit by a car or have an accident and go to a hospital—receive care that everybody is paying for but they are paying for it in the most inefficient way possible? The burden is being paid for by people who have the health care. It goes into their premiums. It isn't shared by people buying their insurance and sharing the risk of getting sick. So all of a sudden, if you get rid of the health care bill, we return America to the days when millions of Americans had no care. And guess what happens when they have no care. They jam the emergency rooms because that is the only place to get the care. The emergency room becomes the place of primary care. But my colleagues do not answer that question. They never deal with reality. They deal with politics and ideology and they throw a lot of baloney at people.

The fact is, if we were to get rid of the health care bill, all those people who used to get sick and would get a letter from their insurance company saying: Gee, sorry to hear you have terminal cancer, but you are not covered—and that is what happened all the time in America—that would start happening again. People were thrown off their policies that they had been paying for for years, and all of a sudden they had no coverage. But they do not address that.

There is another issue: preexisting conditions. Again and again and again, people would be denied the ability to buy health care coverage because they had a preexisting condition of some kind. So if 10 years ago someone had a cancer, even if they were cured of their cancer, the insurance company could either refuse them or charge them a higher set of premiums. People were denied coverage—they just didn't get it. Women who were pregnant and were applying for insurance heard: Oh, sorry, that is a preexisting condition. You are pregnant. We are not going to cover that.

So in America we drove people into poverty for a long period of time. They had to sell their homes or sell down everything they had to become impoverished in order to get to a point where they could get some help.

What about kids in school today? Under the health care bill, up until the age of 26, a child can now be covered by their parents' program. It is not free, it has to be paid for, but they can be covered by it. That would be eliminated.

So all of a sudden we would have a whole bunch of people who would be automatically eliminated and going out fighting to get insurance in the marketplace.

Let me tell you what else happens. There are a whole bunch of reforms to the health care system that our friends never talk about. Today Kathleen Sebelius, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, laid out for us the enormous gains we are making in Medicare fraud. We are beginning to make huge savings for people. The average senior is now saving over $4,000 on their health care bills because of what has been put in place by the health care bill. There are a whole series of things. I don't have them all here at my disposal now because I wasn't planning to talk about this when I came to the floor, but there are a series of reforms about how we pay hospitals, bundling the payments to a hospital, requiring greater accountability from hospitals. I mean, don't we want greater accountability from hospitals? That will vanish. That will be gone if we do away with the health care bill.

We also have greater coordination of care for patients from the beginning of their private care through their admissions and into their discharges. What happens today is there is no coordination of that care, and so a lot of people are discharged, and the readmission rate is staggering because there isn't the coordination between their postoperative, postsurgery care and their

primary physicians and the hospitals. Now there are a number of different pilot projects in place to help coordinate that.

Similarly, we are coordinating the care of what are called dual eligibles—the people who are eligible for Medicare but also eligible for Medicaid. That care has not been well coordinated, so we have huge duplication, enormous costs we don't need, and the result is a waste of money. All of that is being eliminated and/or reduced to a significant level.

There are so many other examples. Let me cite another one. The Senator talked about wanting to take money out of preventive medicine. Preventive medicine? We are told by the doctors, who are the experts and who deal with diabetes, that if we had early screening, which comes by having health care coverage, we could eliminate an enormous amount—maybe as much as $100 billion—of surgery costs and dialysis costs as a result of people not discovering they have this ailment until it is too late for treatment by the more accessible and easier means. There are some oral medications and other things people can take to deal with this disease, but they have to get there at the early stage. If they get there too late, they wind up having to do amputations of limbs or the patient winds up on dialysis, all of which is far more expensive.

There are also pilot projects in the health care bill for helping people receive care at home and not be forced into a higher priced care environment, such as a nursing home or a longer term care kind of environment. This allows them to receive care at home and be in the dignity of their own home and independent and, obviously, with much less cost. All of those things would be wiped out by this notion that we are just going to get rid of this bill.

What this whole notion is built on is the early negative branding—very effective negative branding—that took place and was wrapped around the so-called death panels and the other things, none of which are in this legislation. It is not in it. So this is political. That is why they call it ObamaCare, not health care. They call it ObamaCare to make it a pejorative and to do their best to try to wrap it up in the negativity of politics in our country today. And it is a tragedy because it doesn't do justice to the kind of thinking that ought to go into and did go into this bill in terms of how we do things that really create competition in the marketplace and allow people to get better health care.

What is astonishing is that we spend something like, I think, $15,000 per patient in America. I think that is the average cost. There are countries spending half of that and a lot of countries spending around $11,000 a patient that, I am sad to say, are getting better health outcomes than we get in the United States of America. The United States of America is not No. 1 in health outcomes for the money we are spending in the system, and there are a whole lot of reasons for that, but that is part of why this reform is so critical to our country.

I could say a lot more about this, but I am not going to say it now. Every time we hear from people who are just talking now about how we have to get rid of the health care bill, we have to stand and make it clear to people why this bill is good. A lot of Americans have not heard enough about how this legislation works for them, works for the country, and will improve our system. Is it the cure-all—no pun intended—of the health care system? No. I don't pretend it is. We will have to do more. We will have to tweak it. But it is a beginning step, with critical components that take 4 and 5 and 6 years to put into place so that we can get the full measure of their impact.

I will say this. We have it in Massachusetts. We have it now, and businesses are not complaining. In fact, we have one of the best economies of any State in the country. I think our unemployment rate is now down around 4.9, 5 percent, somewhere in that vicinity. So we have this program. We have had it for a few years now, and 98.6 percent of the people in our State are covered. It has been mandatory since the beginning, and it is working. It is beginning to bring down costs in the individual marketplace. The premiums have gone down by something like 45, 50 percent.

So I think we have to look at facts, as we do on a whole lot of issues here facing this country today, rather than continuing this silly talking past each other, completely contrived, political, ideological debate that is calculated to win power and not calculated necessarily to serve the best interests of our Nation. I hope we are going to engage on this over these next months, and I look forward to defending this health care bill because I think the bill is good for America. I think this bill, while it obviously needs some refinement, some changes, and some tweaking here and there, has accomplished an enormous amount already and is on track to accomplish an enormous amount going forward.

I think the administration has a much better story to tell about it than has been told, and I am glad the President has said he looks forward to going out and talking to the country about it because I believe that as the country learns more about it, in fact, they will say: Wow, that makes sense; that seems like a pretty sensible thing to do.

For our opponents who want to just get rid of the legislation, they have an absolute obligation to put the full deal on the table about what they are going to do in return, and not just Medicare, with the Ryan proposal—which makes it more expensive for seniors and undoes Medicare as we know it, not just that part of it—but the whole of it. How are they going to cover the uninsured? What will they do to take care of all those medical institutions that are struggling to teach doctors for the future? How are they going to hold those folks in a way that continues medical education in our country and so forth? They owe it to the Nation to answer those questions.

Mr. President, that concludes the portion of my remarks I wanted to make in response to the Senator from Wyoming.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RICHARD LUGAR

Mr. President, I wish to take a few moments to share a few thoughts, not about the results of the election last night in Indiana per se, but I do wish to talk about the consequences for the Senate of the loss of Senator LUGAR as of next year and particularly for the Foreign Relations Committee.

It is no secret that DICK LUGAR's loss last night is going to be particularly felt by all of us who have had the privilege of working with him on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, whether he was the chairman of the committee—and I served under him when he was chairman—or whether as a member of the committee and the ranking member, as he is now and as I am now privileged to serve with him.

Whether we agreed with him or not, whether he had the gavel or he didn't have the gavel, DICK LUGAR had an approach to the Senate and to governing that was always the same: He was serious, he was thoughtful, and he refused to allow this march to an orthodoxy about ideology and partisan politics to get in the way of what he thought was the responsibility of a Senator and, indeed, the need of the country to have people come together and find the common ground. He dug deeply into some of foreign policy's most vexing issues, and his expertise on complicated issues that were honed over 36 years really can't be replicated. That is something we are going to lose—the institutional experience, the judgment, and the wisdom of the approach on some of those issues, such as the constitutional questions he would call into account when no one else would, the question of not being stampeded by popular opinion with respect to the use of force in one instance or another. All of those are essential to making this institution live up to its full capacity.

Already since last night's news, we have been hearing again and again on some of the news shows and elsewhere about the work of the Senator from Indiana on nuclear nonproliferation. It is no secret his Nunn-Lugar efforts have become almost shorthand for bipartisanship in foreign policy, and they should be recognized. But I want to emphasize here and now that is not all Senator LUGAR contributed to this field of foreign policy. He is a leading expert on some of the urgent issues that are off the beaten path, from food security and the eradication of hunger worldwide, to his work with JOE BIDEN and then with me, I am privileged to say, to change our relationship with

Pakistan, helping prevent their economy from unraveling and encouraging them to cooperate with interests vital to America—indeed, to the stability of that region—and to establishing what he called a ''deeper, broader, long-term strategic engagement'' with Pakistan.

I am privileged to say, for me, the personal journey with DICK LUGAR began before that, and I think it epitomizes who he is and why he will be missed. It has nothing to do with ideology.

Back in 1980, shortly after I came here—I was elected in 1984, and I started on the Foreign Relations Committee in 1985. Right away, we began to work together on the issue of the Philippines, free and fair elections in the Philippines. I had traveled over there a number of times as a freshman Senator. I had met with Ferdinand Marcos. I was concerned about the torture taking place and the political prisoners and other violations of rights. Yet we were sort of aiding them notwithstanding our values and our standards.

Well, DICK LUGAR joined with me in that effort. He didn't have any reason to join with a freshly minted Senator, wet behind the ears, but he did. Together we sort of became a team that started to focus on the Philippines to figure out how we could hold Marcos accountable. He was serious and he was fair-minded, and I saw firsthand during our trip to the Philippines which we made at the time of the election—after we had done a whole lot of groundwork to set up an accountability system for that election—that he had a very personal and special understanding of what the United States meant to the rest of the world with respect to our values. That cause animated this man whom we all know is dignified and reserved and humble but who proudly came back and recounted with some animation to President Reagan the difference that the United States of America makes when it gives voice to people's aspirations for freedom—and, in this case particularly, the people of the Philippines.

The fact is it was that discussion with Ronald Reagan and the results that came out of the accountability in that election that forced Ferdinand Marcos to leave and we saw Cory Aquino come to power and the Philippines move back into genuine democracy.

I saw the same commitment with Senator LUGAR a number of times over the years, but never more so than 2 years ago when we worked together on the New START treaty. His wisdom and his patience was invaluable in laying out the case, particularly in building support across the aisle so we could find the path to 71 votes.

I said then, and I say it again today, given the bitter, divisive, partisan, continual political squabbling that seems to dominate life in the city today, 71 votes is probably the equivalent of the 98 votes we used to get on those kinds of efforts. So I am grateful to him for his willingness to work to do that. He worked to give Members more time to work through problems, to find a way to solve individual objections. It reminded me of the way you actually work in what is now sometimes, unfortunately, sarcastically referred to as the world's greatest deliberative body. He deliberated and he helped us deliberate.

I thought it was one of the finer and prouder moments of the Senate in recent years.

I am confident DICK LUGAR's record in our committee is going to be one of those which is remembered for a long time. Sadly, last night it was remembered in the context of Senator Fulbright, who also came to lose a primary in the end and paid a high price for his concern about global affairs and his involvement with those issues. But I think he is also remembered significantly for the enormous legacy he built about American foreign policy and how to make our country stronger.

DICK LUGAR does that, and I think he has made it clear—there is no doubt in the mind of anybody on our side of the aisle—that DICK LUGAR is a conservative and his votes through the years have shown that. He is a proud Republican.

But I think probably because he served as a mayor before he came here, he applied what we call the LaGuardia rule to foreign policy—which is the rule that Theodore LaGuardia applied to doing things in New York. It didn't matter whether you were a Republican or Democrat as long as the streets got cleaned and the potholes got filled, and they didn't have any labels on them. That is pretty much the way foreign policies ought to be.

It used to be under Arthur Vandenberg that we said that politics ends at the water's edge, and we do what is in the best interests of our country. Only in the last years in the Senate have I seen a complete diversion from that where, unfortunately—as has been true on both sides—politics has entered into choices people have made with respect to major issues of conflict, potential war and peace, and interests of the security of our country.

So about 4 years ago this time, DICK LUGAR received the Paul Douglas Award just off the Senate floor over in the Mansfield Room, and he summed up his approach to the Senate. I think after last night it is important for all of our colleagues to be mindful of his words and to think about them as we go forward in these next 6, 7, 8 months.

DICK argued that bipartisanship isn't an end to itself, and it is sometimes mistaken for centrism and compromise when, in fact, it is the way he called being a constructive public servant. It is the way a constructive public servant approaches his or her job—with self-reflection, discipline, and faith in the goodwill of others.

He said:

Particularly destructive is the misperception in some quarters that governing with one vote more than 50 percent is just as good or better than government with 60 or 70 percent support. The problem with this thinking is that whatever is won today through division is usually lost tomorrow. The relationships that are destroyed and the ill will that is created make subsequent achievements that much more difficult. A 51 percent mentality deepens cynicisms, sharpens political vendettas, and depletes the national reserve of good will that is critical to our survival in hard times.

That is actually about as fundamentally, philosophically, as conservative as one could ask for. I think every one of us who have seen the difficulty of the last few years of our politics, who have been frustrated by the sheer inability of the institution to work, would agree there is nothing liberal or conservative or moderate about what DICK said. It is just common sense about how human nature works, about how people work. It seems to me we would do well to get back in touch.

I often hear people talk about how we need to change the rules here in order to get something done. Actually, we don't. These are the same rules we operated with when Everett Dirksen was here, when Bob Dole was leader, George Mitchell was leader. But we got things done.

In the 1990s, we balanced the budget of our Nation four times in a row without a constitutional amendment. It didn't take a piece of paper to tell us to do it or new words written in the Constitution. It took the common sense and courage of people on the floor of the Senate to do what was right. We don't have to change the rules. We have to change the thinking—or change the people who don't want to do it.

But every great moment in this great institution, when people look back at the history with pride and point to the Missouri Compromise or point to Henry Clay or Daniel Webster or all these great Senators—or Ted Kennedy more recently and others on the other side of the aisle—when they do that, they are talking about people who operated by the same rules but found the common ground because they had the intelligence and willpower to put the country and its interests ahead of everything else.

So that is what DICK LUGAR's loss last night means to us. I don't know who will replace him. We certainly know the cross-currents of some of the campaign, and we certainly know what Senator LUGAR himself chose to say last night about his opponent's quest for more partisanship, not less.

So the alarm bells have been sounded. My prayer is that this election year is going to help purge this country of this incredible waste of opportunity that we are living through.

This Congress isn't over. For those of us who were here and remember 1996, it bears repeating that even in Presidential years the Congress can actually defy conventional wisdom and get some things done. That is why I know that DICK LUGAR is going to finish out his

sixth term in the Senate with the same determination and effectiveness that has marked every year of his service. He is going to have a lot more contributions to this institution that he reveres and that respects him so enormously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, first I thank my colleague and friend, Senator KERRY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, for coming to the Senate floor and speaking about our mutual friend and colleague, Senator DICK LUGAR, who serves as the ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I am a newcomer to that committee, but I am not a newcomer to my knowledge of DICK LUGAR—who preceded my arrival in the Senate 16 years ago when he was well known throughout the Midwest for his extraordinary service as mayor of Indianapolis, where he did something that was miraculous—he combined and made more efficient local units of government, and I think the rebirth of Indianapolis is attributed to those early steps by DICK LUGAR.

My wife Loretta and I came to know DICK and Char personally through the Aspen Institute, which is an effort that I think we need to encourage where members of both political parties, House and Senate, come together to discuss foreign policy issues—no lobbyists, no special interests. DICK LUGAR was there and always a major contributor when it came to issues of importance.

Before I arrived in the Senate—while Senator KERRY was still here—he teamed up with Senator Sam Nunn to deal with an issue which related literally to the peace and security of the world.

What would happen, as the Soviet Union crumbled, to all of those nuclear weapons? Would they fall into the wrong hands? Would they fall into disrepair? And what could we do about it? Sam Nunn and DICK LUGAR stepped up and said: We are going to work together on a bipartisan basis to deal with them.

Time and time again throughout his career DICK LUGAR has focused on issues of strategic importance to the United States and our security. I can't agree with Senator KERRY more. He looked for a bipartisan approach to so many things. We always knew he was a Hoosier conservative. You weren't going to push over anything when it came to DICK LUGAR. He was strong in his values, but he always listened and he was always a gentleman.

What a disappointment last night. I know Senator KERRY feels, as I do, that once you have been in this Chamber for a few years, you kind of reflect on those lions of the Senate who have come and gone, some because of the decision of the electorate and some because of passage of time and then fateful decisions that ended up with their departure. We think back on some of these great people.

John Chafee. John Chafee and DICK LUGAR were soulmates in terms of their view on the Republican side of the aisle about how to work across the aisle to get things done.

A mutual friend—and I know Senator KERRY's close personal friend—Senator Kennedy. Senator Kennedy's success has always reached across the aisle. I noticed that. Sometimes to the frustration of those on the Democratic side who said: We have enough votes, Ted. We don't have to do this. He would reach across.

Of Bob Byrd, who used to sit right next to where Senator KERRY is sitting now, we think: What will the Senate be like without these great lions? Well, the Senate will go on. But the question is, Will we have learned from their example? Will we take their lives and their careers to build on to make this a better place or, as some have said, are we going to succumb to the temptation of just making this place more partisan, more hidebound, more dedicated to obstruction than moving forward?

I know that DICK LUGAR in the remaining months is going to be an extraordinary servant to the people of Indiana and the Nation as he has been throughout his career, and I look forward to seeing him back on the Senate floor working, as he will, for the remainder of his term. But it is a loss. It is a loss to the Senate that he is leaving, and it is a sad day on both sides of the aisle when DICK LUGAR won't be part of the Senate in person.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MARK KIRK

I would like to speak about another Republican Senator while I have the floor: my colleague, MARK KIRK. Some of you have seen the video.

MARK had a stroke in January. He wrote about it in this morning's Chicago Tribune. He is 52 years of age, the picture of health, a Navy Reserve officer and a U.S. Senator from Illinois, actively engaged in our State, going back and forth, county to county, city to city. We work together on so many things. Then on that fateful day he was stricken, and with this stroke he suffered some very serious damage.

I was a little bit disturbed when his physician/surgeon came out and said, ''Well, here is what we can expect.'' And I am not going to go through the graphic details, but they were all sobering to think that he would be limited in any way by the stroke. I was upset because I thought: He doesn't know MARK KIRK. That isn't going to happen. MARK is going to fight back. He is going to be back, and he is going to defy the odds in terms of stroke victims.

Yesterday he released a video. It is inspiring. I hope everyone gets a chance to see it—I am sure it is readily available—showing him going through rehab, showing the efforts he is making to come back to the Senate. MARK called me earlier this week. We talked on the phone a couple of times since the stroke. He has been actively engaged mentally in everything we have done since the stroke occurred. But every day he tells me that he spends time on a treadmill, miles and miles walking on a treadmill so he will be able to come back. I told him we are on a different treadmill here and I am sure he wants to get back on it with us in the Senate.

He will be back. He said something I think we all ought to remember. He said he asked the staff to count the steps from where he would park outside the Senate Chamber up to the Senate Chamber. They counted the steps and they told him 45 steps and he would be back in the Senate. He said the day is going to come, and I am sure it will be soon, when he will walk those steps, and there will be many, myself included, from both sides of the aisle, cheering his return to the Senate. For MARK, his family, his doctors, his medical staff, and all: Thank you for this battle. Thank you for your efforts on behalf of our State. We look forward to your early return.

MARK and I have a joint town meeting, Republican and Democratic, every Thursday morning. The people sit there politely as we discuss issues and love it when we disagree because we do it without getting angry with one another. He will be back soon, not only at those meetings but also covering the State of Illinois as an effective, engaged Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time from 2 p.m. until 5 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, and that all quorum calls in that period also be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time to urge my colleagues to allow us to move forward in the consideration of the Stop the Student Loan Interest Rate Hike Act so we can allow the interest rate on student loans to remain at its current level rather than doubling, which will happen on July 1, unless we take action. I come to the floor to express the views of many Marylanders with whom I have talked about the cost of higher education. We cannot allow the interest costs to go up. It will affect 7 million students and their families.

We already have too much college debt that families have to incur as a result of the cost of a college education. We are not competitive with the rest of the world. We look at countries with whom we compete and we look at the cost of higher education in their country compared with what our students have to endure, and we start off behind because of the enormous cost to a family to afford a college education for their children.

We know how important it is. You need to have a college degree in order

to be competitive in many fields today. That number of fields is increasing every day. Let me tell you, we have crossed the $1 trillion mark in debt held by families in order to afford a college education. Two-thirds of that debt is held by people who are under 30 years of age. Here they are, trying to start out in life, trying to have a family, trying to buy a home, and they have this large amount of debt.

College debt now exceeds credit card debt in America. It is not unusual for a person graduating from a college to have $20,000, $30,000, $40,000, $50,000, $100,000 in debt, and even higher. If we do not act by July 1, the interest costs will add thousands of dollars to that already burdensome amount.

The cost of a college education in America is too expensive. If we want to be competitive, we have to get the cost of a college education down. The President in his State of the Union Address talked about ways in which we can encourage colleges and universities to be more affordable for the American public. But one thing we can do is to make sure that the cost of borrowing is not increased. That is why it is particularly important that we pass this legislation.

It is affecting family decisions as to what schools children will attend because of the high cost. We are just turning our economy around, starting to make our recovery, and now families are struggling to figure out how they are going to be able to afford a college education. We need to reduce the costs, not increase the costs, to families. We need a trained workforce. We need to be competitive internationally.

Let me tell you what else it is affecting. We have some very talented people who are graduating from college and they want to go into the field where they are gifted, where they can make a real contribution to our communities, to our society, to make a difference, to answer that call of community service. That is what they want to do. But when they are saddled with this much debt and if it becomes more expensive to pay off that debt, they have to make a pragmatic decision about their career path rather than following where they can make the greatest contribution to society. That is how these large debts and the cost of paying off that debt are affecting our country.

You might have a great researcher who can find the answer to one of our diseases, how we can keep a healthier society, a person who may want to go into research, but they know what the return of research will be when trying to pay off their college loans. If we do not act by July 1, that will be even larger. That is what we are confronted with. That is why it is so urgent, that is why we need to be considering this legislation rather than be stuck in this filibuster.

I urge my colleague to move forward. Let's do what the Senate should do—consider amendments and get this process going. It is absolutely critical to our entire country.

Let me talk a little bit about my experiences with Marylanders. I have traveled the State of Maryland. I have talked to a lot of our college students. I will generally talk about a lot of different subjects and then ask what is on their mind. They will talk about the cost of college education. They will talk about the fact that we need more grants. They talk about the fact that we need more affordable loans. They certainly will tell me if you are going to increase the interest costs on their loans, it is going to have a major impact on their ability to stay in college, on their ability to follow the career choices that they want to in life.

Let me share with my colleagues the stories of two Marylanders who have contacted my office, who have contacted me in the last few days to tell me that this bill we are hopefully going to be able to consider will have a direct impact on their decisions.

Katherine Eames is a 22-year-old single mother, with a 4-year-old son Jayden. Katherine has decided to go back to college to pursue her nursing degree and currently attends Hagerstown Community College in Hagerstown, MD. She is attempting to make a better future for herself and for her son. She is attempting—she is going to be a full-time student. Katherine also works part time at a minimum wage job, all while juggling her responsibilities as a single mother. Student loans are necessary. She needs to take out student loans. That is the only way she is able to afford her college. She has student loans in order to be able to stay afloat and realize her dream of making a better future for herself and her son. If student loan interest rates were to double, Katherine would be in a financial turmoil and her future aspirations in jeopardy. Let me quote from Katherine. This is what she says. I think it is so telling.

> I want to be able to close my eyes and see a bright future for my family and my son. However, if these interest rates increase, all I see from this point forward is a hole I don't think I'll ever be able to climb out of.

I know some of my colleagues say we are talking about another 3-percent interest charge, people will be able to afford it. But let me tell you about the real world, the world of Katherine Eames. That is the real world. That is people making career decisions now as to whether they are going to follow their dream; whether she will become a nurse, be able to help her community, help her family, help herself. If we do not make college affordable or if we add additional costs to it, we are going to add more people to this process. As a society, America's competitiveness will suffer as a result. We need to do better. We need to pass this legislation to help the Katherine Eameses who are out there.

Let me talk about another Marylander, Ariana Fisher. She wanted to be a doctor since she was 5 years of age. Through hard work and determination, she has been accepted to Georgetown University's medical school. Attending will require her to take out a significant amount in student loans. That is the fact for most American families, their children will have to take out loans if they are going to be able to reach their dreams. She knows how much these are going to cost, but she says compounding this with increased interest rates hinders her ability to pursue her dream. She has the will and the passion to become an excellent physician and her aspirations should not rest on what we do here in making it more economically difficult for her to be able to afford that education. That will not only benefit her but will benefit our community.

We are talking about our children. We are talking about whether our children are going to be able to pursue the American dream, whether they are going to have the education they need to help themselves and help our country. We are talking about America's future. This is about whether this Nation is going to be able to continue to lead the world in economic growth. We need to take up the Stop The Student Loan Rate Hike Act.

Let me explain. It is subject to a filibuster. Yes, it is a filibuster. We tried to say let's at least get on the bill, which required 60 votes in order to be able to break this filibuster. We came up short. I hope the majority leader will schedule another vote shortly and I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will remember what this means for the future of this country.

The stories I related with regard to Katherine Eames or Ariana Fisher are not unique. I am certain you would find similar examples in New Mexico or any other State in this country. You are going to find similar examples of people who desperately need us to act so college costs do not increase. Then let's work together to bring down the costs of college education. College and postsecondary education are a vital gateway to helping American students around the country to achieve the American dream.

We need to stand for our Nation's future. We cannot allow higher education to become unaffordable for millions of Americans who have the desire and ability to learn and succeed. Let's end the filibuster. Let's work together as Democrats and Republicans. Let's keep America's future in mind, let's keep the American dream in mind, let's allow Americans to reach that dream by making college education affordable. Let's pass the legislation that is currently pending that would stop the increase in the interest rates on college loans.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. 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. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, we arrive here at a moment when we once again have a chance to view the differences in thought and perspective which are exhibited at this moment in this institution. Today, we are talking about college education. We are talking about programs for young people to get an education and go to college.

For generations, affordable college education has been an essential tool for providing opportunity and building a strong society.

I know from personal experience that government plays a critical role in making higher education possible. I served in World War II, and when I joined the Army there was no prospect for me to go to college. I was 18 when I enlisted. When I finished my Army service—having been in Europe during the war—things looked bleak, but there was an opportunity that loomed in front of me, and that was an ability to attend college.

My family was faced with poverty and there wasn't much money in the family, but there was something called the GI bill. The GI bill gave me a chance to achieve a dream.

I joined with a couple friends to form a company. The company was called ADP. The company that produces the labor statistics every month that this country and the whole world sees. When I was able to start this company with two other fellows, none of us had any money. The two of them were brothers, and we didn't have any resources at all. We had to start from nothing. In the days that we had a chance to get going, the future was brightened a little bit by the fact that an education was possible to have. That company we started with nothing today employs more than 50,000 people around the world.

The country invested in my generation by helping us pay for college, and that investment helped create decades of prosperity. As a matter of fact, that generation—post-World War II—was called the greatest generation ever seen in American history. Out of 16 million people who served in the Army, 8 million people got a college education through the GI bill, and thus this generation that came out started us on a track for prosperity this country had never seen. The investment the GI bill made in people says that when we have a chance to educate people and get them to go to college or to attend a university, that is the way we create the next great generation.

Attending college has never before been this expensive. The cost of tuition at public universities is 37 percent more expensive now than just 10 years ago. Think about that. If the average cost for a college 10 years ago was $40,000, it now costs well over $50,000. As a result, more and more students are taking on massive loans that will plague them for years. I use the word ''plague'' because it is very difficult to get started in life, in business or start a family and be facing heavy debt at the same time.

Sixty-six percent of New Jersey students graduate with loan indebtedness. The average loan burden for New Jersey graduates is more than $23,000. No wonder we hear that technology companies are hungry to hire but can't always find people with the education and skills they need. The pricetag alone puts college out of reach for too many people

And the clock is ticking on even higher college costs. Unless Congress acts, interest rates on many student loans are going to double on July 1—less than 2 months from today. For many students, doubling rates will cost them $1,000 more for each year of college.

But instead of standing with students, our friends on the Republican side are playing politics. They made it clear that keeping student loan rates low is not a priority. They don't see it as something being worthwhile. Two Republican Senators have introduced budget proposals that would allow student loan interest rates to double.

Yesterday, we saw 44 Senate Republicans vote to prevent the Senate from even considering our bill to keep student loan rates low. How heartless. How thoughtless it is to punish our country this way. College is already too expensive. Why would we put up obstacles to getting an education?

Republicans should listen to people who are suffering from the high cost of college. There have been 1,400 people who have written to me through mail or Facebook to say: Don't let them do it. Don't let them double my rates.

A single mother from New Jersey who is helping her daughter pay for college wrote to say that any increase would create enormous hardship and an inability to continue to provide for the family. Another New Jerseyan says America will not be able to compete with the rest of the world if college is accessible only to those who have the ability to pay for it up front, and I agree. We will not be able to compete if we don't have the educated people necessary to fill the jobs that are available.

Our Republican friends say they want to prevent the doubling of interest rates. So why don't they step up to the plate? I don't understand that. They say one thing on one hand: Oh, yes; we don't want to increase the rates. On the other hand, they say we are not going to help keep them at the lower rate they are now. They say in order to pay for keeping rates low for students, we have to cut vital funding for programs that keep people healthy. Their bill would slash funding for prevention and public health funds, programs dedicated to stop devastating diseases before they occur. Chronic diseases, such as cancer, heart disease, and diabetes, take more than 1 million lives every year and account for 75 percent of our Nation's health spending. That is why the Prevention and Public Health Fund has invested $226 million to reduce chronic illnesses.

The President's budget also calls for using this program to protect women's health by providing breast and cervical cancer screenings to low-income women, but it won't happen if Republicans get their way.

The Republican bill would also cripple programs that keep kids from smoking and help smokers to quit. We have all seen the ads—real people telling real stories about how tobacco has affected their lives. This chart tells the story: ''Don't be shy about telling people not to smoke around your kids.'' We see a picture here of a mother and a child. Republicans don't care about educating people on the dangers of smoking? Who are they protecting here? Certainly not our children and certainly not our students.

It is unconscionable. Republicans profess they want to keep loan rates low but only if we sacrifice programs that protect children from smoking addiction and help women avoid breast cancer and other deadly diseases.

The Democrats have a better solution. The bill Majority Leader REID has introduced pays for keeping student loan rates low by eliminating a tax convenience that millionaires and billionaires use to avoid payroll taxes. Rather than choose to close this loophole, the Republicans choose to take this opportunity to talk our bill to death. They would rather see interest rates double for students than force the wealthy to pay their fair share of the country's obligation.

Student loans open the door to opportunities. Interest rates have to be kept low to protect graduates from a mountain of debt.

I call on my professional experience again, if I might. I finished college. My father passed away while he was in the Army. He was only 43 years old. He left my mother a 37-year-old widow to care for herself and my sister. As luck had it, I got an education at Columbia University, at the business school there. I started a company I mentioned before called ADP. It provides services across the world for those companies that need help in doing their payroll, accounting, and other recordkeeping that companies must do. It only happened because we were able to get our education through the GI bill. There was zero cost to those of us who served in World War II and even some money to pay for books and for other necessities.

So I call on my Republican colleagues to stop the obstructionism, stop the politicking, and stop throwing obstacles in the way of young people who want to get an education and make a contribution to this society as well as to themselves and elevate America's ability to deal with the competition we see in the world. It is time to do that.

I am not suggesting that our Republican colleagues don't want progress. They do. But when we try to move a bill that says: Keep interest rates low on college loans, keep the rate low so that when people get out of college they are not so burdened by debt that they can't get started in life, I say keep them low so that America competes as it should—right at the top of the ladder with educated people, people who want to succeed but don't have the tools necessarily until they finish their college education. Why put obstacles in the way? It is incomprehensible because there are a lot of good people on the other side. But why do they persist in obstructing the opportunity to even discuss it? They want to filibuster it to death. Filibuster, for those who don't know the term, means talk, talk, talk, talk, talk—do anything but make progress.

So I hope we will say to those who have been successful: Do your fair share. Let your contribution to the well-being of our country educate those who can learn and not make it so expensive, so out of reach that few will be able to take advantage of it.

I ask to please move this bill along. Let's let the American people at least know what we think about this legislation to keep interest rates low.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, first, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks, Senator UDALL of New Mexico be recognized to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I have been listening to these speeches for the last couple of days—3 days, actually. If one listens to the other side of the aisle, one would think Republicans are against college education. I don't think there is a person in America who believes that. One would also believe we want to raise the interest rates from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. There shouldn't be anybody in America who believes that either. We really think that for 1 year the rates on subsidized Stafford loans ought to stay at the 3.4 percent, and maybe beyond that.

The real issue isn't the interest rate, and we can tell that from the speeches that have been given. The real issue is the cost of college. Are we doing anything about the cost of college? No. Does Congress have anything to do besides debate this particular issue? Evidently not. We are being called a do-nothing Congress, but evidently we don't have anything else to do. It could be possible to go to something else, but instead we have had one vote on this, and we still weren't given an option for this side of the aisle to have a vote on our idea. So now we are going to get to vote on that same issue from Tuesday once again—maybe sometime this week or maybe not until next week. Instead, we are going to stay right on this issue so that if we stay at exactly this point in this issue, it will fail again and then that side can say: Oh, those Republicans just want to raise interest rates. Not true.

I hope the American people have noticed that any bill that goes directly from the President to HARRY REID to the floor doesn't pass. A bill that goes to committee, regardless of where the source is, has a chance of a bipartisan solution.

I am the ranking member on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, and we have a user fee bill that passed nearly unanimously out of committee. We have the support of the stakeholders. We have the support of the companies. We have the support of Senate Republicans and Democrats. We have even talked to the House people about it. It is a bill that ought to make it through here pretty quickly, and I suspect it will. When it does, I bet we don't hear any comment about it because that would make us look like a do-something Congress, which is what we ought to be.

My colleagues can't tell me this is the only issue that needs attention. Yet we are going to spend a whole week on this issue when both sides agree it ought to be at 3.4 percent. What we are disagreeing on is how we will pay for it. I have to tell my colleagues that the real answer isn't either side's answer, but it could be worked out if it went to committee.

I was told this was going to be a bipartisan, jointly discussed issue just before we left for the recess. Then this bill was put forward, and no further conversation was allowed on it. Our committee was left out of it. And we bring it to the floor, and they said we will have a fair and open debate. Yes, look at this—there are two of us on the floor, and he is waiting to speak and he is not listening to what I am saying, and there isn't anybody else listening to what I am saying. Well, they might be back watching the television and picking it up there, and I certainly hope they are.

Where we get the real discussion is in the committees. Small groups of people who are intensely interested in the issues come to those committees and we work it out. Senator HARKIN and I will get amendments a couple of days before the bill is to be marked up in committee to find out what everybody's ideas are for how it ought to be changed, and we sit down and we look through those and we say: Well, look at this pile here. They are all pretty much the same amendment, but there are people from both sides of the aisle who are interested in it, so why don't we just get those four people or those two people or those five people together and see if they can't work something out. It is really surprising because they usually can come up with a few changed words that solve the problem in which they are interested. That is the way we get things done. That is not the way we are operating on the floor.

I am on the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee is supposed to be handling taxes. Let's see. How many markups have we had this year? I don't think we have had a single markup. We have not looked at a specific bill and tried to come up with a solution in committee. Nothing has been assigned to that committee to finish.

Do we think we have any tax problems in this country? I think so. We keep talking about tax reform, but we are not doing anything on tax reform. Instead, we are talking about the interest rate on college student loans. It is extremely important to the 40 percent of the students who have a subsidized loan who are going to be protected by this. It is extremely important to them. We keep talking about college and the cost of college, but are we doing anything about the cost of college? No, we are not. That should be disappointing to America. We ought to be covering the big issues.

Our committee did a bunch of hearings, and I asked for those hearings to be on the cost of all college education. Instead, what we did was beat up on private for-profit colleges. We did hearing after hearing after hearing, and some of those were a little suspect because I know at least one of the witnesses called in to testify fell short in the market and was able to run down the colleges and thus make a lot of money off of his testimony. That is not how it is supposed to work. We could have looked at all college costs and found some ways to drive down the price of college, but we didn't do that. So now we are standing here and saying: Those darned Republicans aren't interested in the cost of college. How wrong can you be?

We started this debate on Monday, we voted on it on Tuesday, and then we decided we would reconsider the vote. That means the pollsters said that this is a pretty good issue for that side of the aisle, and if they can drag it out longer, they can do better. That is not what Congress is about. Congress is about solving problems.

There are two sides to this, and in the debate earlier, I said that if we would just allow a side-by-side so that you get a vote and we get a vote, we could get something done and move on. The Senator from Iowa, Mr. HARKIN, said: I would let us do a side-by-side.

The next thing I know, the media is saying: You were offered a side-by-side but you did not take it. Not true. We were offered an opportunity maybe to put a substitute amendment in at a future time—maybe. That is not the same. That is not the same as getting the same kind of a vote on the same kind of an issue. And that is always what has been done. We have always allowed side-by-sides. But not on this one. We would rather have the debate going on and try and convince America that both sides of the aisle are doing the wrong thing.

Not only are we giving the impression that we are a do-nothing Congress,

we are giving them the impression there is nothing for us to do. Let's see. We did not do a budget and we have not done any appropriations bills yet, and there are 12 appropriations bills that have to pass this body, and it takes at least a week for each appropriations bill. We have the authorization bill for defense which we debate each and every year, and about 100 other issues that need to come up here. But instead, we are not voting this week, except the earlier vote on this particular bill and another reconsideration vote. If you keep doing the same thing, you ought to expect the same kind of results.

One of the reasons we are voting against the bill that is on the floor is it has not been to committee so it has a lot of flaws in it. This is a poorly drafted bill. Here is kind of how it works: We have said that dentists and doctors and other professionals who are in small corporations—we are picking on small business here—are cheating on their taxes. They are not paying a payroll tax on their dividends.

There is a law against that, and the IRS can enforce that law, and does enforce that law. The examples that have been given are times that they actually caught people doing that and enforced it and won. But to do an audit on this, it would probably take a maximum of 30 minutes of computer time to find every small business corporation that might be cheating on their payroll taxes. But instead of doing that, we are going to use it as a pay-for, and we are saying it is only doctors and dentists and lawyers and accountants and other professionals who are doing this.

Well, there are a whole bunch of people who have small business corporations. Small business corporations are an important way to finance small businesses, and it is a little less complicated than the big corporations. But we usually do not pick on them specifically, and we usually do not separate them into separate groups. This one is just the professionals. It does not cover the rest of them.

I asked the question earlier. I said: Does that mean you are saving the others for a pay-for for something else? If there is a problem, we ought to solve the problem. But the problem can easily be solved by the IRS by doing the proper job of auditing, if that is the case. But these small business corporations are declaring that a lot of their profit is a dividend.

Here is an interesting part: We are not talking about the income tax they pay on that. They are having to pay the income tax. Unlike a big corporation, they are paying the income tax on their personal tax form the minute it is earned, not when it gets actually distributed.

Most of the small businesspeople have to pay the tax on it but leave it in the business so they can grow their business. I have been there. I have had a small business corporation. I know, while you would like to take the money out, if you want your business to succeed, you have to keep reinvesting and reinventing. That means you do not get to take the money out.

If we were being fair, we would say anybody who makes over $250,000 in dividends a year would include that as payroll tax. In other words, this is another Warren Buffett thing. How many millions do you think he makes in a year that come into him as dividends? If those did not count as dividends, he would have to pay a Medicare percentage tax on every dime of that. That is what we are talking about here with the professionals whom we are going to discriminate against in a bit. We are saying that anything that counts as a dividend for them, they are going to have to pay the Medicare tax on. Why just pick on the professionals? Why not pick on all small businesses?

Of course, small business is the job creator for the country, so we should not be picking on any of them. We should be making sure they are paying the taxes they owe, but that is not what we are doing. And we are saying Warren Buffett is a special case out there, even though we like to talk about a Warren Buffett tax every once in a while, but we are not going to in this case.

What we are talking about is the tax that would be for Social Security and Medicare. If they are not paying that, they ought to be paying it. But we are saying that is a good pay-for.

How many times do you think we can take the money that is supposed to go to Social Security and Medicare and spend it on something else and hope Social Security and Medicare continue to exist? That is what we are doing here. We are saying we are going to take the money from the doctors and the dentists and other professionals and we are going to make them pay a Social Security and Medicare tax, but we are not going to put that into Medicare, we are not going to put that into Social Security. Instead, we are going to give it to college students so they have a reduction in their loan.

It is kind of interesting. The Department of Education borrows their money at 2.8 percent, maximum, and they are loaning it out to college students at 3.4 percent for subsidized student loans and 6.8 percent for unsubsidized student loans. The law says that on July 1 it is supposed to go to 6.8 percent for both subsidized and unsubsidized student loans. Where do you think that profit goes? Well, we already spend that on other projects. That is why it needs to go to 6.8 percent, so we can pay for what we promised we would pay for. But if we freeze the interest rate on subsidized loans at 3.4 percent for one-year, we still have to pay for the other things. So what we are going to do is, we are going to take money that ought to go to Medicare, and we are going to give it to college students. So it is a dilemma.

We want to make sure the rate stays at 3.4 percent. But this body, debating back and forth, without getting any votes, is not going to resolve it. Even if we got to do an amendment or two—that is a big deal around here: to get to do an amendment or two on the floor—we still would not be able to resolve it because we would not have gotten the people from here and the people from there together in a small group to work out a solution. That is what the leader ought to be doing. That is why you send things to committee. But we are not doing that.

The other side has assured me that even though we are not putting this money into the Medicare trust fund, that the Medicare trust fund will still have all of its money. Let me tell you how that works. As an accountant in the Senate—and there are only two of us now. For 15 years, I was the only one. But there are two of us now. Here is how it works: When the money comes in, a bond is put in the Medicare drawer that says the Federal Government owes Medicare that amount of money. But we go ahead and spend the money.

They say: Well, this trust fund is still intact. No. It only has debt in it. It does not have money in it. I discovered that trying to get some money out of a trust fund once. They said: Well, you cannot get it out unless you put money in. What kind of bank account is that? What kind of a trust fund is that? That is what Social Security and Medicare are. They are a bunch of bonds in a drawer that the Federal Government says we are good for. The way we are spending, we may not be able to be good for that. People ought to be concerned about that.

So that is where we are. We are talking about taking the Medicare money and the Social Security money, putting bonds in a drawer, using the money, and saying all is well in the world and everything is paid for.

Our side has said, there is a health care slush fund and there are not any criteria set up on it. There are some broad categories it can be spent on, but there are no real criteria on it, and it has more than enough money to pay for this. The only person who gets to decide how that money is given out is the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and she has a lot of flexibility on that. There is a lot of money coming in—maybe at least $2 billion every year allocated to that, and there is already money in that fund, as it started with more. I think the estimate was actually $80 billion over the life of the health care bill. The President himself has helped himself to that when we did the payroll tax holiday extension. That is where the money came from for that.

So our side has said: Why don't we use that again? That is supposedly real money. But one thing that both sides are doing—they are saying: OK, we are going to freeze the interest rate for 1 year, but we are counting revenue that is supposed to come in for 10 years.

How many people in America can say: I am going to have this salary, and I might have it for 10 years, but I need

to spend it all this year. If I spend it all this year, how do I live the other 9 years of the time? That is what we are faced with every time we do a 10-year receipt of money in exchange for a 1-year spending project. And we are doing that more and more and more.

But, again, under our accounting system, that does not go down as the same kind of liability and debt situation that increases the debt ceiling or increases the debt for the country. So it is a very clever tactic to use, but it is not honest with the American people.

Yes, I am upset we are spending all this time on this reconsideration of a vote that we had. When you do not make any changes, you can expect the vote to come out exactly the same. But it allows us days to harangue each other, and that is the wrong way to do it.

I have asked the leader to pull this bill down, send it to committee, give them a limited amount of time to work on it, and see if they can come up with a solution that both sides would like and one that does not have a lot of loopholes in it.

Loopholes? Well, when we are talking about these small business corporations for doctors and dentists, et cetera, we said: If they make more than $250,000 a year and if the small business corporation has three stockholders or less. I do not think they are cheating to the degree that they say this money would come in. But if they are, I can see the wheels turning out there and people saying: Let's see, I have three people in my corporation. Oh, my son is not in the corporation yet, so we will make that a fourth one. When we get the fourth person in the corporation, we are exempted from this.

How much money do you think is going to come in through that proposal? That is what can be worked out if it goes to committee. So, I again ask the leader to send it to a committee, give them a limited amount of time to work on it, and see if they can come up with a solution that both sides will like because both sides said the interest rate ought to be 3.4 percent for the next year.

Then we ought to take a look at the cost of all college education. As all the people have said, college is important. Education after high school is important. We had one hearing on that in the HELP Committee too. When we were scheduled to have that hearing—I make a weekly trip out to Wyoming and travel around the State so I get to talk to a lot of people—I happened to be talking to some sixth graders, and I said: We are going to have this hearing, and the title of it is: Is education after high school important? Do you know what. Those kids all said yes. We did not have to bring in some people from Harvard and Stanford to convince us of that. We could have been talking about the cost of college, which would get more people going to college, and not just college but some of the tech schools too because we are going to need a lot of different professions in future years.

Let's get this thing to committee and get it resolved and get on with some of the issues we need to be working on—some of the ones that are big money that affect all of America, not just 40 percent of the students at about a cost of $7 a month.

So with that plea, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I thank you for the recognition, Mr. President.

Let me say, I have been sitting here listening to my colleague, the Senator from Wyoming, and I think he makes some good points. I think we do need a more open process. I think we need to try as much as possible to work with each other in the committee process. I do not think there is any doubt about that. I think we need to allow germane amendments and have a good, robust debate on the bills that are on the floor.

But what I want to talk about today is the fact that we are in a filibuster. Fifty-two of us wanted to move forward on this bill and 45 of us did not. That is why we are locked in this situation.

I rise with regret today, and there is much to regret about yesterday's vote on the student loan bill. First, I regret the false choice between helping students or funding preventive health care. Most Americans support student loans. Most Americans see the value of preventive health care. Yet my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would ask that we sacrifice one for the other.

An affordable education should not be held hostage to cuts in preventive health care. That is not a choice; it is an ultimatum.

Have we come to this? We teach our children to set goals, to set priorities. It should surprise no one that they seriously question our goals, our priorities. It is like a bus heading toward a cliff. We can turn it around, and we ought to be able to do so without throwing students underneath it.

The other side says they care about our Nation's students too. Perhaps, but there is caring, and then there is devotion. Once again, their devotion is for the wealthiest among us and not for the 7 million students who are worried about how they will pay for their education.

Back to choices. As any bright college student can tell us, it always comes down to choices. How do we protect the Stafford Student Loan Program? By further cuts to preventive health care? By weakening research to prevent disease? By cutting our response to public health emergencies? No, of course not. We do it by closing a tax loophole, by requiring the wealthy to pay their fair share of payroll taxes.

I submit that this is not, and should not be, a tough choice, but apparently it is. In fact, it is so tough that the other side doesn't want to talk about it any further. The result? Yet another filibuster.

That brings me to my other regret. Once again, this Senate is broken, in limbo, stuck. Once again, the American people look on in dismay.

The Senate was once called the greatest deliberative body in the world. Now it reminds me of that song, ''The Sound of Silence,'' ''and no one dared disturb the sound of silence.''

That is what we hear more and more—silence. No debate, no discussion. Yesterday's vote was the 21st filibuster by Republicans of a Democratic bill this Congress—the 21st—and the year is young.

This ugly parade of filibusters—and for what? Let's see. To block the President's job bill, to stop the repeal of tax breaks for big oil companies, to not help local governments pay for teachers and first responders, to prevent a minimum tax on households earning more than $1 million a year, and now it is student loans—another filibuster, more sounds of silence.

I have previously joined my colleagues and friends, Senator MERKLEY of Oregon and Senator HARKIN of Iowa, to push for fundamental reforms in how the Senate operates. The reason then and even more abundantly clear now is that the Senate was broken.

This is tragic. At a time when our country needs us to act, we do almost nothing. It is no wonder that Congress's approval ratings are at an all-time low. Instead of working to solve the major problems our country faces, we retreat to the shadows.

In order to have real change in the process, the Senate has to change the way we go about business. I have advocated, and will continue to do so, that the Senate, at the beginning of each Congress, should adopt its own rules by a simple majority vote. The Constitution clearly gives us this authority, and it is time to exercise it. Yet at the beginning of each Congress, the Senate, unlike the House of Representatives, doesn't vote to adopt its rules. The Senate simply accepts the rules of the previous Congress—rules that lead to the unfettered abuse of filibusters, rules that have made the Senate a graveyard of good ideas.

When we fail to reform our rules, their abuse becomes an entrenched part of the Senate's culture. That is where we are today—after years of filibuster abuse, we have turned the Senate into a supermajoritarian body. To do anything in today's Senate requires 60 votes.

Yesterday's vote on the student loan bill was a prime example. We can't even get onto the bill. Fifty-two Senators voted to move forward, but 45 Senators chose to filibuster. Once again, minority obstruction prevents majority rule. That is not democratic, and it is not how our Founders intended the Senate to operate.

This has to change. A new Congress will begin next January. Right now, we

don't know which party will control the House, the Senate, or the White House, but it should not matter. The Senate must reform itself regardless of which party has control, not for the good of the Democrats or the Republicans but for the good of the country.

The Senate will have many new Members next January, and I think most of them will want to become part of a functioning legislative body, one where they can bring their best ideas and have them debated, a body where all views are heard and considered but majority rule is once again the norm. That institution cannot exist under the existing rules, and we continue to prove that on a daily basis.

The reforms Senators HARKIN, MERKLEY, and I proposed at the beginning of this Congress had strong support, but it did not pass. So here we are, 21 filibusters later, and the line of Americans who wait for a Congress that works, that actually gets things done, and that comes together to find solutions—that line just got longer by about 7 million students.

Several of my constituents have watched and have seen this filibuster proceed, and they have written me on my Facebook page. I thought I would share a couple of those comments because they really go to the heart of what is happening on student loans.

Tracy Edwards writes me, saying that student loans are vital. She says:

My daughter graduates this Saturday from UNM. Without student loans, this day would not have come.

Her daughter would not have graduated.

In 6 months, we will start repayment of those loans. I am not asking anyone else to pay my daughter's loan, but why should we be punished with an increase for trying to ensure our children get a solid education? If a bankruptcy is filed, you could lose your home, your car, and your credit, but student loans are mandated for repayment, no matter what. Is it too much to ask for a fair interest rate? I think the 1 percent will not be happy until it is a world of the haves and have nots.

Thank you, Tracy.

Donna Kubiak writes this:

I agree . . . my daughter is a single mom of 3 kids and working on her degree to teach elementary school . . . without financial aid, she will have to work for a minimum wage job and get welfare indefinitely.

Thank you, Donna, for that comment.

Mr. President, as we know, this issue is absolutely crucial to 7 million American students who don't want to see those interest rates skyrocket a couple months from now. I believe the estimate is about $1,000 per student. They can't afford that, and we need to get this bill on the Senate floor. We need to cut out the filibusters and settle down and do the amendment process, the debate, and produce a bill.

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. COONS. 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. COONS. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about where we are right now procedurally in the Senate on the issue of student loan debt and the interest rates that we charge those who take out Stafford loans, but also the larger question of student loan debt and how we make the highway, the pathway, to higher education for America's students clearer, fairer, and more predictable.

Yates once said that education is not the filling of an empty bucket but the lighting of a fire. Educating our young people is one of the most important things we do as a society. In lighting the fire of curiosity, imagination, enthusiasm, entrepreneurship, and creativity, particularly higher education is one of the things that distinguishes the United States from many other countries around the world. We have long had an enormous advantage in having one of the world's greatest educational systems.

As the occupant of the chair knows, in Vermont and in Delaware today there are so many working families who deeply question whether the pathway toward higher education for their children will be as predictable, fair, and straight as it has been for past generations. When I meet with business owners, innovators, job creators, they deliver the same message: They have jobs. They are ready to hire people who have the education and the skills they need to compete and participate in the modern economy.

Today, with more than 12.5 million Americans out of work, including more than 30,000 Delawareans who are out of work, the question is, How do we make higher education, skills training, vocational schools, and community college more affordable and accessible? One thing we can do, and have to do, is address the staggering debt that lingers with graduates sometimes decades after completing school.

We are faced with two problems. One is a short-term problem and one is longer term. The short-term problem is that without immediate congressional action, student loan interest rates for millions of Americans will double on July 1.

If we allow rates on federally subsidized Stafford loans to increase from 3.4 to 6.8 percent, we will saddle student borrowers with an additional $6.3 billion in interest payments. In Delaware, this could impact more than 18,000 student borrowers, burdening families who are still struggling to recover from the recession with unexpected additional bills. Lots of people have contacted my office—called or written or sent me postings on Facebook, and they have tweeted to contact my office and many others here about their concerns.

Alexandra, a recent graduate from Wilmington, DE, reached out to me and wrote:

I can confidently say that going to a four-year college has prepared me more than I thought it ever could for success in my job search. Because of this education, however, I am facing about $20,000 of debt with a low-paying job.

Alexandra is deeply concerned about the significant debt she faces, and she urged me to work hard to freeze the interest rate on her student loan rather than letting it double.

I agree with Alexandra and fully support efforts on this floor to fix this short-term problem by freezing interest rates on Stafford loans.

I am disappointed that yesterday's vote—the failure to invoke cloture—to get past a filibuster by the other party has prevented the Senate from moving forward and discussing a possible realistic solution.

It is important for the Congress to confront this rise in interest rates, and I hope we can come to a bipartisan consensus. But let's be clear. Even doing that will not solve the larger long-term problem. Addressing this rise in interest rates would not change how much students borrow, numbers that are only steadily growing.

Just this week our Nation's cumulative student loan debt total crossed the $1 trillion threshold. That is an enormous burden on young people just getting started in life and in their careers. If we are to really address this challenge, we have to help students make smart decisions about financing their education.

We can empower students to make more informed choices by fully understanding the relationship between their debt, their choice of major or studies, and their future career path by providing more and earlier and better information about this.

Financial literacy, and a clear understanding of how or whether borrowing will help raise their earning potential later is a key part of the real solution to our country's ongoing and exploding student loan debt.

We can also seek creative solutions that look beyond the obvious and really work to make higher education more affordable for more students. That is why I am so glad to work with my friend, Congressman CHAKA FATTAH of Philadelphia, PA, on new legislation to encourage private investment in college scholarships. Congressman FATTAH showed tremendous leadership in crafting this bill. We introduce a new tax credit that will help more kids afford a college education, entitled Communities Committed to College Tax Credit Act of 2012.

The bill provides tax incentives to encourage private donors to support and sustain educational trusts that make higher education possible for all the young people of a chosen community. These private donors, encouraged by a 50-percent tax credit, will help fund need-based college scholarships,

fueling a new generation of achievement by making higher education more affordable and reducing the need for student loans. But equally important, in places such as Syracuse where these programs are already in place, it changes expectations. When young people, in the very beginning of schooling—from the first, second, and third grade—know there is some possibility, some savings account, some community program that will fund their higher education, the likelihood they will finish high school and go on to college increases by four to seven times.

I support Congressman FATTAH's innovative effort to support community trusts that support higher education. That is one idea for looking beyond the box and working to make higher education more accessible.

Here is another. The American Dream Accounts Act is a bipartisan, bicameral bill to encourage real partnerships between schools, colleges, nonprofits, and businesses to develop secure, Web-based, individual, portable student accounts that contain information about each student's academic preparedness and skills. It also directly tackles the issue of student loan debt by working with students on financial literacy from a very young age. Instead of having each of these different resources available, as they are now, separately siloed, it connects them across existing education programs at the State and Federal level.

I am grateful to Senator BINGAMAN of New Mexico and Senator RUBIO of Florida for joining me as original cosponsors here in the Senate. This bill is a potentially powerful step toward helping more students of all income levels and backgrounds access, afford, and complete a college education. It is rooted in my own experience with the I Have a Dream Foundation, which has helped more than 15,000 young people all over the country to achieve the dream of higher education.

If we want American companies, American workers, and American families to compete and win in the global economy, we have to help our students afford higher education. It really is that simple. I look forward to working with my colleagues to find solutions that promote affordable, accessible higher education because early action and early engagement can help change the future and the outcomes for our kids and make it possible for them to achieve the American dream.

It is my hope that we can overcome this needless filibuster, yesterday's setback, and that all of us can come together and achieve what we say we want to do together—a responsible path forward that avoids needless additional burdens on working families trying to finance their children's education—and that we can look seriously at these two proposals I have touched on briefly today that will help our students of the future understand and afford higher education to make their American dream possible.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Delaware for speaking to some critical issues. It is a shame we are not in a position where we can offer the Senator's amendments, but, as he knows and as he spoke to in his speech, the decision yesterday by the Republicans to go into a filibuster—which is what we are having on the floor and which is why there are so few people and nothing really happening aside from some really outstanding speeches—is a decision they have made time and again.

This was rarely used in the history of the Senate—the filibuster. Oh, ''Mr. Smith Goes to Washington''—some people will remember that movie, and in the 1960s during the civil rights debate, they may remember that too. Sometimes it was used during the Vietnam war, maybe. But it has rarely been used. Now it has become so routine, so commonplace, that day after weary day people who subscribe to C–SPAN on their cable channels are calling in to the cable providers and asking for their money back because nothing is happening on the floor of the Senate. And whose fault is that? It is our fault. It is our fault. When an issue such as this—the one that brought on this filibuster—is explained to the American people, they shake their heads and ask: What are you doing in Washington?

Well, here is what this is all about. On July 1, the interest rate on student loans through the Federal Government doubles. It goes from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent unless we do something. So we have a bill we brought to the floor yesterday. We said: Let's bring this bill in, debate it, vote on it, and let's change the law so that we can protect these students and families. Let's freeze that increase and keep it at the original 3.4 percent. Now, what is that worth? For someone borrowing $20,000 over the course of their college education, it is worth $4,000. If that is your son or daughter and you happened to cosign with them, $4,000 is nothing to sneeze at.

The Pew Foundation did a survey of working families across America, I say to the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Vermont, and they asked a very basic question of the working-family population. The question was how many of them could come up with $2,000 in 30 days—2,000 bucks. Maybe there was an emergency in their home—a water pipe just broke or the furnace broke down. My daughter just went to the hospital. But how many could come up with $2,000 was the question, and only half responded that they could. Half of the working families in America have access to $2,000. So what does $4,000 or more in interest being paid mean? For a Senator, not much. For an average working person, a lot.

Now, what happened yesterday? We called this bill and said: Let's move it, let's start debating it, and let's get it done before July 1. We all agree we should. President Obama and even Governor Romney said we should get this done. But not a single Republican Senator would vote with us—not one. Not one Senator would join us to bring the bill to the floor. That is why we sit here literally wasting our time and the time of taxpayers over an issue we should not even have to debate.

I don't know about the Presiding Officer, but I had to borrow some money to go to school, and I borrowed it from the Federal Government. It was called the National Defense Education Act. They created it back in the late 1950s, early 1960s, because we were scared to death of the Russians and sputnik. We thought, they can take over the world. They have the bomb, and now they are the first in space with that little basketball-sized satellite. So we thought it was time for America to get up and get moving, and we created, for the first time in our history, student loans available to nonveterans. We gave help to veterans in the GI bill after World War II, but these were for nonveterans. I got one. I signed up for it.

When I graduated from law school in the late 1960s, they added up all the money I had borrowed—college and law school—from the Federal Government.

I remember the day I brought the letter home to my wife, baby in arms and another one on the way, and said: My student loans have all been added up.

She said: How much?

I said: It is $8,500.

She said: We will never be able to pay that back.

And I said: I know, but we have to try. We have a year before the first payment is due.

My first job out of law school paid $15,000 a year, to put things in perspective.

Now look what students are faced with today. They are lucky to get out with an average indebtedness of $24,000—very lucky. For a lot of students, that isn't even possible. They get more deeply in debt as they go through school. They say: Well, you told me to finish my education so I would have a better life and realize my dream. I can't quit now. I have to borrow some more money and finish next year and the following year or I have wasted it all. If I am a college dropout, what do I have to show for it—no diploma, just the debt.

So we asked families across Illinois to get in touch with us and tell us about student debt as they see it in their lives. We know nationally that student debt in October of 2010, for the first time in history, surpassed credit card debt. People owe more money on student loans than on their credit cards, and it is growing—dramatically growing. When you meet these families, it is sometimes a sobering moment.

I was at a college in Chicago last week and met a student, a lovely young lady majoring in art, which my daughter majored in, so I have no problems with that because she is a great

artist and doing well, thank goodness. This young lady said: I am about to get my bachelor's degree with a major in art, and my student indebtedness at this moment is $80,000. But I am going on for a master's. I think it will be about another $60,000 of debt.

I think she was 25 years old. Think about that. Think about what she has just done to herself. First, she did what she was told to do—to get a college degree. Then she got so deeply into debt that she is going to come to realize—sadly come to realize—it is going to influence so many decisions in her life. Will she ever be able to buy a car, get married, buy a home, have children? Each one of those decisions along the way is going to be based on her student loan indebtedness.

So is it right for us to keep the interest rate low on student loans? Of course. Why do we want to make it any worse for her or anyone else who borrows money after July 1? We should be doing this, and we shouldn't be squabbling over it. We were sent here to solve these problems, not to go into filibusters—one more Republican filibuster. I don't want to get partisan about it, but they didn't provide a single vote—not one—to help us move to this issue.

So on our Web site we asked families to tell us their stories. I just spoke about a young student, but many of these students have parents and grandparents who sign up to help them. They say: Yes, we will cosign the note because we want our granddaughter or our daughter to finish school; let me help.

About 6 weeks ago, the New York Times reported a story in which a woman had her Social Security check garnished for student loans. It wasn't a loan she took out, it was a loan she guaranteed for her granddaughter. Her granddaughter defaulted, and they went after grandma. She now receives a smaller Social Security check because of the student loan and her goodness in helping her granddaughter. That is the reality of this debt. It trickles through entire families—families with guaranteed loans that, when they go into default, mom and dad keep working well past what they thought was their retirement age.

I have to say, the more I watch this, the more I am concerned about this student debt bomb that could go off, if it hasn't already. I worry about what it will do to these families and to the reputation of a college degree. There are people who are skeptical today about mortgages. They wonder, why would I take out a mortgage on a home if the value of the home is going to plummet? That skepticism doesn't help us build hope in communities and neighborhoods. What if we reach that level of skepticism when it comes to higher education? So this is part of the conversation.

Let me tell my colleagues about some of the stories I have heard.

Dewaine Nelson from Rockford contacted our office. Dewaine's daughter went to a private college costing about $30,000 a year. She has been a file clerk for 11 years since graduating. He wanted to help her, but he lost his job in 2001. He says:

> Once you fall on hard times you can never get a good job in the finance or insurance industry. Your credit is no good. Bad credit means no good job.

Then he decided to go back to school to pursue his MBA in marketing. Still, with no decent pay, he couldn't repay his student loan. So he went back to school so he could defer the student loan again. He still doesn't have a job that pays enough for him to pay off his loan balance and help his daughter pay her balance.

So here we have mom and dad still with student debt and struggling to find a decent job.

Sharon Sikes from Chicago wrote about her son. She lost her job shortly before her son started college. Each semester his tuition kept going up. This is something we hear about very often. Her son's degree is in journalism and mass communication—not a field where you can find a lot of jobs these days. His loan payments are about to kick in, and he works as a cook in an Irish pub. He makes enough for his basic expenses—food and keeping his bicycle running so he can go back and forth to work. She said she honestly doesn't know what he is going to do when the student loan payments kick in. His debt from the State university tuition has left the family with more than $60,000 in loans, and he is cooking in an Irish pub.

Sharon says she is in her sixties and nobody is lining up to give her a job. She had hoped to be able to help her son pay his loans off sooner. She says:

> He deserves a chance to follow his passion without being saddled with years of debt.

Jill Shakely from Rockford started out at Rock Valley Community College, which I think is a smart decision—to go to a community college if you are not sure or at least you want an affordable first year or two of college. She started out at Rock Valley, and when she graduated in 2002, she decided she wanted to continue her education and pursue a 4-year degree. She didn't have any support from her family. They couldn't help her pay for it. So she took out students loans. The tuition was $26,000 a year, and it added up quickly. She doesn't own a home and makes a salary some would say is pretty small. She spends a large percentage of her salary on her loans. She would like to go back to school but can't take on any more debt. She is worried about how it will affect her future. She said that keeping interest rates low will help students like her.

Who wants to argue against this situation? Who believes we ought to raise the cost of student loans? Who thinks that is in the best interest of this country in terms of encouraging young people to go to school and getting them out of school without a mountain of debt which crushes them?

That is what this debate is all about. The fact that we couldn't get one single vote from the other side of the aisle—not one—to move to this bill to even debate it is a sad commentary.

This Senate Chamber is supposed to be about deliberation, amendment, and debate. At the end of the day we put our fate in the hands of those gathered here and have a vote, up or down, win or lose. I know the Presiding Officer has had some that have won and some that have lost and so have I. But that is what it is supposed to be all about. Instead, my voice echoes through an empty Chamber. The people who forced the filibuster and stopped us from taking up the student loans are gone. Not a one of them is here.

Last night, I was one of the last speakers, and I looked over there to an empty side of the aisle and I said: Of all the people who objected to our going to the bill, not a single one of them is here. They are all out to dinner. That isn't right.

I know the Presiding Officer has been pushing for changes in the Senate rules. It would strike me that if someone wants to stop the consideration of a bill before the Senate, they ought to park their posterior in one of these chairs and be prepared to take on all comers to explain why. If they don't have the time or inclination to do it, then for goodness' sake don't start a filibuster. One of the rule changes we have talked about says that if it is that important to stop the business of the Senate—as we are doing now—they ought to at least have to stay on the floor of the Senate to defend their position. Is that too much to ask, that they don't go out to dinner and check in the next day to make certain that lunch is going to be served on time?

I think this issue gets to the heart of what our economy is facing, what families are facing, and what the Senate refuses to face. This Republican filibuster has stopped us from taking up a measure that would reduce the interest rate on student loans from 6.8 percent to 3.4 percent. In my State of Illinois, 365,000 students will be affected if that interest rate goes up. It isn't fair to them. It isn't fair at all. It isn't fair to be stuck in the middle of a filibuster when we ought to be rolling up our sleeves and tackling this issue.

The House passed a bill on student loans. Just to give an idea of how there is a different approach to things, the House Republicans—with very little, if any, Democratic support—said: OK. We will lower the interest rate on student loans, and here is how we will pay for it. We will take money out of a preventive health care program. In other words, we will reduce childhood immunizations, and the money we save by not vaccinating children, we will use that to bring student loan interest rates down.

How about that for a Faustian choice? How about that for a deal with the devil? We will run the risk that children will get childhood diseases,

and we will take the savings from that and help the kids who are in college. Is that what it has come to now, your money or your life? That is the choice we have? That is all? I don't think so.

Why is it that the Tax Code in this country has become a sacred document? One would think that some people, instead of putting their hand on the Bible and swearing to uphold the Constitution, put their hand on the Bible and swore to uphold the Tax Code as it stands, without a word being changed. I didn't. That Tax Code is a law written by men and women, some of great intellect and some bowing to special interests. Our job every year is to look at it and see if it makes sense.

The way we pay for the student loan interest rate to stay affordable is closing a loophole in the Tax Code used by accountants and lawyers to avoid paying taxes. They have made out pretty well under that provision for a while. But why should they have that for life? Are they now entitled to that? Is that an entitlement they get for life? I don't think so. I think it is a loophole we can close, save the money, and reduce student loans—not at the expense of children being immunized against whooping cough and measles. That is what it comes down to.

House Republicans seem to think that is a pretty good tradeoff. I don't. Let's at least debate it on the floor of the Senate instead of getting locked into a worthless filibuster again and again and again. That is where we are.

Many of us have gone to our official Web sites and invited people living in our States to send us their stories about student loans. I have read three of them here. I can tell you many more from those I witnessed just this last week going through my State, going from Chicago to Peoria to Decatur and all points in between. The stories just come crushing in one after the other, and they are reminders that what we do on the floor of the Senate makes a real difference in the lives of families across America.

I have said it before: I wouldn't be standing here today without student loans. The government loaned me the money, and somehow or another I paid it back. I didn't think I could, but I did, hoping the next generation could use that money to get their own student loans. It is part of the kind of trust we have, one generation helping another. So are we going to let these students down? Are we going to let this filibuster be the end of the conversation?

I have listened to the Republican leader come to the floor day after day and say: Oh, this is just a political stunt. Where is the stunt? What it comes down to is we want to bring the bill to the floor and open it to an amendment process.

To my friends on the Republican side, give us your best ideas. Put them in amendment form. Bring them to the floor. Let's debate them. Let's vote. We will do the same. Who knows, we may find some common bipartisan agreement and get this problem solved. We will not get it solved stuck in another filibuster, which is where we are right now, wasting the time of the Senate and the time of the taxpayers and endangering a lot of families across America who desperately need our help.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke on the floor about the Democratic bill to reduce interest rates on student loans, and I was lamenting the fact that our Republican colleagues would not even permit us to turn to the bill. They were filibustering a motion to proceed to the bill which meant we could no longer work on it. That is why this floor today is so empty. We should have been here working on a student loan bill which is so critical to so many college students and their families across the country. The interest rates on these student loans, which are the Stafford loans, the Federal subsidized loans, is going to go from 3 percent to 6 percent. We want to get it back down. This is important to 7.5 million students and their families.

When I concluded my remarks, Senator BROWN from Massachusetts took to the floor. He expressed shock that I was concerned about Republican filibusters and started to talk about how cooperative the Republicans have been, pointing to a few issues where we have worked together. Look, I am here to say that working together in a bipartisan manner on a few issues is fine, but we need to work together in a bipartisan manner on almost all the issues we work on because the American people are counting on us. Because there are a handful of issues on which the Republicans cooperated, let's not come down to the floor and say everything is perfect and Republicans are not blocking us, when, in fact, they are blocking us.

The Democrats essentially retook the Senate in 2007. Since then, these Republican filibusters have been off the charts. Don't take my word for it, listen to congressional scholars Thomas Mann and Norman Ornstein. They recently wrote an opinion piece in the Washington Post. It was based on a study. I ask unanimous consent to have that printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Washington Post, Apr. 27]

LET'S JUST SAY IT: THE REPUBLICANS ARE THE PROBLEM

(By Thomas E. Mann and Norman J. Ornstein)

Rep. Allen West, a Florida Republican, was recently captured on video asserting that there are ''78 to 81'' Democrats in Congress who are members of the Communist Party. Of course, it's not unusual for some renegade lawmaker from either side of the aisle to say something outrageous. What made West's comment—right out of the McCarthyite playbook of the 1950s—so striking was the almost complete lack of condemnation from Republican congressional leaders or other major party figures, including the remaining presidential candidates.

It's not that the GOP leadership agrees with West; it is that such extreme remarks and views are now taken for granted.

We have been studying Washington politics and Congress for more than 40 years, and never have we seen them this dysfunctional. In our past writings, we have criticized both parties when we believed it was warranted. Today, however, we have no choice but to acknowledge that the core of the problem lies with the Republican Party.

The GOP has become an insurgent outlier in American politics. It is ideologically extreme; scornful of compromise; unmoved by conventional understanding of facts, evidence and science; and dismissive of the legitimacy of its political opposition.

When one party moves this far from the mainstream, it makes it nearly impossible for the political system to deal constructively with the country's challenges.

''Both sides do it'' or ''There is plenty of blame to go around'' are the traditional refuges for an American news media intent on proving its lack of bias, while political scientists prefer generality and neutrality when discussing partisan polarization. Many self-styled bipartisan groups, in their search for common ground, propose solutions that move both sides to the center, a strategy that is simply untenable when one side is so far out of reach.

It is clear that the center of gravity in the Republican Party has shifted sharply to the right. Its once-legendary moderate and center-right legislators in the House and the Senate—think Bob Michel, Mickey Edwards, John Danforth, Chuck Hagel—are virtually extinct.

The post-McGovern Democratic Party, by contrast, while losing the bulk of its conservative Dixiecrat contingent in the decades after the civil rights revolution, has retained a more diverse base. Since the Clinton presidency, it has hewed to the center-left on issues from welfare reform to fiscal policy. While the Democrats may have moved from their 40-yard line to their 25, the Republicans have gone from their 40 to somewhere behind their goal post.

What happened? Of course, there were larger forces at work beyond the realignment of the South. They included the mobilization of social conservatives after the 1973 Roe v. Wade decision, the anti-tax movement launched in 1978 by California's Proposition 13, the rise of conservative talk radio after a congressional pay raise in 1989, and the emergence of Fox News and right-wing blogs. But the real move to the bedrock right starts with two names: Newt Gingrich and Grover Norquist.

From the day he entered Congress in 1979, Gingrich had a strategy to create a Republican majority in the House: convincing voters that the institution was so corrupt that anyone would be better than the incumbents, especially those in the Democratic majority. It took him 16 years, but by bringing ethics

charges against Democratic leaders; provoking them into overreactions that enraged Republicans and united them to vote against Democratic initiatives; exploiting scandals to create even more public disgust with politicians; and then recruiting GOP candidates around the country to run against Washington, Democrats and Congress, Gingrich accomplished his goal.

Ironically, after becoming speaker, Gingrich wanted to enhance Congress's reputation and was content to compromise with President Bill Clinton when it served his interests. But the forces Gingrich unleashed destroyed whatever comity existed across party lines, activated an extreme and virulently anti-Washington base—most recently represented by tea party activists—and helped drive moderate Republicans out of Congress. (Some of his progeny, elected in the early 1990s, moved to the Senate and polarized its culture in the same way.)

Norquist, meanwhile, founded Americans for Tax Reform in 1985 and rolled out his Taxpayer Protection Pledge the following year. The pledge, which binds its signers to never support a tax increase (that includes closing tax loopholes), had been signed as of last year by 238 of the 242 House Republicans and 41 of the 47 GOP senators, according to ATR. The Norquist tax pledge has led to other pledges, on issues such as climate change, that create additional litmus tests that box in moderates and make cross-party coalitions nearly impossible. For Republicans concerned about a primary challenge from the right, the failure to sign such pledges is simply too risky.

Today, thanks to the GOP, compromise has gone out the window in Washington. In the first two years of the Obama administration, nearly every presidential initiative met with vehement, rancorous and unanimous Republican opposition in the House and the Senate, followed by efforts to delegitimize the results and repeal the policies. The filibuster, once relegated to a handful of major national issues in a given Congress, became a routine weapon of obstruction, applied even to widely supported bills or presidential nominations. And Republicans in the Senate have abused the confirmation process to block any and every nominee to posts such as the head of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, solely to keep laws that were legitimately enacted from being implemented.

In the third and now fourth years of the Obama presidency, divided government has produced something closer to complete gridlock than we have ever seen in our time in Washington, with partisan divides even leading last year to America's first credit downgrade.

On financial stabilization and economic recovery, on deficits and debt, on climate change and health-care reform, Republicans have been the force behind the widening ideological gaps and the strategic use of partisanship. In the presidential campaign and in Congress, GOP leaders have embraced fanciful policies on taxes and spending, kowtowing to their party's most strident voices.

Republicans often dismiss nonpartisan analyses of the nature of problems and the impact of policies when those assessments don't fit their ideology. In the face of the deepest economic downturn since the Great Depression, the party's leaders and their outside acolytes insisted on obeisance to a supply-side view of economic growth—thus fulfilling Norquist's pledge—while ignoring contrary considerations.

The results can border on the absurd: In early 2009, several of the eight Republican co-sponsors of a bipartisan health-care reform plan dropped their support; by early 2010, the others had turned on their own proposal so that there would be zero GOP backing for any bill that came within a mile of Obama's reform initiative. As one co-sponsor, Sen. LAMAR ALEXANDER (R-Tenn.), told The Washington Post's Ezra Klein: ''I liked it because it was bipartisan. I wouldn't have voted for it.''

And seven Republican co-sponsors of a Senate resolution to create a debt-reduction panel voted in January 2010 against their own resolution, solely to keep it from getting to the 60-vote threshold Republicans demanded and thus denying the president a seeming victory.

This attitude filters down far deeper than the party leadership. Rank-and-file GOP voters endorse the strategy that the party's elites have adopted, eschewing compromise to solve problems and insisting on principle, even if it leads to gridlock. Democratic voters, by contrast, along with self-identified independents, are more likely to favor dealmaking over deadlock.

Democrats are hardly blameless, and they have their own extreme wing and their own predilection for hardball politics. But these tendencies do not routinely veer outside the normal bounds of robust politics. If anything, under the presidencies of Clinton and Obama, the Democrats have become more of a status-quo party. They are centrist protectors of government, reluctantly willing to revamp programs and trim retirement and health benefits to maintain its central commitments in the face of fiscal pressures.

No doubt, Democrats were not exactly warm and fuzzy toward George W. Bush during his presidency. But recall that they worked hand in glove with the Republican president on the No Child Left Behind Act, provided crucial votes in the Senate for his tax cuts, joined with Republicans for all the steps taken after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks and supplied the key votes for the Bush administration's financial bailout at the height of the economic crisis in 2008. The difference is striking.

The GOP's evolution has become too much for some longtime Republicans. Former senator Chuck Hagel of Nebraska called his party ''irresponsible'' in an interview with the Financial Times in August, at the height of the debt-ceiling battle. ''I think the Republican Party is captive to political movements that are very ideological, that are very narrow,'' he said. ''I've never seen so much intolerance as I see today in American politics.''

And Mike Lofgren, a veteran Republican congressional staffer, wrote an anguished diatribe last year about why he was ending his career on the Hill after nearly three decades. ''The Republican Party is becoming less and less like a traditional political party in a representative democracy and becoming more like an apocalyptic cult, or one of the intensely ideological authoritarian parties of 20th century Europe,'' he wrote on the Truthout Web site.

Shortly before Rep. West went off the rails with his accusations of communism in the Democratic Party, political scientists Keith Poole and Howard Rosenthal, who have long tracked historical trends in political polarization, said their studies of congressional votes found that Republicans are now more conservative than they have been in more than a century. Their data show a dramatic uptick in polarization, mostly caused by the sharp rightward move of the GOP.

If our democracy is to regain its health and vitality, the culture and ideological center of the Republican Party must change. In the short run, without a massive (and unlikely) across-the-board rejection of the GOP at the polls, that will not happen. If anything, Washington's ideological divide will probably grow after the 2012 elections.

In the House, some of the remaining centrist and conservative ''Blue Dog'' Democrats have been targeted for extinction by redistricting, while even ardent tea party Republicans, such as freshman Rep. ALAN NUNNELEE (Miss.), have faced primary challenges from the right for being too accommodationist. And Mitt Romney's rhetoric and positions offer no indication that he would govern differently if his party captures the White House and both chambers of Congress.

We understand the values of mainstream journalists, including the effort to report both sides of a story. But a balanced treatment of an unbalanced phenomenon distorts reality. If the political dynamics of Washington are unlikely to change anytime soon, at least we should change the way that reality is portrayed to the public.

Our advice to the press: Don't seek professional safety through the even-handed, unfiltered presentation of opposing views. Which politician is telling the truth? Who is taking hostages, at what risks and to what ends?

Also, stop lending legitimacy to Senate filibusters by treating a 60-vote hurdle as routine. The framers certainly didn't intend it to be. Report individual senators' abusive use of holds and identify every time the minority party uses a filibuster to kill a bill or nomination with majority support.

Look ahead to the likely consequences of voters' choices in the November elections. How would the candidates govern? What could they accomplish? What differences can people expect from a unified Republican or Democratic government, or one divided between the parties?

In the end, while the press can make certain political choices understandable, it is up to voters to decide. If they can punish ideological extremism at the polls and look skeptically upon candidates who profess to reject all dialogue and bargaining with opponents, then an insurgent outlier party will have some impetus to return to the center. Otherwise, our politics will get worse before it gets better.

Mrs. BOXER. Here is the title of their piece, ''Let's Just Say It, The Republicans Are The Problem.''

They explain that in the past they looked at Congress and thought both parties were to blame. But on reflection, as they studied the facts—not the rhetoric but the facts—it was Republicans who are causing all the problems. Here is what they write:

The filibuster, once relegated to a handful of major national issues in a given Congress, became a routine weapon of obstruction applied even to widely supported bills or Presidential nominations.

All we have to do is watch the Senate or certainly when one is in the Senate we realize these scholars, Mann and Ornstein, are absolutely right. In this Congress, the 112th Congress, we have already seen 48 Republican filibusters; 48 times the Republicans stopped us from doing our work. But don't get the impression this was new behavior because it did not just start in the 112th Congress, it started way before. In the 111th Congress, which covered 2009 and 2010, Republicans conducted 91 filibusters. In the 110th Congress, 2007 and 2008, they conducted 112 filibusters. So far this year we have had 48 Republican filibusters. In the Congress before that we had 91, and the one before that we had 112.

What does this mean? It means that in all those times we were unable to do the work of the American people because one party stopped it. There have been more filibusters by the Republicans in the 6 years since Democrats took over the Senate than there were in the prior 10 years. I want to remember one of those times because I was sitting down there in the manager's chair, coming out of my committee, Environment and Public Works, with a near unanimous vote on a little program called the Economic Development Administration. This EDA has been in place for—I want to say 50 years. It has been in place for 50 years—5–0; not 15—50 years through Presidents Republican and Democratic. It is a beautiful program because what it does is it takes some modest Federal funds and leverages States' money, local money and private money and it comes into areas that are having difficulty with job creation and invests that money there. As a magnet it creates all of these contributions, and we have seen hundreds of thousands of jobs created as a result.

So I come to the floor to get this little bill reauthorized. After coming out of my committee with a strong bipartisan vote, it is filibustered. I stood down there for 5 days, and I could not believe it. They are filibustering a bill that would create and save hundreds of thousands of jobs.

We also saw these Republican filibusters when we tried to say millionaires should pay their fair share, which would have reduced the deficit by billions. Oh, no, they could not stand to have us debate that so they filibustered. They filibustered a bill to eliminate tax subsidies to big oil and gas companies that are making record profits and getting subsidies that they have gotten for 30 to 40 years. No, we were not allowed to go to that.

And then, of course, the most recent filibuster by Senate Republicans is on this critically important legislation to cut interest rates on student loans. They are going to double on July 1. Oh, no. They wouldn't even let us go to the bill. I say that despite the protestations of Senator BROWN of Massachusetts, this has got to stop. He cited three or four times that we worked together. I say good for that; I am happy for that. That does not in any way change the fact that we face filibuster after filibuster, 48 times in this Congress so far now.

I hope every college student in this country who has an opportunity is watching this Chamber. This Chamber should have been bustling today with people talking and working together, offering amendments so we could cut these interest rates on student loans. College students and high school students who want to go to college, and their parents, grandparents, aunts, and uncles ought to understand that this floor is not filled today passing this legislation because of a Republican filibuster.

What we do here matters. We could save students thousands of dollars on the life of their loans. These are student loans for the middle class. More than 75 percent of the borrowers in the program come from families with incomes below $60,000 a year. This is not some fun and games, but my Republican friends and their presumptive Presidential nominee want to cut taxes for people who earn millions of dollars. They want to give back an average tax cut of $250,000 a year, and they don't have it in their hearts to lower student loans for families who earn less than $60,000 a year. They call for permanent tax cuts for the people who don't need them and again they block the way for us to help the middle-class students to get a break.

Yes, I hope college students are paying close attention to this debate. I know some of them from the great State of California whom I represent are paying attention. I have heard from some of them, and I will have some of their comments for the RECORD.

Delmita Turner of Rancho Cordova, CA writes:

> I am the single mother of three children ages 7, 14, and 20. My daughter Khendel is in college and we have had to get student loans to pay for her tuition. I am also in college and have student loans as well. An increase would put a tremendous strain on an already stretched budget.
>
> After our family suffered nearly every type of loss one could, including death, foreclosure, divorce, and unemployment all within a year, I decided to go back to school with the hopes of making life better for my family. I began working a year ago last December after being unemployed for 2 years.

Now I ask: How American is that? We always strive to be better. Here is a woman who went through death, foreclosure, divorce, and unemployment within 1 year. She decided to make life better for her family. She began working a year ago last December after being unemployed for 2 years.

She continues: ''So please consider how this will impact so many of us.''

I am asking my Republican friends—as we have another vote on this I think tomorrow morning—to think of Delmita Turner of California and what this means to her.

Then there is Joseph Briones of San Fernando, CA. He writes:

> I am a senior in high school who will be attending college this fall. My dad is unemployed and a cancer survivor and my mom is working part-time. These conditions put a large stress on my myself as well as on my parents to attend my top choice of college, Westmount College.
>
> We did not receive financial aid from the state and we have an immense amount remaining to pay for my upcoming educational years. We are going to be taking out student loans to pay for college. Please do not allow the passage of the bill that will increase the interest on student loans. We rely on these loans and it is difficult to pay them back for some students as it is. Please do not make it a larger burden for students to go to college.

So tomorrow when we take up this bill again, I hope my Republican friends will stand down and think of Joseph Briones of San Fernando, CA, who is making a very pointed plea that he relies on these loans, and it is going to be very difficult if the interest rates are doubled.

Then there is Rachel Zavarella of San Jose, CA. She says:

> Increasing Stafford loan interest rates only kicks students and borrowers when we are down . . . Increasing student loan interest is another dirty trick to redistribute wealth to the top, and it's disgusting and unacceptable. I want you to vote for students and borrowers by voting yes on the bill.

Mr. President, that is just three stories from my State. I know in your beautiful State of Oregon, which has so many wonderful universities, you could have dozens of stories like this. Clearly this is not a time to increase loan rates for students. This should not be a partisan matter. Why would every single Republican vote no? I guess it is their ideology. Tax breaks for the rich, rich, rich, rich, and nothing for the middle class.

If anyone wants to know the difference between the two parties, this is the moment. It used to be a little harder to describe the differences between the parties. When I was young, both parties stood here and fought for the middle class, for students, for the environment, and for women. It isn't that way anymore. It just is not.

If we say we are here for the next generation, which all of us say all the time one way or the other, then you don't allow student loan interest rates to double. You don't allow it. We know how to fix it. We found a very simple way to pay for this that makes sense. Closing a tax loophole doesn't hurt anybody. Look at yesterday's vote. It was not good; it was not pretty.

I am glad Senator HARRY REID is going to give us another chance to change that, and I hope my Republican friends are now hearing from their constituents back home. I hope when they come here tomorrow they will cast a ''yes'' vote and let us proceed to this bill and let us do our work. Let us stand for the people who need us to stand for them, the middle class of this great country. We know why the country is great; it is because of the middle class. We need to make sure they have the opportunity to go to college and not have this burden on them that is so heavy it becomes too heavy for them to bear. Pretty soon they will stop going to college because they don't want to have that burden on their back.

We have a chance to do the right thing. I hope we will. Let the record show these filibusters are outrageous and they are historic in nature. We have never had them before. We have never had such a lack of cooperation from Republicans before, and it has been a sad several years where we have seen filibuster after filibuster, even stopping us from going to a bill. Tomorrow maybe we can come together and get on this bill and do our work.

I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUBIO. 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. RUBIO. Mr. President, I have followed with great interest this week the conversation in the Senate about student loans, the issue we are currently on, to proceed to a bill on student loan interest. I have followed it with great interest for a couple of reasons.

First of all, in the State of Florida, obviously, and across the country, there are thousands—maybe hundreds of thousands—of people who either have student loans and are paying them back or are relying on them to go to school in the future. So it is totally an issue that affects the State of Florida, where I come from.

I have a personal interest in the student loan issue as well. I think I have said on the floor before that my parents worked very hard, but they were never able to save enough money to pay for my college education. So I relied on grants and on loans for undergraduate education, but especially for my law school education. I came back to Miami to go to law school. I am glad I went to the University of Miami. I am proud to have gone there, and I think the education I got there, my legal education, was very good. It also happened to be very expensive. I relied on student loans to be able to pay that, so much so that when I graduated from law school in 1996 I graduated with a law degree and a significant amount of student debt that I had accumulated throughout 7 years of study.

In fact, I am still paying one of those loans today. I think—I may be wrong, but I know of one—I know of only one other Senator who is paying student loans right now. I pay, as I have joked in the past, about $723 a month to somebody named Sallie Mae, which is, all joking aside, a servicer that collects on these loans. So it is an issue I understand and care about on a personal level, as well as because of the people I represent.

This issue we are discussing this week has allowed me to use it as a point of illustration to the people back home who are watching this debate. After having spent my first year here, one of the questions I get the most is, What is it like in the Senate?

Let me begin by saying I am honored and privileged to serve here. There isn't a day that I don't walk into this building, even into this very room, and not be taken aback by the history that has been made on this floor, by the great men and women who have served our country from it, and by the wonderful Americans with whom I serve even now. I have bragged to people who are watching or to whom I have spoken that I have never had a bad experience with anyone in the Senate in the year and a half I have been here, and I am very proud to be a part of this institution.

However, there are things about it that trouble me. Particularly, at this moment in American history, and maybe as a result of what is happening this week, circumstances allow me to illustrate that better than any other week since I have been here.

Everyone agrees that interest rates on student loans cannot go up. Everyone agrees. There hasn't been a debate on that. I haven't run into anybody in either party who has come to me and said: Let the interest rate go up. Let students pay more. There isn't any argument about that. The argument is simply this: How do we pay for it? We have to pay for it because if we are going to keep the interest rates down on these federally subsidized loans, we have to pay for it. We have to find the money from somewhere to pay for it. So the debate and the disagreement, to the extent it is a complicated disagreement—and I don't believe it is—the disagreement is not about the student loan interest rate; the disagreement is about how we pay for the cost of keeping the rate low for another year. There is a difference of opinion.

I am new to the Senate. I am not new to legislation. I spent 9 years in the Florida Legislature and 2 years as the Speaker. We dealt with complicated issues there as well. What we would do in those instances where there was a disagreement, not on what we wanted to accomplish but on how to get there, is we worked on it. We would sit people down and say it is not that much money in terms of Federal standards—it sounds crazy to say that because we are talking about billions of dollars—but from a Federal standpoint, it is not that complicated an issue. Let's sit down. Let's get some like-minded people together and let's figure out a bipartisan way to pay for what we all agree we need to do. That is the normal, regular way to deal with an issue such as this.

That is not what has happened. Why hasn't that happened? Why have smart, well-educated, intelligent people who serve in this Chamber not met and discussed a way to pay for this? It is really not that complicated. It wouldn't take that long to come up with a way to pay for it that both sides agree on. Why hasn't that happened?

The answer to that question is something people back home are not going to like, and people who are here today visiting are not going to like to hear, and whoever is watching on television right now isn't going to like. The reason is because that is the way things have been since I have gotten here. It is about politics.

Shocking as that may be, there is politics in this process. That is what is influencing us today.

A few weeks ago, the President made a decision that this was an issue he wanted to use. His campaign folks made a decision that student loan debt and the interest rate was a perfect opportunity to use as, yet again, another wedge issue. The latest wedge issue, and we have seen a series of them, is let's campaign on the idea that Republicans are not in favor of students, and let's use the student loan issue as an example of that. Of course, those plans kind of got messed up when Republicans said: We agree with you. We can't let student interest rates go up either. So they were off balance for a couple of days.

By the way, the President continued to travel the country and campaign on keeping student loan rates down even though no one was against them. He was campaigning against his opponents on this issue even though there were no opponents on this issue.

But, nevertheless, after a couple of days of figuring out they were going to lose this wedge issue, they came up with a second way to deal with it; that is, let's bring this issue to a vote on the Senate floor, but let's build it in such a way—let's put a bill on the floor of the Senate that we know will fail, that we know Republicans can't vote for. It wasn't: let's meet and see where we can agree on how to pay for this so we can get something done. It was: let's put a bill on the floor that we know Republicans will never support, designed specifically to fail, so we can then spend the week talking about this on the Sunday talk shows and speeches on the floor and missives from the campaign. It is about messaging.

In a country where our national debt now equals the size of our economy; in a country where we are 5, 6 months away from catastrophic increases in taxes; in a country where just last Friday we learned that job creation and job growth is stagnant, where millions of Americans have been out of work for 2 years or longer; in a country where millions of Americans have stopped looking for work because they have become so depressed, the Senate has wasted yet another week on a show when, in fact, this is an easy issue for us to have come together and solved.

This is not new, by the way. This has been the mode of operation here for most of the weeks I have been in the Senate. It is a pretty familiar pattern. The campaign of the President decides on an issue they want to use to divide Americans for electoral purposes, the Senate offers up a bill they know Republicans will vote against, and then they spend a week giving speeches on it. The only difference is they are doubling down: We are going to vote on the exact same thing a second time, just to drive the point home.

Here is why this bothers me. No. 1, there are real issues this country faces, issues that deserve a sense of urgency, issues that deserve every single person who serves here to solve. This is one of them, by the way. We don't have time to waste on shows. It bothers me.

The second reason it bothers me is these are real people who are being impacted by this issue. There are real people out there who, because they can't find a job when they graduate, have to get a forbearance. Forbearance

means they have to call their lender and say they can't pay their loans. Do my colleagues know what happens when we get a forbearance on our loans? It compounds. It sits there. It is delayed. It is not delinquent, but it compounds. The interest rate is added to the principal. So by the time a person starts paying it, their loan is even bigger than the loan they took out to go to college.

There are other people who can only afford to make X amount of payments because they are not making as much money. Maybe they didn't find the job they thought they were going to get, so all they can do is pay interest. So that means by the time they finish paying off these loans, their kids will be in college.

Let me tell my colleagues what it means in the real life of someone who has these loans because I still have them. What it means in the life of a person who has a loan such as this is the following: They can't save for their own kids' college, which means not only will they have their student loan debt, but their children will be stuck with it as well.

What bothers me about this issue is that instead of solving it, we have spent the week playing a game with it while real people are out there scared to death—real students, real parents, real families who are facing the threat of not just an increase in the interest rate but of an economy that doesn't have a job for them.

Do we think the interest rate is the biggest risk these people are facing? It is not. The interest rate is a problem. Not having a job is a catastrophe. The interest rate could be zero. If a person doesn't have a job, how are they going to pay it? That is the No. 1 issue facing these graduates. No one is doing anything about it.

Here is what I suggest. If this was a place that was really working to solve problems, what we would have done and what we would do right now is stop this process, go back there somewhere, get a few people together who know how to solve this, and come back here. I guarantee that if we decided we wanted to solve it, it would not take long.

Here is what else I guarantee. This is going to get solved. My colleagues can mark my words. A few weeks from now they will come up with a deal or a bill that will have enough votes to pass the House and Senate, and this will get solved. But not before we score political points, right? This will get solved, but not before the people who care more about politics than policy score their political points on this issue.

Now, look, I have been around politics. I understand this is an election year and election year stuff is going to happen. But why are we playing with the lives of real people? These are real people who are hurting, and their lives and their experiences and their worries are being used as a pawn in a political game. And it is wrong.

I will make another prediction to my colleagues. Next week it will be another wedge issue of the week. Next week we will be right back here with another bill that was designed to fail on purpose so we can get another week's worth of talking points on yet another issue.

The good news is—people in this city, unfortunately, think they are smarter than they really are. People back home know all of this. They can see it for what it is. People aren't dumb. The American people certainly aren't dumb. They can see right through this stuff, and they understand exactly what is happening.

So my suggestion would be that on this issue, let's come together. Let's say this is one of the issues that is so important, that impacts so many people in such a significant way, that it should be above politics. Let's get together over the next 48 hours. It doesn't seem as though this place is overworked when we look around the room.

What are we doing all week? What is going on all week? We voted on a few judges, and we have given a bunch of speeches. Why don't we go somewhere and get a group of people to work on this issue and come back with a solution? This can be solved.

What is going on now is a disservice to the people who sent us here. They deserve better. They really do. The American people deserve better. The people we represent, the people who hired us to do the job we have now, deserve better than this sort of theater. The Senate has become a theater. It has become a show. That is why people get grossed out by politics. That is why people watch the news at night and just don't understand this whole thing. They have a right to be frustrated. They have a right to be upset. They have a right to be impatient with us because nothing is happening on the issues that matter to their real lives.

I hope this pattern will stop. I get it. There are still going to be plenty of other issues we are going to have arguments about during this election year, and that is good for our country that we have a good debate on the issues of the day. But on the ones we can solve, on the ones we agree on that impact the real lives of real people, let's stop the games.

Let's get something done.

Thank you. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I cannot believe we have come to the floor of the Senate at a time of economic hardship and recovery for millions of families, a time where jobs are scarce, the need for a skilled workforce is critical, and student loans are about to double, only to have those on the other side turn this into yet another filibuster, another capitulation to those on the far right of their party—those who are so far right that when they look back along the political spectrum they can only see the small image of their hero, Ronald Reagan, fading in the distance.

They have gone so far to the right that they can no longer see any heroes, not even their own. So here we are with our side once again debating the obvious and the other side defending the indefensible position of the far right.

We are looking for common sense, reason, and fairness. We are, that is, looking to govern fairly for all. They are looking to play politics that benefit a few.

We are asking to stop interest rates on student loans from doubling for 7 million Americans by closing a gaping tax loophole that those who have benefited most from this economy can drive an S corporation through. My Republican friends are once again saying no. They are once again attempting to govern from the extreme, once again demanding that even closing an obvious tax loophole that benefits the wealthiest is an unacceptable government intrusion but that ending preventive care for those who are struggling with rising health care costs is the best option.

Can they be serious? Can we be standing in this Chamber saying that the most reasonable option to prevent student loans from doubling is not commonsense tax reform but ending breast cancer screening for millions of women? Is that the view from the far right of the political spectrum? I ask my colleagues on the other side do they truly believe that is a fair option? Have we run through all other possible options to have reached a point where we can now say: The only arrow left in the quiver is to end preventive care as we know it. Have we already ended all outrageous tax loopholes for the wealthy? Have we already ended subsidies to Big Oil that will make $1 trillion over the next 10 years and yet we give them $24 billion of tax cuts? Have we ended the Bush tax cuts for the top 1 percent and now have no other option than to end preventive health care for women, for millions of Americans whose health depends on it?

Unfortunately, it seems our Republican friends have once again put partisanship and politics first. Their budget prioritized tax breaks for the wealthy over keeping college costs down for middle-class families. Only when they realized this would not play well politically did they reverse course and drop their objections to keeping student loan rates lower because, they said, no, that is not the government's role. But then they said: OK. We will climb on board with that idea but only under certain conditions.

Rather than close a special-interest loophole that only a small minority of

wealthy businesses can exploit, they would rather cut funding for children's vaccines, mammograms, and other critical services. This is the classic case of giving with one hand and taking with the other and all without asking the wealthiest Americans—those who have reaped the most rewards and benefited the most, particularly in tax breaks they have received over the last almost decade—to help the country, simply to help the country at this critical time.

If that does not tell us about the priorities of each party, I do not know what will.

These preventive health services not only improve people's health and their lives, they also reduce the cost of health care. That is because it is a lot easier and less costly to treat illnesses when they are first detected.

When women have access to affordable mammograms, their doctors will be far more likely to catch breast cancer in its early stages, when it is most treatable and least expensive to cure.

When we give a child a simple inexpensive measles vaccine, we do not have to worry about expensive treatment for measles later on.

When we help people quit smoking, we dramatically reduce the cost of treating that individual for a whole host of illnesses.

The saying, ''An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure,'' could not be more appropriate to this debate.

For a party that loves to preach about fiscal responsibility, it boggles my mind that they would fight to cut preventive care that will reduce health care costs but allow tax loopholes to stay open.

Republicans decided to make a target of these programs, not because of substantive issues—I would respect that—but just because, plain and simple, they were included in the President's health care bill. As we know, as the distinguished minority leader said, it is all about defeating the President. The problem with that is, it is not about the President failing, it is about the Nation failing at one of the most critical times in its history. They lost the health care debate in 2010, and they have spent every day since trying to refight that battle.

Now Republicans will try to scare people into thinking that closing this corporate tax loophole will kill small businesses. That is the mantra we hear every time. But, actually, according to Citizens for Tax Justice:

> [C]losing this loophole will actually help most small businesses, which are currently subsidizing the minority who abuse it to avoid [paying] payroll taxes.

Isn't that interesting? So most small businesses are out there meeting the economic challenge every day. They pay payroll taxes, but those who are taking advantage of this loophole do not. It seems to me we would be giving small businesses a far better competitive advantage.

Let's be clear: The vast majority of small businesses pay their fair share into Medicare. But this loophole—affectionately dubbed the Edwards/Gingrich loophole—has allowed certain professionals such as former Senator John Edwards and former Speaker Newt Gingrich to avoid paying millions of dollars into the Medicare Program. Technically, they were not wrong to take advantage of this loophole. We were wrong to allow it to even be available.

But enough about the details on how we pay for it. This debate is all about people, all about families struggling to pay for college. As the first person in my family to go to college, who had to rely on Federal grants and loans to pay tuition, I have a firsthand appreciation of the importance of giving all students the opportunity to pursue their dreams.

For students struggling to pay for college and racking up debt, this is not an academic argument. The extra $1,000 they would have to pay each year is not theoretical money. It is the difference between being able to repay their loans and entering the workforce with good credit versus being overwhelmed by debt and going into default.

Recently, I had the pleasure of having a roundtable and speaking to students from Montclair State University in my home State of New Jersey about how the interest rate would affect them.

I heard from Emily Delgado, a first-generation American and the first person from her family also to go to college. She just completed her freshman year at Montclair. Despite working for the college as a student mentor, Emily will still be saddled with approximately $20,000 in debt by the time she graduates. If she decides to go on to graduate school after that, then, of course, that will rise significantly.

She told me she cannot even bring herself to calculate how much the interest rate hike will cost her because, in her words, ''it will just crush my dreams.''

Nick Weber, works three—not one, not two, but three—part-time jobs to help pay for college. Despite these three jobs, Nick only makes around $175 per week, which is about how much extra he would have to pay in interest every month if we do not act now. He does not think that is fair, and neither do I.

A student by the name of Jamie Sommer—who dreams of one day becoming a professor—works part time for the school, but her income hardly puts a dent in her debt, and she fears she will not be able to afford graduate school, she will never realize her dream.

Emily and Nick and Jamie and all the other students who are struggling to pay for college deserve to be able to realize their hopes and dreams and aspirations. It falls to us—all of us in this Chamber—to do all we can to keep those dreams alive.

These students deserve our support. They deserve the common sense of a community that understands we have to reduce the deficit but we cannot balance the budget on the backs of the next generation. We cannot cash in their dreams and let those with the most cash out. We need a fair solution, not political dogma.

These students have worked hard. They deserve better. They are not asking for a handout. They studied hard in high school, got good grades, took out loans, and got jobs to pay for college. They are working toward a better life, doing what every parent dreams of for their children: to do well, build a decent life for themselves and their family, and give something back to their community and to the economy.

They epitomize everything we want our young people to be. All they are asking in return is fairness—not a political sleight of hand that helps them with their student loans, but in the process takes away their health care. All they are asking is for us not to make it harder for them, for us not to add yet another stress to their lives. Certainly, it is our obligation to not shut down their dreams of a higher education. For it is in their dreams for a better life that the economic future of this Nation will be built.

We are globally challenged—globally challenged—for the creation of a product or the delivery of a service in terms of human capital. The boundaries of mankind have largely been erased in the pursuit of human capital. So an engineer's report is done in India and sent back for a fraction of the cost in the United States. A radiologist's report is done in Northern Island and read by your doctor at your local hospital or if you have a problem with your credit card, as I recently did, you end up with a call center in South Africa.

In the pursuit of human capital for a product or service, we are globally challenged. For the Nation to continue to be a global economic leader, it needs to be at the apex of the curve of intellect—the most highly educated generation of Americans the Nation has ever had. We cannot achieve that if we have students who have to forgo not only their dreams but the ability to help the Nation compete globally by getting a world-class education.

We owe them every chance to achieve their dreams and to help us make this another American century. Isn't that the least we can do? Isn't the choice clear? Let's choose closing a tax loophole that is actually creating challenges to small businesses that are paying their payroll taxes, and let's preserve the preventive health care that will improve the quality of the lives of our fellow citizens and, at the same time, save our health care system hundreds of millions of dollars.

I think that choice is pretty clear—the choice the Senate should take clearly on behalf of our students of the future and our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, earlier today, just a few minutes ago as I was presiding where the Senator from Minnesota is now sitting, I listened to my colleagues speak on this issue of interest rates on student loans. I was particularly interested in the speech of a colleague who came to the floor and said this bill that is designed to prevent interest rates from doubling is all political show. The concept of it being a political show is difficult for me to get my hands around. Quite frankly, the President didn't set July as the date student loans would double in cost. That date was set by legislation that was passed in the Senate and in the House and sent to the President. It is that date, just 2 months from now, that brings forth the urgency on this issue—Presidential campaign or no Presidential campaign.

It is also important to recognize that this is not a debate at this moment about final adoption of a bill. It is about beginning the process of debating the bill. It is a motion to proceed. For those unfamiliar with Senate process, well, this is a motion that says this is an issue that, because of its urgency, should be on the floor now for us to work on, and everybody in this Chamber knows it cannot pass without 60 votes. As the debate unfolds, amendments are debated and hopefully a path is found that will produce the 60 votes necessary to send it on to the House and to the President's desk.

So I differ with my colleague, with whom I actually have collaborated on a number of projects. My colleague sees this differently. He sees this issue as one of politics. I see it as one of an urgent need in America for our students to have a chance to go to college with affordable financing, and that affordable financing will expire a few weeks from now. It is incumbent upon this body to take up this issue and provide a pathway to prevent that from happening.

I am struck by the voices I am hearing from Oregon. I was doing townhalls in Oregon, and people expressed concern about this to me. I am receiving letters from students about this issue and from other Oregonians. This is really a kitchen-table issue. This is the family sitting around the kitchen table and saying: How are we going to make things work? Is our child going to be able to go to college? Are we going to be able to afford it? We can contribute a little, and hopefully our son or daughter will get some grants, but they will also have to borrow some money. If they have a huge debt load and a high interest rate, will that be feasible for them or will they have to take a year or two off and try to find a job or two in the service economy to save money and then go back, and then what?

That is why student loan rates are so important. It is about the opportunity for our sons and daughters to have the course in life in which they are able to pursue their dreams and realize their potential. That is what this debate is about. That is a pretty big deal—certainly a big deal for students in my State of Oregon, for their parents, and for our future economy, which needs to have our children in America well-trained in order to drive the success of our economy.

We are facing a Republican filibuster saying: We don't want to talk about this issue. That is what a motion to proceed is. My colleagues have said: No, we don't want to debate it. I disagree with them.

Let's hear it through the voices of some of those folks on the front line.

Sermin from Multnomah writes:

Dear Senator Merkley:

Today I am writing about student loan interest rates. I do not want to see these rise, even double, when the legislation expires in July.

Please fight to keep these loans at a low interest rate so average Americans can have a chance at an education, a better life, without crippling debt.

She continues:

I was just accepted in the University of Oregon's graduate program in architecture. I have applied for loans as I do not have the money to pay for this education. My husband and I will have to scrape by when I quit my job to go to school.

Once I graduate and find employment, I am confident in my ability to pay back the loans. But raising interest rates would make it difficult to do so quickly, adding $5,000 in interest to my 5-year payback plan.

Please stand with middle America, average Americans, and support legislation to extend the low interest rates on student loans.

Kalie from Polk County writes:

Senator Merkley,

I am currently a freshman in college and have taken out a substantial amount of student loans in my own name to make my goal of attaining a college degree attainable.

Being 18 and having more than $20,000 in debt is scary, especially with the insecurity of today's economy, but I strongly believe that I am making the necessary investment to not only better my own future, but that of the U.S. society as a whole, as well as generations to come.

As it stands right now, a college education is something that, realistically, not everyone can achieve purely from an economic standpoint, and the legislation to raise interest rates on Federal student loans would only make attending college all the more difficult for some.

Please do myself, my peers, my future children, and their grandchildren a favor and help keep student loan rates where they are.

Help to make college more affordable for all people so more of our citizens can realize their dreams of higher education while simultaneously building a better country for future generations.

Doesn't that sum it up? ''Help to make college more affordable for all people so more citizens can realize their dreams while simultaneously building a better country.'' I think she got right to the heart of it.

Caroline in Benton County writes:

I am an oncology nurse, presently working on my Master's degree in nursing. Like many others, I have student debt. If we are to have an educated workforce, we must ensure that the high cost of education doesn't leave students in financial ruin.

Indeed, the fear of financial ruin from heavy debt burdens and high interest rates is a significant factor that is dissuading people from pursuing higher education.

Cynthia from Columbia County writes:

If we expect to compete in a global marketplace, our children must have affordable access to education.

I have two kids in college, and the debts we are incurring are already topping $50,000; is it right that only rich people can send their children to college?

What kind of a country is it where we can spend billions on ''independent security contractors'' in Iraq or Afghanistan, but not on our own children's education?

She concludes:

Please support a plan to keep student loan interest rates from doubling this July.

I want to dwell on the point she made for a moment. We spent $120 billion in Afghanistan last year on misguided nation building while we let nation building at home suffer, both in terms of investment in our infrastructure and investment in education. So Cynthia wonders what is wrong that we are failing our children when we have billions to spend on a misguided war overseas.

Alana writes:

I am working to pay off student loans now, which is hard enough. Now my family's trying to send my youngest sister to college and is finding it hard to afford, and we are upper middle class. If we can barely afford an education now, how will anybody be able to do so if the interest rates go up? Please support the plan to stop this. This is a critical investment in the success of our middle class.

I think these folks from Oregon—Sermin, Kalie, Caroline, Cynthia, and Alana—have hit the critical points here. They may not know the finer points of Senate procedure, but the fact that a good portion of this Chamber is voting to block having a debate and consideration of this bill because the bill doesn't start in exactly the form they want it passed at the end is pretty difficult to explain.

I say to my colleagues, if they don't like the bill as it is, why not bring your amendment? The bill still cannot pass in the end without a supermajority, so why not bring forth your amendment—collaborate with others and bring an amendment forward.

There is a fundamental disagreement in the beginning on how we pay for this extension. It would not surprise anyone that I would say let's end this war in Afghanistan. Let's pay a third cutting down our deficit, a third on infrastructure, and a third on education, including keeping student loans affordable. But that is not the plan we are debating today. I would be glad to propose that plan if colleagues would like to join me to create a supermajority. I would do so after we are on the bill. You introduce a bill, you debate and amend it, and you have a final vote. You cannot get it done without a supermajority in the end.

The bill as introduced says we are going to close a loophole that is a tax entitlement for the very well off. I have heard many colleagues across the aisle talk about entitlements for the

poor. I point out they should be equally concerned about wasteful entitlements for the best off—in fact, more concerned. One is a fundamental safety net for those who are struggling in an economy where there are few jobs. The other is a big bonus for the best off at the very top of society. Doesn't it strike my colleagues that the safety net is better than the big bonus for the best off? Well, my colleagues across the aisle have said: No, no, no, we want the bill to start with our payment plan, which is to strip health care prevention from children and parents. I guess they weren't raised with the same story I was raised with, which is that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. It is simply better to inoculate children than to hospitalize children with whooping cough. It is better to prevent measles than to have children suffer with measles and be damaged by measles. It is better to manage diabetes than it is to amputate feet and provide guide dogs because folks have gone blind from diabetes. Prevention is better than cure. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

I disagree with the plan to strip prevention as a strategy when we have options. Let's take that money from nation building in Afghanistan, let's take the money from bonus breaks for the best off in society, those tax loophole entitlements—let's do that because those do not rip a big hole in the safety net for Americans.

I come from a working family. My father was a millwright and a mechanic. They weren't sure how I would be able to go to college. They were determined that I would go. They raised me to believe in gaining the education necessary to have opportunities in life. But they didn't have the money. Despite the fact that I worked a job in college, that wasn't enough money. I got substantial grants, and that wasn't enough money. I had to take out loans, and I had to pay back those loans. The interest rates matter.

I say to my colleagues: End your filibuster. Come here as Senators, present your amendments, debate this bill, and if you don't like the bill in the end, vote against it. But do not block this debate on an issue of fundamental importance to the success of our children.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant editor of the Daily Digest proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRANKEN. 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. FRANKEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Madam President, yesterday our colleagues on the other side of the aisle stopped the Senate from reducing the enormous burden of debt that students take on. At a time when college is more expensive than ever, this body's inaction will increase each student's borrowing costs by about $1,000 for each year of college. And that is no small amount for most American families. That is because on July 1 the interest rate on new subsidized Stafford loans is expected to double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. We have been talking about this all day. The students who qualify for these loans are from middle-class and low-income families. If the Senate does not act soon, we will make it even harder for them to receive the education and training they need for jobs in this 21st century economy.

High school students and adults looking for new career opportunities realize how economically necessary it is to attend college. In my generation, if you had a high school degree, you could get a good manufacturing job that paid a decent wage and gave you health care and a pension. Today we need postsecondary training and strong computer math skills to operate the equipment in most manufacturing facilities. But it is not just manufacturing, it is many of the fastest growing jobs in the United States—it is computer jobs and health care jobs. A high school diploma is simply no longer a ticket to a job that pays family-supporting wages.

With an increasing number of jobs requiring some level of postsecondary training, we have a significant skills gap. In Minnesota—a State the Presiding Officer and I are proud to represent—70 percent of the jobs in the next several years will require postsecondary training. Yet only 40 percent of working-age Minnesotans currently have a postsecondary degree. Most of our States have similar skill gaps.

The United States used to lead the world in the percentage of adults with a college degree. Today we are No. 16. If our Nation is going to prosper in a global economy and continue to grow economically, we need to provide pathways for students to attend and pay for college so we can close those skill gaps.

A number of students are lucky enough their parents can provide these pathways for them and help pay for college, but most other students have to work—part time, maybe even full time. The Presiding Officer will appreciate this. I had students from the MNSCU board—their top students—who came to visit me. I am sure they visited my colleague too. There were about 15 or 20 of them. They represented Minnesota's colleges and universities. I asked them: How many of you work at least 10 hours a week while going to college? All of them raised their hands. I asked how many work 20 hours a week. Most of them. I asked how many work 30 hours a week while going to school. A lot of them. And how many of you work full-time, 40 hours a week, while going to college? A number of them.

That is no way to go to college. When you work 40 hours a week, can you take the full course of credits? Maybe not. So then maybe it takes you 6 years to graduate. But they are also taking out loans, and often huge loans.

We take for granted these days that students can get a loan, but 50 years ago that was not true. Students could get scholarships, but that was about it. My wife's family did it on Pell grants and scholarships. At least until 1957, when the Russians—or the Soviets at the time—launched Sputnik. Suddenly, the Soviets had nuclear weapons and were ahead of us in space and, as a Nation, we were terrified. It woke our Nation up to the importance of better educating Americans and getting them the skills they needed to compete with the Soviets. That meant more Americans would have to go to college.

I was 6 when Sputnik was launched. My brother was 11—younger than the pages. A lot younger. My parents sat us down in our living room, in St. Louis Park, MN, and said to us: You boys are going to study math and science so that we can beat the Soviets. I thought that was a lot of responsibility to put on a 6-year-old, but my brother and I were obedient sons and we studied math and science. And wouldn't you know it, my parents were right. We beat the Soviets. You are welcome.

But to get there we had to put in place new Federal programs to help average Americans afford college. A year after Sputnik was launched, Congress passed the National Defense Education Act, which helped put America back on top. This was actually the predecessor to the Perkins loan program, and it offered students low-interest loans to go to school, with a preference for low-income students.

This was just the beginning. Soon we gave student loans to medical students, created the Federal work-study program, and in 1965 created the Guaranteed Student Loan Program. This last one was later renamed the Federal Stafford Loan Program—which is what we are talking about today—and it made more money available to students to offset rising tuition. All this, really, because of Sputnik.

Today, there are two main types of Federal loans. Subsidized Stafford loans are awarded based on need, and unsubsidized Stafford loans are available to all students. The overwhelming majority of subsidized loans go to students from middle and lower income families. The Federal student loan program was created to open the doors of higher education to more Americans and provide them with stable, low-cost loans to pay for their education. And it originally did so to help Americans compete with the Soviet Union.

Well, we may have beat the Soviet Union, but we now face new economic threats from rising powers such as China and India. In our interconnected world, in which it is easier than ever to outsource, the quality of our workforce matters more than ever before. So with college costs increasingly out of the means of many American families, in

2007 Congress decided to help lower and middle-income students by cutting the interest rates on the subsidized Stafford loans.

The rates declined incrementally over time to a low of 3.4 percent this past year. But because this program was so expensive, the 2007 legislation would sunset on July 1 of this year and interest rates for subsidized Stafford loans would double, going back up to 6.8 percent.

Allowing this to happen doesn't make sense. Interest rates on mortgages and Treasurys are far lower than they were in 2007, when no one had any inkling of the turn our economy would take. No one could have predicted we would be experiencing near-record low interest rates and that it would make no sense to double them now to 6.8 percent. Of course, the threat we face from global competition has not waned in the last 5 years. It is greater than ever.

So with the July 1 deadline rapidly approaching, the time to act is now. Most high school seniors already have had to decide where they are going next year, and now they are figuring out how to pay for it. While students are wrestling with these tough decisions, it is not time for us to get into a procedural fight here in Washington. I am hopeful we will vote again this week to move the bill, and this time we will put our differences aside and represent all the families in all of our States who can use any bit of help we can offer them.

I am glad to hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle agree we should stop the interest rate from going up, and we agree we should be fiscally responsible and pay for it. We just disagree on how to pay for it. I am proud to have joined a number of my colleagues in putting forward the legislation before us with a responsible, commonsense offset.

I think we can all agree that if you are going to collect Social Security and Medicare, it is only fair you pay in what you owe, and yet some people have found a loophole that allows them to game the system using subchapter S corporations to avoid paying some of their Social Security and Medicare taxes, some of their FICA.

Most small business owners are not only honest but incredibly civic minded, and so they pay all the payroll taxes that they owe. Unfortunately, a small percentage of individuals have found a loophole.

If you have an S corporation, which is basically a passthrough—which means at the end of the year the profits are passed through to you as your income. If you have that, whatever profits you make at the end are considered income by the IRS. So if you make $300,000 in 1 year, you pay income taxes on all of that. Either way, on this you pay income taxes on all your income. Here is the loophole: You decide, I know what I am going to do. I am going to pay myself an artificially low amount, $40,000, and call that my salary. You pay FICA on that amount so you can qualify for Social Security later on in your life. Then at the end of the year, you get the passthrough of the other $260,000. You still pay income tax on all $300,000 because it is all considered income. It is not capital gains; it is still income, so you pay income taxes on it. But because of an ambiguity in the way the law is written, you can avoid paying FICA taxes on the $260,000.

Again, this money is indistinguishable from the so-called salary you took earlier. You could have paid yourself $30,000, so it could be $270,000 that you harbor from FICA.

All of this is active income you are making because of active work you have done—it is not capital gains—so you should pay FICA taxes on all of it. There is simply no excuse for not paying FICA taxes on all of your income—Medicare taxes on all the income and Social Security taxes on up to $110,000. That is what anyone making $300,000 would do except for this anomaly that was accidentally written into the Tax Code. This is exactly the kind of loophole we should be closing.

I hear all the time that we should be closing loopholes so we can keep the marginal rates down. If you can't close this loophole, you can't close any loophole. There is no reason this loophole exists. There is no good reason for it, there is no purpose to it, and there is no reason to keep it. It is an accident that results in people avoiding their rightful obligations. Our legislation would close the loophole for those individuals making over $250,000.

Governing is about making choices, and this one seems as clear as day to me. Save millions of Americans about $1,000 for each year of schooling on their college loans by closing a tax loophole that allows the wealthiest among us to avoid paying taxes they should pay and avoid gaming the system. It sounds like a no-brainer to me. Instead, a minority of Senators is stopping consideration of the bill because they object to closing this loophole. They want to repeal a section of the Affordable Care Act that supports prevention efforts. They want to eliminate the provision that helps stop diabetes and other diseases before they occur, the kinds of chronic diseases that are driving our health care costs through the roof. This is simply shortsighted and, frankly, fiscally irresponsible.

But I am ready to have that debate. Let's have it here. Let's debate the different ways to pay for this legislation. Let's stop this filibuster and proceed to consideration of the bill. Let's work together to keep America on top and rise to our generation's Sputnik challenge.

Millions of students are depending on us. This bill will provide some relief to those students. Millions of businesses are depending on us to give them the educated workforce they need. This bill will take a small step toward helping them as well. It is time to act. I call on my colleagues to work with me to pass this important legislation.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam President, I come to the floor to share some letters I have received about the importance of freezing the 3.4 percent Stafford subsidized college loan program.

It is important because there are some 380,000 students in my home State of Ohio alone who are in the Stafford subsidized loan program. Many of them will see as they continue their college education—whether it is at Sinclair Community College in Dayton or Youngstown State or Hiram College—where their costs are continuing to go up. We know the average Ohio 4-year college graduate has about $27,000 in student loan debt. That is much higher than people had a decade ago or 20 years ago or 30 years ago or so when my generation was in college.

Federally subsidized student loans have been a reliable answer for so many in my State. I wish to encourage people to tell their stories. Some of my colleagues in the Senate are doing this also, but I urge people in Ohio to go to brown.senate.gov/collegeloanstories, and tell your story about how important this is.

The disappointment is that 5 years ago this was bipartisan. President Bush signed a bill that many of us here sponsored, in both parties, in a Democratic House, Democratic Senate, a good bipartisan support, signed by a Republican President to lock in for 5 years this 3.4 interest rate. If we do nothing, if we can't get our Republican colleagues to join us on this and then do the same in the House of Representatives to continue this 3.4-percent subsidized Stafford loan, it is going to mean that come July, the average college student will pay about $1,000 more for each year of college. That is unconscionable when college student loans are such a burden.

It means people who have these loans at this level, when they get out of school they are less likely to buy a house, less likely to start a family, less likely to start a business.

If people will bear with me, I wish to read four or five of these letters I have gotten on our Web site.

Nick from Beavercreek, OH:

I am a college student at Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio studying chemistry and biology. I hope one day, through my education in the sciences, that I might be able to make us a stronger nation through innovation and technology.

The fact of the matter is that I would not be able to pursue an education if it were not for student loans from the Government.

On behalf of the future of science in this country, which is in trouble already from what I hear, I urge you to reach a bipartisan agreement that would prevent interest rates from doubling.

It seems that student debt is unavoidable for the average college student. College already is an expensive investment that shapes our personal finances for the rest of our lives.

I ask that you, on behalf of those who are already burdened by debt, to find a way to reach across the aisle on this one and stop interest rates from rising.

I ask that you find a way to lighten our load. We would not forget that if you did that for us. We would greatly appreciate policy that opens up avenues to higher education for ourselves as well as for those future seekers of such an education.

Justin from Cincinnati, in Southwest Ohio:

I am the first person in my family to attend college and am on track to completing my BS in experimental psychology. I plan to go straight into a PHD program after I graduate and the prospect of loan rates doubling is absolutely horrifying.

I work full time to be able to support myself but still have about $15,000 in student loans. By no means does this compare to others who have much more in loans but allowing the interest rate to double is unacceptable and severely limiting to individuals such as myself.

Lower tuition would boost the number of students attending college making life better for everyone.

I don't suggest that everybody should go to college. I know everybody doesn't want to go to college. But I do know that people often need a technical education or a 4-year degree, a 2-year degree at a community college or a technical degree or a 4-year degree at a liberal arts school, a State university or a private school. The choices in my State are huge. We have literally dozens and dozens of small liberal arts schools and 4-year and 2-year community colleges and institutions of higher learning. Students should be allowed, if they choose, to be able to have access to college. Increasingly, it is more difficult for students to do that.

Lorie from West Jefferson, OH:

I am a full time working mother of three teenage boys as well as a full time college student at Ohio Dominican University.

I currently have over $40,000 in student loans. I still have one more year to go before completing my program and earning my Bachelor's degree.

By that time my loan amounts will probably be around $50K.

About the time I finish college, my oldest son will be beginning college and the student loan process will begin again.

He will be the first of three children that we will put through college.

Listen to the definitive. She has decided she is going to make sure her kids get a chance to go to school right away. I don't know her, but apparently she didn't get a chance to go until she was older and became married, with children, and has decided to go back to school and is completing her education as her children reach their teens or mid-teens or upper teens.

Low interest rates would help make this a little less of a financial burden for me and my family.

I do not see how raising interest rates on student loans do anything but cripple those trying to better themselves.

The last couple I will read. Linda from Centerberg, OH:

We are grandparents of 5 children. We and our children are middle class constituents who live in a rural area close enough to Columbus to commute.

Please do not let the interest rate for the Stafford Loan increase in July.

Our oldest grandchild is preparing to start college in the fall. She is fourth in her class and shows great promise for a good future in her chosen field, but our children are finding that paying for college is really going to stretch their budget.

Please don't put a further burden on our grandchild by increasing the interest rate of a loan she may need to finance her future.

So those last two are interesting in that this doesn't just affect college students; this affects the parents; it affects the grandparents. It is important that they don't want welfare. They just want an even shot and a break here. That is so important for this grandmother. People understand that this is going to help everybody if they get to go on to college.

The last one I will mention is Carla from Steubenville in eastern Ohio, near the Ohio River:

I am very concerned about the raising of interest rates for student loans.

I am a mother in a middle class family working to help put my sons through college.

I don't expect a handout but I have worked hard to acquire my position as a teacher.

My husband and I have exhausted our savings to pay for most of our sons' expenses—even with the support of subsidized and unsubsidized loans.

I have put out over $80,000 in my eldest son's college. Please, let's help those that help themselves. If not, then the economy is going to continue to fail.

The middle class will go bankrupt just trying to pay for their kids college.

I was taught to work and you shall receive but that is not true anymore. Please help the working poor.

What I take out of this more than anything is back in the 1940s and 1950s our government, through legislation that President Roosevelt signed in 1944, the GI bill, created a whole generation of prosperity. Millions and millions of young men and women coming out of World War II were given the opportunity to go to college and build homes and get their families started.

Because government at one time helped these millions and millions of students, it lifted the entire country. It lifted the economy. We had a much more prosperous economy because all these young men and women went to college because they chose to—millions and millions of them—because of the GI bill. It meant colleges were built. It meant more highways were built. It meant more businesses were started after they got out of college.

This subsidized Stafford Loan, as the Presiding Officer this afternoon knows, as we all know, helping all of the hundreds of thousands—in my State 380,000, in Minnesota more than 200,000 students—helping those hundreds of thousands of students in our two States will help our States become more prosperous.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support our legislation. Lock this in. Do it bipartisanly. It was bipartisan 5 years ago, as the highway bill used to be bipartisan, as raising the debt limit used to be bipartisan. Please return to those days when bipartisanship around here was rewarded and was effective.

I close by asking people to go to my Web site and tell us your story: brown.senate.gov/collegeloanstories. Tell us your story. I would like to share it with my colleagues because I think putting a human face on this for the student, for the parents who are struggling, even for the grandparents who care so much about the future, as most of our grandparents do, can make a real difference.

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. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we are still here. We have not gotten much of a response from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle about our legislation that would help students throughout America pay their tuition costs and pay a reasonable amount of interest on their loans. I don't know what my colleagues are waiting for. We all know the crisis in America. College has become more and more important. To many, it is a necessity, and it has become more and more expensive. That equation is not only hurting the kids who go to college, it is hurting their families and hurting this country.

When the percentage of people who graduate from college declines vis-a-vis other nations, that is a very bad sign for America. We can talk about the problems of quality in our K–12 schools, and those are important issues, but our higher education system is still rating just about the best in the world. That is shown by the fact that hundreds of thousands from around the world, including places such as China and India, apply to our schools, come here and attend. It is a shame we send them back even if they want to stay, but that is an immigration issue not an education issue.

Our schools are great, and the big problem with higher education in America is not quality—although, of course, it could be made better—it is affordability. It is not the same as K–12.

Yet here we are, sitting here, and the other side is in a certain sense twiddling their thumbs and making it worse.

How is America going to stay the greatest economic power in the world when fewer and fewer of our bright, capable, hard-working students can afford college and when more and more of them decide they are not going to go to school or, if they go to school, not to the college of their choice for financial reasons?

We put a reasonable offer on the table. The proposal is we pay for our college tuition act by closing a loophole that people such as Rush Limbaugh said should be closed when John Edwards was found to have used it in his law firm, when other leading Republicans in 2004 said this is one of the greatest abuses of the Tax Code they had ever seen. All of a sudden our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say they cannot vote for it. This was an issue that was talked about as we talked about dealing with the budget gap in August or in December—during last year, whenever it was. Again, we did not hear objections from the other side: Take that one off the table, we can't live with it.

It seems what is going on is very simple. Our colleagues know that it is certainly politically unpopular, but probably it is politically wrong to allow interest rates to double. But they can't just say they are against it. They tried to say they are against it, but when the President went around the country and talked about it they had to back off that.

So in the House they came up with a pay-for which was sort of laughable. Everyone knew that would never pass, and no one took their position seriously. But we had always hoped that our colleagues in the Senate who, frankly, have been much more reasonable in the last little while—we passed a highway bill with bipartisan support, we passed a postal reform bill with bipartisan support, we passed the Violence Against Women Act with bipartisan support, and we thought we could get this done with bipartisan support.

Our goal is not to draw a difference between the parties—that has been apparent—but to get this done. We thought when we put our proposal on the Senate floor they would accept it. At minimum we thought they would at least come back with an offer: Let's debate it. Let's try and see if their amendment passes in terms of a different pay-for. Let's see if our amendment could get support. Instead, what have we found? A filibuster blocking the Senate from even considering this reasonable measure.

I am going to yield the floor because I see my colleagues have arrived, the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from New Hampshire, who I know have strong beliefs about this issue. We have an all-New England cast in the room, with a little help from the Mid-Atlantic.

I hope they will reconsider. I hope they will reconsider because it is better for the politics of this country to come together once again on reasonable issues, as we have done in the past few months. It is better, frankly, for their own politics. I am not wishing them ill. But most of all, it is better for the future of our country. Please reconsider. Let's move forward and debate this bill and let's not let the high cost of going to college get unnecessarily higher.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am honored to follow my distinguished colleague from New York and his very powerful and eloquent words on a subject that concerns all of us, not only in New England but across the country. I have heard from countless students in Connecticut where we have some of the best educational institutions in the country. I know my colleague, Senator SHAHEEN from New Hampshire, has been very much in touch with the people of her State, and particularly young people there, striving—as they are in Connecticut—for more affordable education.

We are talking about the future of our country. There should be nothing contentious, certainly nothing partisan about this issue of financing the future of education and particularly student loans. This ought to be a common cause, and it ought to be bipartisan. I believe eventually it will be because we need to come together on this issue for the sake of young people whose lives are very directly and immediately impacted by this issue in Connecticut and across the country. The impact is not only on their lives but our competitive economy, increasingly a global economy in Connecticut that depends more and more on exports and more and more on talented and gifted and trained, educated skilled people. We need them in Connecticut, and we cannot permit the interest rate on Stafford loans to rise to 6.8 percent from its present rate of 3.4 percent.

Even now the debt with the present 3.4 percent is crushing to many of our students who are struggling to pay their student loans with that lower interest rate.

Stanley Knotowicz—who contacted my office, who is seeking solutions in good faith, constructively, and positively—reached out to my office because he experiences the same financial hardships facing millions of recent graduates across the country. He is paying $70 a week for gas. He is providing financial support for his grandmother in her late eighties who might lose her home. He is trying to save money to get his own apartment. He is one of the many students in Connecticut and across the country who have reached out and my office has helped him.

I have also heard from Brenda Kasimir, a mother who would be crushed if she were forced to pay this higher interest rate. Again, my office has helped her to meet the ever-increasing challenge of today's economy with that student debt that now, overall, is the highest of any debts faced by our people as a whole, more than $1 trillion.

Senators REID and HARKIN want to come to a solution that will keep the burden off the backs of students without adding to our national debt. It is not a tax increase that they propose, it is simply a solution that clarifies tax rules that are already in existence by closing a loophole. It is known as the Gingrich-Edwards loophole. I wish it were not known by that name. But it lets lawyers, consultants and highly paid professionals dodge payroll taxes and push that burden off on the middle class.

Getting rid of this loophole is another step toward an America where everybody pays their fair share and everybody plays by the same rules. It is the America that we grew up believing in. It is the America that we continue to believe in. Some have claimed that it is an America we have lost. I don't believe it. We can prove it by closing this loophole.

The provision proposed by Senate Democrats to close this loophole is narrowly tailored to affect only wealthy individuals, those making over $200,000 for an individual or $250,000 for joint filers. They are trying to shield their salaries from taxes, calling themselves small businesses. It will not affect the actual small businesses of this country, and it will not raise taxes for anybody who already pays what they owe in payroll taxes. This loophole should be closed independent of the student loan crisis. We ought to close this loophole regardless of the challenge we face now in keeping the interest rate at 3.4 percent.

Very simply, we are being asked to make a false choice—the choice between accessible education and improved public health. It is not a choice we have to make. Our long-term economy and, as a result, the Federal budget will both benefit if both of these goals are served and preserved.

There is an old saying that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and that is supremely epitomized by this situation. Last year an analysis in Health Affairs found that for each 10 percent increase in local public health spending, the rate of infant deaths and death from diabetes, heart disease, and cancer dropped significantly. Preventing these deaths and the costly treatment that precedes them could save the Federal Government large amounts of money and improve the quality of life for countless Americans.

I urge my colleagues to come together and recognize that preventive health care is essential not only to the future of this generation that will take advantage of the 3.4-percent interest rate for their Stafford loans but other generations as well, generations whose they will be and generations who are their parents.

This program is essential. The 3.4-percent interest rate should not be a partisan issue, and we should be closing this loophole regardless of the Stafford loan issue. But one way or the other, we should pay for it by closing the loophole and making sure students have an affordable interest rate for these Stafford loans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. INHOFE. If the Senator would yield for a unanimous consent?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I will yield.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks by the Senator from New Hampshire, I be recognized for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues from Connecticut and from New York and others who have been on the floor today to talk about the importance of addressing the—of avoiding, I guess I should say, the potential for the student loan interest rates to rise at the end of June. The fact is that the U.S. workforce needs to have the skills to compete in the global economy, and that means making sure college is affordable because so many of the new jobs that are being created require higher education.

The reality is that students today face ever-growing tuition rates, and student loans are a critical bridge for them to cover these costs. But unless we act, over 7 million students—38,000 in my State of New Hampshire alone—who rely on subsidized Stafford student loans will see an increase in their student debt when they graduate.

This is a particular problem for students in New Hampshire because our students have the highest average student debt in the Nation. They are graduating with just over $31,000 in debt per student. Not only do they have the highest average debt, but 74 percent of our college students are in debt, and that is the second largest number in the country. So we have the highest average debt and the second highest number of students graduating with debt.

Students in New Hampshire and across this country need some relief, and doubling the interest rate is exactly the wrong way we should be going in terms of policies to promote giving every American the opportunity to succeed. We need to encourage our students to go on to higher education, to advanced-degree programs, and to professional schools. Their future employment and our future economy both depend on this.

Last week I had the opportunity to visit with two of our State colleges, Keene State College and Plymouth State University. Everyone I spoke with had stories about the escalating cost of college and concern for rising student loan interest rates. Over the past 24 hours I have heard from hundreds more constituents who are anxious about this.

Now, to be clear, the legislation we are considering would affect current and future students who will receive subsidized Stafford loans starting July 1. The last thing anyone needs in this economic climate is a reason not to pursue their undergraduate or graduate studies.

Meghan Jordan of Amherst is a sophomore at the University of New Hampshire. She told the Union Leader newspaper that student loan debt has become a constant concern for her. Meghan says that her parents would do just about anything to pay for her college education in full, but with two brothers also in college the finances are simply not available. Meghan views the prospect of interest rates doubling as an attack on college students trying to make a better future for themselves. Sadly, she said it feels like it is a punishment for trying to obtain a college degree.

When I was at Keene State College in Keene last week, I met Keith Couch, a parent who has a daughter at Keene and a son at Boston College. Between his two kids, his annual tuition bill comes to $90,000. No wonder he is having trouble figuring out from where the money is going to come. He spends hours trying to figure out how his family will make college payments each month. He said loans help bridge that gap.

One constituent, Erin, posted on my Facebook wall that her husband recently completed medical assistant courses at Hesser College in Manchester. He is due to start paying his student loans next month, but he hasn't been able to find a job in his chosen field. Erin said that family finances are tight and if interest rates were to double on the loans they have, there is no way they would be able to pay them back.

The stories I have heard in New Hampshire are similar to the stories Senator BLUMENTHAL told about Connecticut and what Senator SCHUMER has had to say about New York and what we are hearing from students and families across the country. Higher education is essential for economic opportunity and personal growth. It is equally essential to the prosperity of our country, and, most importantly, the prospect of higher debt levels affects whether people choose to enter college to begin with.

When I was in Plymouth last week at Plymouth State University, a student stood up and said: I want to teach history. Tell me why I shouldn't just drop out of college and be a mechanic. I said: Well, I like teachers myself, and we need more of them. But in this rapidly changing, highly competitive global economy, we should be doing everything we can to make sure college is more accessible to Americans so we don't have students across this country saying: Why shouldn't I drop out if no one supports my getting a college education?

It is critical for all of us, and, unfortunately, high debt burdens have serious consequences for individuals, for families, and for the economy. Student loan debt affects where graduates live, the kinds of careers they can pursue, whether they can start a new business, when they can start a new family, when they can purchase a new home, and when they can start to save for retirement.

Our students deserve better. We need to get rid of any obstacles that are keeping our students from getting the education they need to succeed. We should not put more obstacles in their way. We need to come together, Democrats and Republicans, to stop this increase in student loan interest rates and to do what is in the best interest of our families and our young people who need that college education.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am proud to rise today to support the Stop the Student Loan Interest Rate Hike of 2012. I cosponsored this bill because it extends the current interest rate of 3.4% for subsidized Stafford Loans for the next school year. This interest rate reflects a record low for interest rates on Federal student loans, and these loans can only go to students and families that demonstrate a need for them; nearly 50% of the students that take advantage of subsidized Stafford loans come from families with an annual income of less than $50,000. Subsidized Stafford loans help more than 7 million students attend an institution of higher education without worrying that the interest on their loans will begin accruing while they are in school. It helps more than 103,000 students in Maryland. Middle class families are feeling stretched and stressed and if we fail to act, students could be facing an additional $1,000 in debt over the life of their loans.

It is important to note that we will not expand our Federal deficit, and we will help families not expand the family deficit, by keeping the interest rate at 3.4 percent. Senator REID's legislation offsets the cost of this legislation by closing a tax loophole enjoyed by individuals seeking to avoid paying payroll taxes on their income. This would only affect those who make more than $250,000 a year and simply requires people who make any income from a professional service business such as lobbying to pay taxes if more than 75 percent of the income from that business comes from three or fewer shareholders.

I adamantly oppose the alternative proposal from House and Senate Republicans that would repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund authorized by the Affordable Care Act. In the last year alone, that prevention fund has funded activities in my home state of Maryland to promote tobacco prevention, substance abuse prevention, mental health services, and community programs to promote healthy living. The fund is also used to invest in childhood immunizations to decrease the risk of disease among children. In the future, the President plans to use this fund to support breast cancer screenings for more than 300,000 women and cervical cancer screenings for more than 280,000 women. Repealing the prevention fund would not only

strike an unnecessary blow to prevention activities aimed to improve the lives of women and children, it would also promote increased health care costs by eliminating strategic investments meant to prevent or mitigate chronic illnesses that can be expensive to treat.

Students will bless us if we are successful in keeping their student loan interest rates as low as possible. Getting a college education is the core of the American dream and I am going to be sure that every student has access to that dream and make sure that when they graduate their first mortgage isn't their student debt. This legislation pending before us today should be passed in a swift, expeditious, uncluttered way. This bill is absolutely a great bill for students and it is a great bill for America. It gives our students access to the American dream. It gives our young people access to the freedom to achieve, to be able to follow their talents, and to be able to achieve higher education in whatever field they will be able to serve this country.

I urge the swift passage of Senator REID's legislation to maintain the current interest rate for subsidized Stafford loans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

EPA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, I will be introducing a bill in a minute called S. 3053, but as a predicate to that, let me talk again about my ongoing investigation of the overreach of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Certainly the Washington Post is right-on with their editorial. On May 3, the Washington Post editorial board penned an editorial entitled ''The EPA is earning a reputation for abuse.'' In this editorial, they discussed how former region 6 Administrator Al Armendariz's ''philosophy of enforcement'' has severely hurt the EPA.

To refresh your memory, it was a couple of weeks ago at this very podium that I read the quotes I am about to quote again today. While the Washington Post doesn't agree with me all the time, I was pleased to read that they saw that the ''crucify'' policy Mr. Armendariz purported in his visit to Dish, TX, clearly showed that he ''preferred to extract harsh punishments on an arbitrary number of firms to scare others into cooperating.'' Further, the Washington Post editorial board saw this attitude as both unjust and threatening to investors in energy projects.

While Armendariz has resigned—he is gone now—his statements have undermined the legitimacy of the EPA's regulatory authorities. We know that the policy of extracting harsh punishment on arbitrary individuals in order to scare others into cooperation was not just an inflated rhetoric. Mr. Armendariz followed through on his philosophy when he had the EPA region 6 pursue a trumped-up emergency action against the natural gas company Range Resources in Texas. The EPA is not using its powers fairly and is showing its enforcement is arbitrary, unreliable, capricious, and unduly severe.

But the Post's editorial board didn't see Armendariz as an isolated incident. They also called out EPA's actions in another recent high-profile misuse of power that has hurt the Agency's credibility.

The EPA insisted that an Idaho couple, the Sacketts, stop construction on a home because that violated the Clean Water Act. On March 21 the Supreme Court ruled unanimously—this was not a split decision; it was unanimous, 9 to 0—that the EPA had exceeded its authority in pursuing the Sacketts and has ensured that they and other people who find themselves in similar situations can overcome the EPA's assertion of whether or not their property contains jurisdictional wetlands, without submitting to the permit process. A mere 2 days later, the EPA was again called out for overreaching its authority on water issues. Then on March 23 the U.S. district court ruled that the EPA overreached in revoking a permit to Arch Coal after the Army Corps of Engineers had already granted it. In quite a blow to the Agency, the judge said EPA's claim—and I am now quoting what the judge said in his order—''that section 404(c) grants it plenary authority to unilaterally modify or revoke a permit that has been duly issued by the Corps'' is a ''stunning power for an agency to aggregate to itself when there is absolutely no mention of it in the statute.'' That is what the court said.

Yet, in the midst of scathing rebukes from the press and the courts, the EPA is still acting as if everything is the same as it was before these cases happened, and they are actively pursuing more regulatory power by attempting to vastly increase the scope of the Clean Water Act's reach. In fact, when discussing the results of the Sackett case at an American Law Institute-American Bar Association event on May 3 of this year, Mark Pollins, Director of EPA's Water Enforcement Division, said, ''Internally it is the same old, same old.''

I plan to send a letter to Administrator Jackson addressing Mr. Pollins' comments and trying to find out how an EPA official, in the face of a 9-to-0 Supreme Court decision, could say that the Agency is not going to do anything different. And if the EPA is able to finalize its new Clean Air Act jurisdictional guidance, it will have given itself a whole new set of excuses for pushing the boundaries of the Clean Water Act as far as possible. This continued overreach is why we now have bicameral, bipartisan legislation introduced to stop this current guidance overreach.

Let's take a moment and go back in time to where this all started. We might remember a couple years ago Senator Feingold from Wisconsin and Congressman Oberstar over in the House introduced the Clean Water Restoration Act. The Clean Water Restoration Act removed the word ''navigable.'' This act gave the Federal Government, through the EPA, the jurisdiction over the navigable water. That is what the law was. But they wanted to take out the word ''navigable'' and, therefore, the EPA would have jurisdiction over all land in the United States. It is very simple. It was so unfair that not only did we defeat the Clean Water Restoration Act but the people defeated Senator Feingold in Wisconsin and Congressman Oberstar, after they had been in Congress for a long time. Obviously, this is something that is not popular. It is an overreach and everyone understands it.

Normally, when the Obama administration can't achieve what they want to achieve through legislation, they do it through regulations. We see this in cap and trade right now. We saw the President try to get legislation on cap and trade which amounted to a $300 billion to $400 billion tax increase on the American people and it wouldn't have done any good or helped anyone. Yet it would have been the largest tax increase in history. I go back and compare it with what they were attempting to do with the Clinton-Gore tax increase of 1993. That is where they raised the marginal rates, the capital gains tax, the death tax—this massive tax increase—a $32 billion tax increase. This will be 10 times greater than that. Now they are trying to do what they couldn't do with legislation through regulation. But that is because in order to undertake a Clean Water Act rulemaking, EPA would have to follow a transparent process and engage in a public comment period as required by the Administrative Procedures Act.

For that reason, they didn't pursue that through regulations. Given how unpopular their proposal has been, going through with the rulemaking would make it much more difficult to obtain the expanded Federal control they are clearly trying to pursue. By changing agency practice in this formal and nonregulatory way, they virtually ensure that they will be able to formalize this agenda easily through future rulemaking. So what they couldn't achieve through legislation or, in this case, through the proper rulemaking process, they are trying to do through guidance.

What is even more frustrating than the EPA's continued overreach is that this new guidance would provide no improvement to water and would likely hinder real progress on cleaning water. The guidance's broad reach and legalistic language would inevitably shift the balance of regulatory authority further away from States, which are better equipped to protect waters within their borders. Giving the Federal Government control over nearly all water features will not lead to cleaner water. It will, however, lead to tremendous uncertainty, tremendous confusion, and economic pain for farmers,

energy developers, small businesses, and State governments by saddling them with more layers of expensive, onerous, and unnecessary Federal regulations. It is yet another Obama administration policy that will be all pain for virtually no environmental gain.

Congress has been explicitly clear with EPA that this new guidance is unacceptable. Last July I wrote a letter, along with Senator ROBERTS, the ranking member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, and 39 of our colleagues to Administrator Jackson, where we raised our concerns that this document went far beyond mere guidance. EPA and the Corps of Engineers greatly expanded what can be considered jurisdictional waters through a slew of new and expanded definitions and through the changes to the applications and jurisdictional tests.

Administrator Jackson has said this guidance will increase the Clean Water Act's scope. In the economic analysis that accompanied the guidance, it stated that as few as 2 percent and as many as 17 percent of the nonjurisdictional determinations under current guidance would be considered jurisdictional using the expanded test under the new guidance. However, this analysis was only for the Army Corps making dredge-and-fill permit decisions when compared to current practice. The guidance will apply to the entire Clean Water Act, including the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permits, the Oil Pollution Act and Spill Prevention Control, and Countermeasure plans, water quality standards, and even State water quality certifications. Because most States have delegated authority under the Clean Water Act, this change in guidance will also result in a change in the responsibilities of States in executing their responsibilities under the Clean Water Act and a change in how individual citizens are governed by law.

So what we are talking about is what they have been unable to do with legislation they were going to be doing with regulation. But in this case, what they couldn't do with regulation because it would be too transparent they are trying to do through guidance.

The finalized guidance document is currently at OMB for formal interagency review before it is finalized. We don't know what changes have been made, but based on a draft that was leaked to the press, it doesn't appear that the document is substantially different from the proposed guidance document they put out for public comment last May. This is the last step before this expansive document starts being used throughout the country, and that is why I hope all my colleagues in the Senate on both sides of the aisle will join me in trying to stop it.

Working with Senator BARRASSO, Senator HELLER, Senator SESSIONS, and others, we introduced S. 2245. We call it the Preserve the Waters of the United States Act. It is a bill that stops the EPA from finalizing the guidance and from using the guidance to make decisions about the scope of the Clean Water Act or to turn it into a rule. The House has also acted with chairmen and ranking members of the Transportation and Infrastructure and Agriculture Committees introducing the bipartisan H.R. 4965. I applaud Mr. MICA and Mr. RAHALL in this bipartisan effort, as well as Mr. LUCAS and Mr. PETERSON and Mr. GIBBS for their actions. These bills do not change or roll back any current protections in the Clean Water Act; they simply stop the EPA and the Corps of Engineers from moving forward and making these unprecedented regulatory changes through a guidance document.

The EPA needs to withdraw this guidance document immediately. If it wishes to make changes to the Clean Water Act, it should go through a complete and proper rulemaking process under the Administrative Procedures Act. That is why it is there, so people in America will know the cost of what these regulations mean to them and what they do and do not do. Why do it under the veil of guidance when they should be doing it out in the open? That is what we want. That is all we are asking for.

I mentioned I am introducing a bill today.

(The remarks of Senator INHOFE pertaining to the introduction of S. 3053 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. INHOFE. With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, yesterday Republican Senators voted to block the bill to prevent the doubling of the Federal student loan interest rate on July 1. As long as they continue their filibuster, there is no clear way forward to prevent that devastating rate hike less than 2 months from now.

If that happens, more than 7.4 million American students will be required to pay an average of $1,000 more per year of school. This is especially important to my State of Iowa—and it is important to all States—where nearly 72 percent of Iowa's college graduates have student loan debt, the fourth highest percentage in the Nation. Those borrowers are carrying an average of $30,000 in student loan debt, which is the third highest in the Nation.

In floor debates this week, Republicans claimed that they, too, want to prevent the rate hike. I welcome their support. But if they want to join with us in preventing the rate hike, why in the world won't they let us proceed to the bill? That will give us all the opportunity to debate the bill and offer amendments.

I call on my Republican friends, if they want to keep the interest rate hike from doubling on students, to call off the filibuster and let's move ahead with the bill. I am not the only one who wants to end this obstruction by our friends on the Republican side. I have heard from constituents in Iowa who are frustrated at the Senate's failure to act. This is a kitchen-table issue for middle-class Americans, families all across the country.

I have heard reports that over 500,000 signatures from students around the country have been delivered to the Hill to show their support for keeping the rate at 3.4 percent. I know many Senators have come to the floor to share stories from their constituents about how the interest rate hike would affect them. I will share a story I received from an Iowa student.

Dear Congressman, [or Senator, as the case may be] I am writing you on behalf of myself, current college students, and future college students everywhere. I recently re-enrolled in college to further my education. This decision came after much time and deep thought. The problem wasn't that I didn't want to attend school, it was whether or not I could afford to attend school.

I live on my own, hold a full time job that I previously attended a technical school to obtain. This job supports me fully, and as much as I love parts of my job, I know that my decision to re-enroll in school to further my education was the right decision for me.

. . . In the middle of all of this preparation, I came across an article in the USA Today that said the Federal Government might raise student loan interest rates. Not just raise, but double them, unless Congress intervenes.

I could not believe what I was reading, and feel so passionate about the subject that I had to write a letter to you. I am already struggling on a daily basis to support myself. I live paycheck to paycheck and often have to rely on the savings account I worked so hard to save before graduating high school, along with consistent help from my parents and grandparents. I wish to be independent from this help even though I am thankful that it is there.

This increase in interest rates on loans . . . was not only disappointing, it was infuriating to me. This will have an effect for many years beyond what it should and not only for me.

I live in Stanwood, IA, a place that not many people have heard of, and I commute the 35 miles to Cedar Rapids every day for my job. . . .

So when I saw that these loans that I am relying on to support me and fund my education were going to double, I was heartbroken and I wonder what is wrong with my country? I am very proud to be an American, and more so an Iowan. . . .

I believe that the one thing the USA has going for it: supporting our future, but that is quickly fading in front of my eyes. I hope that you read this and feel every ounce of disappointment in our great country as I do, and do everything in your power to not let the interest rate on student loans increase on July 1.

I hope you can put faith in the American students who are relying on these loans to

educate themselves, and together get our country back on the right track, not headed down the wrong one. Thank you so much for your time, and I hope to hear great things from my representatives soon.

Sincerely, a proud fellow Iowan.

This is just one of the many stories I have received from my constituents, telling me how detrimental it would be if the rate were to double on July 1.

This increase is a looming reality for many students and families if this Senate continues to do what it is doing—and that is to do nothing to bring the bill up and having Republicans filibuster it, and not even letting us proceed on it.

For the past 3 days, we have been hearing from Republicans that they want to keep the interest rate at 3.4 percent, but they don't like how we are paying for it in our bill. I have said many times that if they don't like that—and our leader came out here, as many have, saying, look, if my Republican friends don't like how we pay for it, let us get on with the bill and they can offer their offset or pay-for. We can vote on it and they can vote on ours. But that is not acceptable to the Republicans. They don't even want the bill to go forward.

We have been hearing from Republicans that our offset, which is closing a loophole in the Tax Code that affects subchapter S corporations—and I might add it only affects a very small sliver of subchapter S corporations, very tightly drawn; they can't have more than three shareholders. How about that. And you have to have more than $250,000 in income, and it pertains only to those subchapter S corporations that provide certain kinds of professional services. In other words, it doesn't pertain to real estate, or manufacturing, or anything like that. It only has to do with certain professional services, such as lawyers and accountants, people such as that.

Well, the Republicans say that if we do this—close that loophole—it will hurt the ''job creators.'' How many times have I heard that, job creators—that we are going to hurt small businesses. The other side would have you believe that we are doing this for political gain, that somehow we Democrats are doing this for political gain. Well, if that were the truth, why would we pick an offset, a pay-for, to fix a problem that conservatives have railed against in the past? Yes, the problem that we are trying to fix in subchapter S corporations is a problem that conservative Republicans have railed against in the past. I want to refresh my colleagues' memories and set the record straight on this issue of S corporations, the offset we have.

For starters, in 2004, the Wall Street Journal editorial page said this on July 13, 2004:

Conservative Support for Closing the S Corp Tax Loophole.

Senator Edwards talks about the need to provide health care for all, but that didn't stop him from using a clever tax dodge [these are the words of the Wall Street Journal, not mine] to avoid paying $591,000 into the Medicare system. While making his fortune as a trial lawyer in 1995, he formed what is known as a ''subchapter S'' corporation, with himself as the sole shareholder. Instead of taking his $26.9 million in earnings directly in the following four years, he paid himself a salary of $360,000 a year and took the rest as corporate dividends.

Since salary is subject to 2.9 percent Medicare tax, but dividends aren't, that meant he shielded 90 percent of his income. That's not necessarily illegal, but dodging such a large chunk of employment tax skates perilously close to the line . . .

CPA Magazine lists it as number 11 of its 15 best underutilized tax loopholes.

I ask, is the Wall Street Journal in favor of—what did they say?—hurting job creators? Are they in favor of that? Is the Wall Street Journal in favor of ''raising taxes on the very businesses we are counting on to hire these young people,'' as the minority leader said on Monday? I repeat, we limit it to only three shareholders. They are going to count on them to hire these young people, he said. What is the minority leader talking about? That same year, in 2004, the late conservative columnist Robert Novak wrote:

It is one of the last loopholes left in the Internal Revenue Code, and it is a big one.

Here is the whole statement:

How can John Edwards explain setting up a dummy corporation—subchapter S—to avoid paying an estimated $290,000 in Medicare taxes in the 2 years before he ran for the Senate? This is a classic subchapter S corporation devised to shelter income, mainly for professionals, such as lawyers (and also syndicated columnists, but not me). It is one of the last loopholes left in the Internal Revenue Code, and it is a big one.

That is Robert Novak. Has anyone ever questioned his conservative credentials?

Sean Hannity said this:

Hey, John Edwards is worth, what, $30 million to $40 million, set up a sub-S corporation to keep him from paying Medicare taxes on 90 percent of his income, and then he lectures the rest of us how Medicare is going broke.

Finally, Rush Limbaugh himself said this:

. . . and he [Senator Edwards] has also compounded that by structuring his own personal finances to avoid paying Medicare taxes on 90 percent of the nearly $27 million he earned over four years.

I ask my Republican colleagues, are Robert Novak, Sean Hannity, Rush Limbaugh, and the Wall Street Journal all in support of raising taxes? Are they all in support of killing job creators? These are their statements. That is the record.

For the last several years, conservative Republicans have been going after this loophole, until they obviously found a Democrat who used it, John Edwards. Lots of people use it, a lot of lawyers and accountants and doctors. A lot of different kinds of professionals have used this loophole to avoid paying their fair share of taxes.

Here is another classic case where the Republicans say we are using this for political gain. Wait a minute. They are the ones who have been going after this loophole for years. We said: Hey, we finally have something on which we can agree. The Wall Street Journal and all these other people are saying we have to close this loophole. We have the opportunity to do so, and in doing so raise the money both to help Medicare and Social Security and to keep the interest rates on student loans at 3.4 percent. Yet the Republicans will not even allow us to bring it to the floor.

So who is playing politics, I ask? Who is playing politics?

Well, as I have said before, and I will say again, we have come here with a serious offset—one, as I said, that has been supported—at least closing this loophole has been supported—by conservative Republicans in the past. If anything, it is worse today than it was in 2004. More and more people are finding out about how they do this. They form this little subchapter S corporation and avoid paying their taxes. It is time to close that.

We came up with a serious offset we thought would be acceptable on both sides because of the history. We are ready to do this now—ease the concern of so many students and families across the country. The Republicans came and wanted to pay for it by eliminating the Prevention and Public Health Fund. They want to eliminate the one thing that is going to prevent obesity, heart disease, stroke, cancer, and diabetes in the future and save us a lot of money. They want to end that and take that money and put it into keeping the interest rates low. They are pitting the low interest rates for students against the health care of children—immunizations for kids—which is what we use this prevention fund for. And for diabetes prevention. That is what we use the fund for. They want to take that away, pitting students against the health of our country. That is not a serious offer. That is not a serious offer by the Republicans.

That alternative is going nowhere. Besides, the President has said he would veto that. So I ask my colleagues on the other side to quit playing politics. Quit playing politics with this. Let's bring it up for a vote.

Maybe they should listen to the Wall Street Journal, and the now deceased Novak and Fox News and even Rush Limbaugh and Hannity. Let's close this loophole once and for all and do something good with it. Let's do something good with it. Keep the interest rates low for our students in this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. 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. REID. Mr. President, during the day I flipped on the TV that we have in

our offices and looked at it as often as I could. I was very impressed with my colleagues who came and talked about why it is so important that we not have an increase in the interest rate for student loans. I have been very happy with my Democratic colleagues who have come here and made such a profound case. But I listened also to what the Republicans had to say, and it is beyond my comprehension how they can come to the floor with a straight face and say what they have said. I have listened as my Republican colleagues have come to the Senate floor to blame Democrats for stalling legislation to keep college affordable for 7 million people throughout our great country. The claim is pretty rich considering that Republicans voted unanimously yesterday to filibuster this legislation. What is a filibuster? It is stopping us from going to the legislation.

Our bill would prevent 7 million students from paying $1,000 more on their loans. With college already unaffordable for far too many young people, Democrats believe we should be doing all we can to provide access to higher education. That is what these student loans are all about.

Republicans have repeatedly claimed they support efforts to support legislation to keep loans from doubling this summer, but they sure have a funny way of showing it with this endless filibuster. Today, Republicans have said that Democrats should negotiate a way out of this stalemate—again, a very strange reasoning. It is hard to negotiate without a partner.

Every Tuesday after we do our weekly caucus meetings, I go to what we call the Ohio Clock. One of the reporters said: Your Republican colleague Senator MCCONNELL said you should negotiate on this issue with Speaker BOEHNER.

Now, how do you like that one, that I, the leader in the Senate, should go to the Republican House and start negotiating with them? That is a strange, strange way of doing business.

The Republicans claim their only objection to our legislation is how it is paid for—by closing a tax loophole that allows wealthy Americans to dodge taxes they already owe. That is what we feel should happen. We don't believe it is a tax increase—just that people should pay what they are supposed to pay. They now have a way of avoiding taxes. Rich accountants and lawyers avoid it by claiming they are going to pay dividends and not ordinary income. It is not fair to everyone else.

So if the Republicans object to this, fine. Democrats are willing to consider alternative offsets. In fact, we are even willing to vote on the House Republicans' own proposed offset. Now, that is a doozy, the offset from the Republicans coming from the House, which takes away money for preventive care for virtually everybody. The leading causes of death in America are diabetes, heart disease, and cancer. They want to take away preventive programs to stop heart disease. And, as we know, there are programs now—mammograms, for example—that stop people from having to get too far behind with the dread of breast cancer. That is their offset. We strongly oppose that alternative, but we are willing to vote on it. We are not running from it. And once their proposal to slash programs that save money and lives fails on a floor vote—and it will fail—we Democrats are still willing to consider other options to pay for this legislation. My Republican colleagues on the other hand have refused to consider alternative ways to pay for a bill they claim they support.

So I say to my Republican colleagues, let us bring this bill to the floor. If Republicans are so interested in negotiating a solution, they should be willing to take that first step. Once the bill is on the floor, we can debate it, we can amend it with an offset on which both sides can agree. But until Republicans end their obstructionist filibuster, there is no path forward.

So for my Republican colleagues to come down here and say ''we support this legislation,'' I repeat, what a strange way of supporting this legislation.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FLAG MAN LARRY ECKHARDT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was in Tazewell County—which is in the area of Pekin, in East Peoria, IL—last week at the Veterans Administration Commission.

I talked to a number of vets from the Vietnam war and other conflicts. We talked about obvious questions: veterans' unemployment, what was happening with disability payments, education for veterans, topics that most vets are very concerned about. They face some pretty significant challenges, as we know.

We promise these men and women that if they put up their hand and swear that they will risk their life for America, we swear we will be there when they come home. It is that basic. We have to keep our word. As a nation, we have a sacred pledge to take care of veterans who serve. I take it very seriously—I think both parties do—and we should.

We also need to honor those who have lost their lives. Just a few weeks ago, we buried another soldier from that county. There was a huge turnout at the memorial service. One particular local resident was doing his part to honor our fallen heroes in an extraordinary way. I learned about him when I visited Tazewell County. He is from Little York, IL, and he is known as the Flag Man.

Larry Eckhardt is not a veteran, and there are no servicemembers in his family. But in 2006, Larry Eckhardt attended a funeral for a soldier from his area who had died. He said, ''There aren't enough flags here.'' So on his own, Larry bought 150 American flags and started hauling them in his truck to military funerals all across my State. As he puts it, ''I just honestly don't believe there's any such thing as too many flags for a soldier.''

Larry's inventory of 150 flags has grown to 2,200 flags, and he can line them up to 14 miles of a fallen soldier's final journey.

Traveling in his old 1999 Ford van, stripped down to one seat to make room for all the flags, he has now graced more than 80 funerals from Wisconsin to Kentucky and Iowa to Indiana and certainly in his home State of Illinois. Last year, Larry drove 40,000 miles with his flags to these funerals. He covers all the costs out of his own pocket and a couple donations from friends. When asked why he does it, he simply says, ''It's my way of giving back.''

Larry rarely uses the word ''I.'' He is quick to praise all the volunteers—often organized by veterans organizations—who help him stake the flags in the ground along the funeral procession routes. ''Without them,'' he says, ''I couldn't get them all done.''

In one instance over a long weekend, dozens of volunteers helped Larry install the 2,200 flags to honor a 23-year-old Army sergeant during his funeral. After the service, volunteers helped pack up the flags for the next stop. Volunteers ranged from kids as young as 3, assisting their parents, to an 83-year-old woman who wanted to help out in Orchardville, IL. When she was asked her reason for weathering the tough January Illinois cold to help, she said, ''We can only bake so many tuna casseroles.''

This story is what America and the State of Illinois are all about. It is the common man, such as Larry Eckhardt, following his heart and taking the initiative to do something extraordinary for our fallen heroes, and it is about a community rising to the occasion to lend its support and honor those who deserve so much of our gratitude. Larry may have said it best when he humbly stated:

> This is my feeble attempt to say thank you to every soldier who has ever served and fought to protect the freedoms that I have.

This speech on the floor of the Senate is my feeble attempt to say thanks to you, Larry, and the countless Americans just like you who step up and do their part to show our veterans how much their service means to each and every one of us. They embody the enduring spirit and values that make America great and they make me proud to serve in the Senate and humbled to represent my State of Illinois.

Thank you, Larry, and thanks to all the other Americans who are doing

their part to support our veterans and their families.

TRIBUTE TO COACH FITZGERALD

Mr. DURBIN. I rise today to recognize Northwestern University head football coach Patrick Fitzgerald for his leadership and service to the community. Patrick ''Coach Fitz'' Fitzgerald, a lifelong Illinoisan, has enjoyed a long and distinguished relationship with Northwestern University.

He completed his undergraduate studies and played football at Northwestern, where he racked up several worthy achievements. A two-time first-team All-American, he won the Nagurski and Bednarik Awards twice, was named Big Ten Defensive Player of the Year and Linebacker of the Year, and received the George Ballentine, Jr., Memorial Leadership Award.

As Northwestern University's head football coach, Pat Fitzgerald has amassed an impressive record, leading the Wildcats to four consecutive postseason games and 5 consecutive years of eligibility for postseason games. And his leadership isn't confined to the football field. His commitment to academic achievement among Northwestern's football scholar-athletes has led to many being named Academic All-Big Ten students and the school's ranking among the Nation's leaders in annual graduation rates.

Coach Fitzgerald has been recognized for his work ethic, integrity, and positive attitude. He was designated one of college football's top recruiters and serves on the Ethics Committee of the American Football Coaches Association and USA Football's Tackle Advisory Committee.

Pat and his wife Stacy are active at Northwestern University and in the Chicago community, participating in many charitable activities, toy collection drives, and school health and wellness programs.

I congratulate Coach Pat Fitzgerald on the many successes of the Wildcats' football program and thank him for his service to one of our finest schools and the broader Chicago community.

TRIBUTE TO THE WHITAKER FAMILY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to honor a family who has chosen to live and work in the small town of Cromona, KY, which they have come to love over the years. The Whitaker family has successfully owned and operated Superior Printing and Publishing Company, Inc. since 1958. Three generations of Whitakers have been involved in the proceedings of the company, with a fourth learning the family trade as they grow.

Superior Printing was started as a local printing operation by Charles and Bobbie Whitaker. They began the business in a remote part of Letcher County, KY, in a town called Cromona. The small town now has a population of 665 people, but the success of Superior Printing has far surpassed the boundaries of little Cromona. The company has become one of the most popular printing firms in the tristate area, offering business in Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia.

You may be asking yourself, how does a company in such a small town become so successful? Charles's son, Mike Whitaker, president of Superior Printing, thinks it is due to their customer service. He has said that the only difference between Superior and the larger firms in metropolitan areas is the family atmosphere that Superior provides. Superior employees have love and pride for their hometown and home State, and they don't try to hide it.

Superior provides services that promote the local economy and the entities within the local economy alike. They offer professional color printing that has been known to help all of the local schools in the area with various things like sports programs and bulletins. They also are a big distributor of print for local fundraisers and fundraising groups. The Whitakers have also recently just began printing hardback books—something that isn't common in most local printing firms. Mike believes that the new hardback binding will help local authors be able to easily print and publish their books. With some of the amazing artistic talent I have seen come out of the Bluegrass State, I am anxious to see some of the works by Kentucky's own authors that will come from this new way to print and publish.

Not only does the Whitaker family run a successful printing and publishing business, but they keep busy with providing Letcher County with the news in their own paper, the News-Press. The Whitaker family is devoted to keeping the locals of Letcher County informed about what is going on in the county, State, and country, further proving that the Whitakers are truly focused on bettering themselves and those around them.

Charles and his wife Bobbie are the proud parents of Mike, who has two sons, Paul and Nick. Paul is a U.S. Army veteran who has completed two tours of Active Duty in Iraq, while Nick has just recently graduated from Eastern Kentucky University. Both Paul and Nick are planning on staying in Letcher County so that they can be close to their family and local community.

Whether it be creating a business that provides a convenient and professional service to the local community, making a conscience effort to support the local economy with their services, informing the citizens of Letcher County on the news, or helping many undiscovered Kentucky authors and artists get the exposure they deserve, the Whitaker family of Cromona, KY, have made a contribution to their State that will not go unnoticed. I am inspired to see an entire family give in so many ways to their local community.

Mr. President, I would like to ask at this time for my colleagues in the Senate to join me in recognizing the Whitaker family of Cromona, KY. There was recently an article published in Eastern Kentucky's local periodical magazine, the Sentinel-Echo: Silver Edition, highlighting the hard work of the Whitaker family. 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]

SUPERIOR PRINTING: FAMILY PRIDE IN EACH AND EVERY JOB

As you wind along State Route 805 in northern Letcher County, you may not think there's much going on. But Cromona, Kentucky (population 665), is home to one of the finest print shops in the tri-state. Established in 1958 by Charles and Bobbie Whitaker, Superior Printing and Publishing Company, Inc. is a thriving, family-owned business with three generations of Whitakers working and a fourth generation expected to ''watch and learn.''

Charles and Bobbie Whitaker's older son, Mike, is the president of the company and currently sees to its day-to-day operations. The company offers all the expected print shop products and services like business forms, letterheads and envelopes, but what is surprising is that it also houses the region's only four-color, sheet-fed press capable of printing up to a 19-by-26 sheet.

''The installation of the press in 2008 has increased our production capabilities as well as the quality of products that we can offer,'' said Mike Whitaker. ''Local firms no longer have to rely upon faraway print houses for their color-printing needs. We're very competitive with the big, out-of-town firms so we can save our customers time and money. Most of our customers really appreciate the convenience of having us close by, and they understand how important it is to keep business here at home when they can.''

Mike explained how their press and booklet maker, which automatically collates, folds, staples, and trims books and magazines, has boosted the company's production of programs local schools use as fundraisers. ''Last fall we produced football programs for 16 different schools in Kentucky and Virginia. Our jobs range from full-color brochures and rack cards for the tourism industry to flyers, multi-page newsletters, magazines and books. In fact, more than 500 businesses throughout the region have turned to us for their printing needs.''

Since the press purchase, the Whitakers have added hardback book-binding capabilities to the business. ''This is new to us, and we are just getting started producing hardback books in small and large quantities,'' Mike said. He is especially proud of a leather-bound project utilizing the new hardback book-binding equipment. ''With the growing number of local authors, we are excited to offer both soft- and hardback book bindings to our customers.''

In addition to commercial printing, the Whitakers own and operate the News-Press, a newspaper based in Letcher County. The conservative-based newspaper has promoted the coal industry, faith and family for over 50 years.

Offering quality products at competitive prices is the mark of any successful business, and Superior Printing is no exception. ''Perhaps the only difference between our firm and one from a metropolitan area is the

sense of family pride that goes into each and every job,'' Mike said. ''We may have to work a little harder at getting our raw materials such as paper, plates, and ink, but we make up for it with the satisfaction that we are able to live and work in the place we love, here in eastern Kentucky.''

Mike Whitaker's sentiments are echoed by his sons, Paul and Nick, who both work in the business. Paul is a U.S. Army veteran with two tours of duty in Iraq behind him and is anxious to spend the remainder of his adult life near his home. Nick is a recent graduate of Eastern Kentucky University who chose to stay in the area to be near family as well. Both plan to raise their families much the same way they were raised in Letcher County.

If you have a print order for Superior Printing, you may want to call it in or perhaps email it. If you want to stop by the printing company to place your order, call ahead for directions. It is a little hard to find.

TAIWAN'S PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATION

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, on the occasion of his upcoming inauguration for his second term in office, I am pleased to commend Republic of China, Taiwan, President Ma Ying-jeou. President Ma has shown himself to be a dedicated public servant, continually electing to serve his nation even through difficult times.

During his first term, President Ma—like many world leaders had to struggle with the worldwide economic crisis. His stewardship during this difficult time helped Taiwan avoid some of the worst disasters that other countries have faced and also helped Taiwan recover more quickly than many other countries.

Taiwan has been a great economic partner for Alaska in the past years under President Ma's leadership, and we are fortunate to have such a relationship. Taiwan has remained in Alaska's top 20 export markets for the past 15 years. Alaska's exports to the country have totaled more than $22 million in sectors such as energy, forest products, machinery, and seafood products. In addition, Taiwan is one of Alaska's three sister states or provinces, and it is my hope that we will continue this sister-state exchange for many years to come.

We witnessed during President Ma's first years in office his diligence in dealing with economic and international challenges, and the upcoming 4 years for President Ma will continue to be challenging. I am confidant President Ma will overcome difficulties and serve his nation to the best of his ability.

Once again, I offer my congratulations to President Ma, and I wish him all the success in his future endeavors, and for the future of Taiwan.

NATIONAL SCHOOL NURSE DAY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor National School Nurse Day. Today we recognize the contributions that school nurses make every day to improve the health and learning outcomes of our Nation's children, especially as our children face more challenging chronic health issues than ever before. A top priority of this Nation should be ensuring that our children have a healthy and successful future. School nurses make this vision a reality each day. Quite simply, healthy children learn better and are more likely to become successful members of society.

In New York there are about 3,700 school nurses who are serving our students out of the more than 76,000 nationwide. School nurses provide a nonnegotiable value to schools, families, communities, and this Nation as a whole. By keeping children healthy, in school, and ready to learn, school nurses save money and save lives. Every teacher deserves to stay in the classroom and focus on educational outcomes, and every parent deserves to be able to go to work and send his or her child to school with a nurse who will keep his or her child safe and healthy. School nurses have the knowledge, skills and judgment to manage potentially emergent situations and provide daily care for students with increasing chronic health conditions, ranging from asthma to childhood obesity to Type-2 diabetes to severe food allergies. Research shows that when a full-time school nurse is present, student attendance rates increase and hospital utilization rates decrease. The school nurse also plays a vital role in promoting prevention and wellness, from detecting outbreaks of communicable diseases, such as H1N1, and taking action to prevent cases from developing to administering immunizations and ensuring students are compliant with regulations. Every day, school nurses are on the front lines, providing access and delivering health care services to our Nation's children.

In 1897, after several outbreaks of infectious diseases that affected the New York City schoolchildren, the city's department of health appointed the first doctors to examine students for contagious diseases. With the concerns over uneducated and unhealthy youth growing, Lina Rogers Struthers became the Nation's first school nurse. The impact of nursing services proved dramatic, and after only 1 month the city voted to set aside money to employ trained nurses in its schools.

Today, the National Association of School Nurses celebrates the specialized practice of school nursing, acknowledging that school nurses advance the well-being, academic success and life-long achievement and health of students. The American Academy of Pediatrics has also reaffirmed the crucial role of school nurses ''in the seamless provision of comprehensive health services to children and youth.'' ''The Role of the School Nurse in Providing School Health Services,'' AAP, Pediatrics, Vol. 121, No. 5, May 1, 2008, pp. 1052–1056.

National School Nurse Day highlights the need for a full-time nurse in every school, every day—which is why I have introduced a bill, the Student-to-School Nurse Ratio Improvement Act of 2012, S. 2047. This legislation would help lower the ratios of students to school nurses and evaluate the correlation between access to professional student health services and improved educational outcomes. This Nation must invest in programs and services that seek to improve the health and well-being outcomes of children, which include supporting school nurses.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing today as National School Nurse Day so we may continue to honor school nurses and the care they provide to students day in and day out, paving the path for a healthier and more successful future for all of our Nation's children.

COMMENDING OHIO HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor 369 high school seniors in eight northeast Ohio counties for their commendable decision to enlist in the U.S. Armed Forces. Of these 369 seniors from 128 high schools in 87 towns and cities, 83 will enter the Army, 174 will enter the Marine Corps, 25 will enter the Navy, 30 will enter the Air Force, 4 will enter the Coast Guard, and 53 will enter our Ohio Army National Guard. In the presence of their parents/guardians, and high school counselors, military leaders, city and business leaders, all 369 will be recognized on May 10, 2012 by ''Our Community Salutes of Northeast Ohio.''

Later this month, these young men and women will join many of their classmates in celebration of their high school graduation. At a time when many of their peers are looking forward to pursuing vocational training or college degrees, or are uncertain about their future, these young men and women instead have chosen to dedicate themselves to military service in defense of our country.

Naturally, many may be anxious about the uncertainties that may await them as members of the Armed Forces. But, they should rest assured that the full support and resources of this Chamber, and the American people, are with them in whatever challenges may lie ahead.

It is thanks to the dedication of an untold number of patriots like these 369 that we are able to meet here today, in the U.S. Senate, and openly debate the best solutions to the many diverse problems that confront our country. It is thanks to their sacrifices that the United States of America remains a beacon of hope and freedom in a dangerous world. We are grateful to them, their parents and their communities for instilling the character, values, discipline and mental and physical abilities of these outstanding young men and women.

I would like to personally thank these 369 graduating seniors for their selflessness and courage that they have shown by volunteering in defense of our Nation. We owe them, along with all those who serve our country, a deep debt of gratitude.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print the names of the 369 high school seniors in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES ARMY—83

Abfall—Amherst; Armstrong—Jefferson; Balog—Elyria; Baril—Deerfield; Binion—Cleveland; Brennan—Conneaut; Bullock—Streetsboro; Camp—Amherst; Chrosniak—Sheffield Lake; Clough—Sheffield Village; Clymer—Independence; Cobble—Cleveland; Coleman—Garrettsville; Coleman—Streetsboro; Cook—Cleveland; Davis—Cleveland; Dawson—Amherst; Doerschuk—Lakewood; Downs—Sullivan; Dullen—Kent.

Fisher, A—Amherst; Fisher, S—Independence; Frary—Seville; Fritz—Independence; Gerez—Garrettsville; Gilbow—Ravenna; Gooch—Cleveland; Goodwin—Wadsworth; Gortz—Berea; Hardin—Elyria; Harris—Cleveland; Hillrich—Medina; House—Wasdworth; Jennings—Garrettsville; Johnson—Elyria; King—Cleveland; Korzinski—Medina; Kumhall—Medina; Lambert—Elyria; Lemaster—Berea.

Lennerth—Aurora; Luster—Lakewood; McKain—Diamond; McVicker—Wadsworth; Miller—Doylestown; Milyaro Lucas—Ashtabula; Moore—Cleveland; Moore—Norton; Moore, J—Euclid; Moss—Euclid; Murray—Medina; Nall—Lakewood; Oringer—Ravenna; Paine—Jefferson; Patrick—Lakewood; Quesenberry—Medina; Schabulach—Brunswick; Semple—Strongsville; Sheers—Wadsworth; Shreve—Orwell.

Slanker—Mogadore; Smith—Akron; Smith—Columbia Station; Spooner—Homerville; St. Louis—Parma; Steiner—Ravenna; Stout III—Cleveland; Tester—Elyria; Tompkins—Cleveland; Townsend—Mogadore; Wallis—Ravenna; Walters—Brunswick; Weinzatl—Sullivan; Wheeland—Sullivan; White—Ashtabula; Wiley—Andover; Williams, D—Mentor; Williams—Cleveland; Wilson—Kent; Wilson—Windsor; Woods—Cleveland; Young—Medina; Zak—North Royalton.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS—174

Acosta—Lorain; Adkins—Cleveland; Aghakhan—Winesburg; Anderson—Cuyahoga Falls; Andrews—Novelty; Arnold—Solon; Badalich—Akron; Baldwin—LaGrange; Barfield—Brunswick; Basar—Brecksville; Baughman—Mogadore; Blain—Wadsworth; Blas—Lorain; Bowman—Chagrin Falls; Brancifort—Brunswick; Brown—Brunswick; Buckley—Middlefield; Burkey—Strongsville; Cannon—Elyria; Caraballo—Cleveland.

Carlton—North Olmsted; Chambers—Parma; Chaney—Wadsworth; Chapman—Akron; Christian—Elyria; Cillian—Berea; Ciprich—Lorain; Clapacs—Painesville; Close—Sheffield Lake; Collins—Avon; Conard—Hiram; Corbett—Ravenna; Cowling—Perry; Crabb—Tallmadge; Dancy—Shaker Heights; Danicki—Lorain; Deyermand—Dorset; Dibble—Akron; Dudley—Conneaut; Easterly—Amherst; Edwards—Lorain.

Ellis—Lorain; Ellis—Painesville; Figueroa—Lorain; Figueroa Burgos—Ashtabula; Fisher—Copley; Fort—Cleveland; Frames—Wellington; Gargano—Cleveland; Giebner—Chagrin Falls; Gluvna—Solon; Goodwin—Avon Lake; Greenfield—Orwell; Grimes—Clinton; Gullatta—Aurora; Gump—Akron; Gunkelman—Valley City; Gunnoe—Eastlake; Guy—Stow; Haberkorn—Brunswick; Hall—Conneaut; Hallgren—Geneva; Hancock—Norton.

Haseley—Broadview Heights; Hawkins—Maple Heights; Haynes—Brunswick; Hoffman—Barberton; Holland—Olmsted Falls; Howard—Akron; Hubbard—Hinckley; Hughes—Wadsworth; Hyatt—Lodi; Jeske—Westlake; Jogan—Madison; Jones—Macedonia; Keely—Warrensville Heights; King—Cleveland; Krajnyak—Eastlake; Krenisky—Cuyahoga Heights; Kuilman—North Olmsted; Layne—Brunswick; Lee—Richmond Heights; Loughrey—Stow.

Love—Cleveland; Lucas—Cuyahoga Falls; Lupica—Avon Lake; Martin—Medina; Martinez Magana—Cleveland; Matousek—Cleveland; Maybaugh—Wellington; McCartney—Akron; McClinsey—Hudson; Milioni—Medina; Miller—Avon; Mitchell—Conneaut; Mize—Copley; Moore—Ravenna; Moravec—Wellington; Morgan—Cuyahoga Falls; Morgan—Akron; Morrison—Akron; Morrison—Chardon; Morrow—Spencer.

Munn—Kent; Murray—Richfield; Music III—Mentor; Nagy—Conneaut; Newman—Southington; Novotny—Avon Lake; Oddo—Strongsville; Odorcich—Brunswick; Olivas—Conneaut; O'Neill—North Royalton; Pamula—Peninsula; Paramore—Painesville; Paul—Macedonia; Pena—Cleveland; Perkins—Cleveland; Persinger—Amherst; Pinkerton—Lorain; Plop—Lakewood; Powers—Middleburg Heights; Prinzo—Akron.

Prochazka—Lorain; Pugh—South Euclid; Rady—Painesville; Reed—Shaker Heights; Regal—Lorain; Riolo—North Olmsted; Robinson—Cleveland Heights; Rodriguez—Lakewood; Rodriguez Ayala—North Olmsted; Rollins—Cleveland; Ross—Brunswick; Ryan—Wadsworth; Sallaz—Newton Falls; Sanders—Sullivan; Sartor—Deerfield; Schroeder—Wadsworth; Secolic—Chagrin Falls; Seegert—Conneaut; Shipbaugh—Cuyahoga Falls; Shook—Madison.

Silvestro—Mentor; Simko—Medina; Slaughter—Parma Heights; Snyder—Parma; Solly—Madison; Stanko—Perry; Steagall—Diamond; Sterling—Conneaut; Stutzman—Rittman; Swires—Akron; Sykes—Akron; Szabo—Amherst; Szoke—Sawyerwood; Taylor—Lorain; Tennant—Lakewood; Tibbs—Broadview Heights; Tramte—Chardon; Trautman—Ravenna; Trunck—Akron; Umstott—Lakewood.

Vinci—Avon Lake; Volanski—Jefferson; Wadsworth—Wellington; Wagner—Akron; Walsh—Lakewood; Watson—Cuyahoga Falls; Wood—Akron; Wooden—Newburgh Heights; Yanchar—Mentor; Zierau—Rittman; Zuberer—Kirtland.

UNITED STATES NAVY—25

Bittner—Mentor; Bowers—Ashtabula; Carter—Avon; Coe—Mentor; Collins—Madison; Cook—Lorain; Cornell—Middleburg Heights; Cothran—Lorain; Haviland—Olmsted Falls; Herchick—Twinsburg; Homza—LaGrange; Hruska—Garfield Heights; Kilbane—Lakewood; Law—Middleburg Heights; Linville—Olmsted Falls; Lucas—Lorain; Magda—Jefferson; Merhige—Rocky River; Nolan—Ashtabula; Rose—Ashtabula; Scheiferstein—Vermilion; Swartzlander—Maple Heights; Swatowski—Madison; Tomsco—Vermilion; Yerich—Middleburg Heights.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE—30

Barron—Brunswick; Bilal—Painesville; Blaha—Northfield; Blaylock—Cleveland; Campanella—Brunswick; Causby—Elyria; Christian—East Cleveland; Cronk—Garfield Heights; Duke—Middleburg Heights; Ginn—Ashtabula; Hejl—Garfield Heights; Holcomb—Strongsville; Hoover—Perry; Keating—North Olmsted; Kilgore—Elyria; Konieczynski—Parma.

Kovacs—Lorain; Limpert—Grafton; Martin—Garfield Heights; McCall—Brookpark; Miller—North Ridgeville; Moulton—Wickliffe; Orsik—Wellington; Paine—Ashtabula; Senko—Jefferson; Suknaich—Wickliffe; Torok—Strongsville; Turner—Cleveland; Wilthew—Garrettsville; Zdancewski—Windham.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD—4

Correa, A—Cleveland; Correa, D—Cleveland; Dukes—Lyndhurst; Magrans—Eastlake.

OHIO ARMY NATIONAL GUARD—53

Barkley—Cleveland; Bates—Lorain; Belknap—Akron; Bohach—LaGrange; Brown—Wadsworth; Cleveland—Cleveland; Coleman—Ravenna; Costa—Twinsburg; Davey—Bath; Decesare—Sagamore Hills; Devlin—Avon Lake; Duong—Lyndhurst; Ferrante—North Royalton; Graham—North Ridgeville; Griffin—Grafton.

Hammond—South Amherst; Heckathorn—LaGrange; Horst—Streetsboro; Ibarra—Cleveland; Jackson—Euclid; Jeffery—Westfield; Joyner—Brooklyn; Lockhart, Jr.—Cleveland; Lyberger—Cuyahoga Falls; Marshall-Felder—Cleveland; Millirons—Tallmadge; Mitchell—Strongsville; Mitchell—Hartville; Myers—Mogadore; Phillips—Richmond Heights; Powell—Uniontown; Pruitt—Sheffield Lake; Reyersbach—Strongsville; Riddell—Elyria; Riley—Amherst; Roberts—Akron; Rose—Cleveland.

Schill—Brookpark; Scott—Cleveland; Scullen—Berea; Shary—Wayland; Shear—Brooklyn Heights; Skipper—Grafton; Stokes—Cleveland; Thompson, Jr.—Maple Heights; Tuck—Cuyahoga Falls; Vaughan—Cleveland; Whiting—Stow; Whitsitt—Cleveland; Wiggins—Maple Heights; Woisnet—Cleveland; Young, M—Middleburg Heights; Young, T—LaGrange.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL KENNY C. MONTOYA

• Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate MG Kenny C. Montoya on the occasion of his retirement as Adjutant General of the New Mexico National Guard, and to thank him for his 30 years of outstanding service to our Nation. General Montoya has served our country well, both as a soldier and as a civilian, and New Mexico and our Nation are grateful for his efforts and service.

General Montoya began his distinguished career as an enlisted member of Battery A, 4th Battalion, 200th Air Defense Artillery in Raton, NM. He completed Officer Candidate School and was commissioned in 1983. During his 9 years as Adjutant General of the New Mexico National Guard, General Montoya helped train over 9,000 National Guard men and women.

I also want to thank General Montoya for working so well with my staff and me to effectively support the critical missions of the National Guard, our servicemembers, and their families. The New Mexico National Guard has been instrumental in protecting our country and its interests. Under General Montoya's leadership, the New Mexico National Guard has maintained the lowest casualty rate of any State during the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan with one combat casualty out of 9,000 deployments.

General Montoya has also been a tireless advocate for the National Guard Counterdrug Program, which provides critical assistance in securing the border and disrupting drug trafficking activities. The New Mexico National Guard has also proved to be a successful partner in natural disaster response, including numerous wildfires and the extreme cold experienced by parts of the State last year. New Mexico has a long and proud history of military service, and we are honored to have many living testaments to American bravery in our State.

Knowing his dedication to public service, I am sure General Montoya will continue to play an important role in contributing to our country for years to come. Mr. President, please accept my best wishes for General Montoya and his family as he begins the next chapter in his life. I wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.●

COMMENDING UTAH'S ACADEMY NOMINEES

● Mr. LEE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize 10 exemplary Utahns and future officers in the U.S. military. Each of them will begin their education at a military academy this fall.

James Cardinal, graduating from Layton High School, will be attending the Air Force Academy. As an Eagle Scout, he earned his Order of the Arrow, and is an honor student at his school. He was also a captain of his track and field team.

Connor Crandall, graduating from South Summit High school, will be attending the Air Force Academy. He is a class officer and president of the student government. He is also an honor student and a General Sterling Scholar, and a captain of his wrestling team.

Taylor Lanier, graduating from Viewmont High School, will be attending the Air Force Academy. She is an honor student, a member of the Youth City Council, and a Tae Kwon Do black belt. She is also a captain of her swimming team, and was a captain of her lacrosse team.

Brandon Lloyd, a graduate of Highland High School and graduating from the Air Force Academy Prep School, will be attending the Air Force Academy. He is an Eagle Scout, and while attending Highland was honored with its Warner Award. He also was a captain of his wrestling team, of which he was named Wrestler of the Year.

Bryce Magera, graduating from Hillcrest High School, will be attending West Point. He is an Eagle Scout and an honor student. He is also vice president of his Future Soldiers of America Club, and is trained in several types of mixed martial arts.

Mormon Redd, graduating from Viewmont High School, will be attending the Air Force Academy. He is an honor student and a patrol leader in his scout troop. He was also a captain of his wrestling team last year, and he volunteers for the Youthlinc humanitarian program.

Blair Roberts, graduating from Bingham High School, will be attending the Merchant Marine Academy. He is a captain of his swim team and a certified lifeguard. He has been named the KJZZ Prep Student Athlete of the Week, and helps children with cancer as a summer camp volunteer.

Zachary Santella, graduating from Davis High School, will be attending the Naval Academy. He is an honor student, captain of his swimming team, and was named Most Valuable Swimmer and hardest worker by the team.

Collin Shurtleff, a graduate of Parowan High School and graduate of Marion Military Institute, will be attending West Point. He is an Eagle Scout, an honor student, and president in his school's student government. He is also a captain of both his football team and his wrestling team.

Amy Slaughter, a graduate of Weber High School and the Marion Military Institute, will be attending West Point. In high school, she was president in her student government. She was also a captain of her volleyball team and a captain of her track team, and was named an Academic All-State Athlete in track.

One of my greatest honors as a U.S. Senator has been to get to know and nominate each of these young men and women. I know that our Nation's future is bright in the hands of these exemplary individuals who have distinguished themselves amongst their peers.●

TRIBUTE TO J. DAVID COX

● Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment today to recognize National Secretary-Treasurer of the American Federation of Government Employees AFGE, J. David Cox, the recipient of the 2012 Yitzhak Rabin Public Service Award.

This award is given out by the American Friends of the Yitzhak Rabin Center each year to individuals who reflect Prime Minister Rabin's legacy of peace, leadership, and public service. Having come to know and appreciate J. David's accomplishments, I feel that he is more than a fitting recipient of this honor.

Over the course of his decades-long involvement with AFGE and AFL–CIO, J. David has worked tirelessly to ensure that Federal employees here in Washington, D.C. and across the nation enjoy the dignity, fair pay, and safe working environment that they deserve. Based upon the number of leadership positions he has been elected to by his fellow Federal workers, it is clear that they approve of his efforts. In the past, he has served as Executive Vice-President of the AFGE National Veterans Affairs Council, President of AFGE Local 1738 in North Carolina, and Co-Chair of the Department of Veterans' Affairs National Partnership Council. In addition to his role as National Secretary-Treasurer, he currently is vice co-chair of the AFL–CIO's Union Veterans Council, vice-president of North Carolina State AFL–CIO, and was appointed by President Obama to serve on the Federal Salary Council and the Federal Prevailing wage council.

J. David got his start in the Federal workforce in 1983 as a registered nurse within the Department of Veterans Affairs. He served our nation's veterans for 23 years before moving on to AFGE in 2006. As Chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I have come to value J. David as an important advocate for veterans as well as VA's Federal workforce. J. David has testified before us several times over recent years and has established himself as a key asset to the Committee. Throughout his testimony, J. David has always sought to make sure that the doctors, nurses, and other health professionals at VA have the resources they need to provide the best possible care to our veterans. In particular, his vocal support for assured funding and VA budget reform help to lead to the current 2-year appropriations process that VA uses today.

I am grateful for J. David's work and applaud the American Friends of the Yitzhak Rabin Center for selecting him as one of this year's award recipients. I offer my sincerest congratulations to J. David and hope that he continues to fight for Federal employees and veterans into the future.●

TRIBUTE TO ALYSSA HANISCH

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Alyssa Hanisch, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several months.

Alyssa is a graduate of O'Gorman High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, she is attending the University of South Dakota, where she is studying political science and finance. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Alyssa for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO CODY HORTON

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Cody Horton, an intern in my Sioux Falls, SD, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several months.

Cody is a graduate of Mitchell High School in Mitchell, SD. Currently, he is attending the University of South Dakota, where he is majoring in political science and history. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Cody for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO RACHEL SCHMIDT

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Rachel Schmidt, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several months.

Rachel is a graduate of Marion High School, in Marion, SD. Currently, she is attending the University of South Dakota, where she is studying prelaw. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Rachel for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13338 OF MAY 11, 2004, WITH RESPECT TO THE BLOCKING OF PROPERTY OF CERTAIN PERSONS AND PROHIBITION OF EXPORTATION AND RE-EXPORTATION OF CERTAIN GOODS TO SYRIA—PM 47

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency, unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions of the Government of Syria declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004, as modified in scope and relied upon for additional steps taken in Executive Order 13399 of April 25, 2006, Executive Order 13460 of February 13, 2008, Executive Order 13572 of April 29, 2011, Executive Order 13573 of May 18, 2011, Executive Order 13582 of August 17, 2011, Executive Order 13606 of April 22, 2012, and Executive Order 13608 of May 1, 2012, is to continue in effect beyond May 11, 2012.

While the Syrian regime has reduced the number of foreign fighters bound for Iraq, the regime's own brutality and repression of its citizens who have been calling for freedom and a representative government endangers not only the Syrian people themselves, but could yield greater instability throughout the region. The Syrian regime's actions and policies, including obstructing the Lebanese government's ability to function effectively, pursuing chemical and biological weapons, and supporting terrorist organizations, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect the national emergency declared with respect to this threat and to maintain in force the sanctions to address this national emergency.

In addition, the United States condemns the Asad regime's use of brutal violence and human rights abuses and calls on the Asad regime to step aside and immediately begin a transition in Syria to a political process that will forge a credible path to a future of greater freedom, democracy, opportunity, and justice. The United States will consider changes in the composition, policies, and actions of the Government of Syria in determining whether to continue or terminate this national emergency in the future.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 9, 2012.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:32 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 1302. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property in Tracy, California, to the City of Tracy.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUYE).

At 6:08 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2072. An act to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2072. An act to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–6004. A communication from the Administrator, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Community Facility Loans'' (RIN0575–AC78) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6005. A communication from the Associate General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, (3) three reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Agriculture received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6006. A communication from the Director, Office of Procurement and Property Management, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Guidelines for the Transfer of Excess Computers or Other Technical Equipment Pursuant to Section 14220 of the 2008 Farm Bill'' (RIN0599–AA13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6007. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''1-Naphthaleneacetic acid; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9346–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6008. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Ametoctradin; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9339–7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6009. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''a-(p-Nonylphenol)-w-hydroxypoly(oxyethylene) Sulfate and Phosphate Esters; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9340–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6010. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''a-[p-(1,1,3,3-Tetramethylbutyl)phenyl]-u-hydroxypoly(oxyethylene); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9340–1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6011. 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: Order of Application for Modifications'' ((RIN0750–AH56) (DFARS Case 2012–D002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6012. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of two (2) officers authorized to wear the insignia of

the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6013. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of five (5) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general and brigadier general, as indicated, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6014. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a quarterly report entitled, ''Acceptance of Contributions for Defense Programs, Projects, and Activities; Defense Cooperation Account''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6015. A communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Program Acquisition Unit Cost and the AIM–9X program exceeding the Acquisition Program Baseline values; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6016. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting legislative proposals and accompanying reports relative to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6017. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting a legislative proposal entitled ''Leadership, Education, Accountability and Discipline on Sexual Assault Prevention Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6018. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting legislative proposals and accompanying reports relative to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6019. A communication from the Member of the U.S. House of Representatives for the 10th District of Virginia, transmitting, a letter sent to the Secretary of Defense relative to the establishment of an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6020. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order to take additional steps with respect to the national emergency originally declared on March 15, 1995 in Executive Order 12957 with respect to Iran; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6021. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility'' ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA–2012–0003)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6022. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''State Community Development Block Grant Program: Administrative Rule Changes'' (RIN2506–AC22) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6023. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of a national emergency declared in Executive Order 13222 with respect to the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6024. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13413 with respect to blocking the property of persons contributing to the conflict taking place in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6025. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency relative to the actions and policies of the Government of Sudan as declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6026. A communication from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to material violations or suspected material violations of regulations relating to Treasury auctions and other Treasury securities offerings for the period of January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6027. A communication from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report for the period of January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011 relative to any exceptions granted by the Secretary of the Treasury to the prohibition against favored treatment of a government securities broker or government securities dealer; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6028. A communication from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report for the period of January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011 relative to significant modifications to the auction process for issuing United States Treasury obligations; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 3032. A bill to extend temporary suspension of duty on 1,1,2-2-tetrafluoroethene, oxidized, polymerized; to the Committee on Finance

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 3033. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on ethene, tetrafluoro, oxidized, polymerized reduced, methyl esters, reduced; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 3034. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Linuron; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 3035. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Terbacil; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 3036. A bill to extend and modify the temporary reduction of duty on certain men's footwear, not covering the ankle, designed to be worn in lieu of, but not over, other footwear as a protection against water, oil, grease, or chemicals or cold or inclement weather; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 3037. A bill to extend and modify the temporary reduction of duty on certain men's footwear, covering the ankle, designed to be worn in lieu of, but not over, other footwear as a protection against water, oil, grease, or chemicals or cold or inclement weather; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 3038. A bill to extend and modify the temporary suspension of duty on certain men's footwear, not covering the ankle, designed to be worn in lieu of, but not over, other footwear as a protection against water, oil, grease, or chemicals or cold or inclement weather; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 3039. A bill to extend and modify the temporary suspension of duty on certain men's footwear, covering the ankle, designed to be worn in lieu of, but not over, other footwear as a protection against water, oil, grease, or chemicals or cold or inclement weather; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 3040. A bill to extend and modify the temporary reduction of duty on certain women's footwear designed to be worn in lieu of, but not over, other footwear as a protection against water, oil, grease, or chemicals or cold or inclement weather; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 3041. A bill to extend and modify the temporary reduction of duty on certain men's footwear designed to be worn in lieu of, but not over, other footwear as a protection against water, oil, grease, or chemicals or cold or inclement weather; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 3042. A bill to extend and modify the temporary reduction of duty on certain men's footwear whose height from the bottom of the outer sole to the top of the upper does not exceed 8 inches and designed to be worn in lieu of, but not over, other footwear as a protection against water, oil, grease, or chemicals or cold or inclement weather; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 3043. A bill to extend and modify the temporary reduction of duty on certain women's footwear, covering the ankle, whose height from the bottom of the outer sole to the top of the upper does not exceed 8 inches, designed to be worn in lieu of, but not over, other footwear as a protection against water, oil, grease, or chemicals or cold or inclement weather; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 3044. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain suspension system stablilizer bars; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 3045. A bill to extend and modify the temporary suspension of duty on certain cases or containers to be used for electronic drawing toys, electronic games, or educational toys or devices; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 3046. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain injection-molded ABS or PP cases or containers to be used for electronic drawing toys or electronic games; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 3047. A bill to encourage responsible homeowners to refinance mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 3048. A bill to provide for a safe, accountable, fair, and efficient banking system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 3049. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to expand the definition of homeless veteran for purposes of benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 3050. A bill to extend the National Flood Insurance Program until June 30, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 3051. A bill to extend the National Flood Insurance Program until July 31, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

S. 3052. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide veterans, when such veterans electronically file claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary, with notice that relevant services may be available to the veterans from veterans service organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 3053. A bill to require Regional Administrators of the Environmental Protection Agency to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. PRYOR, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 3054. A bill to provide strategic workload to Army arsenals in their function as a critical component of the organic defense industrial base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3055. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain leathered footwear for women; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3056. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain leathered footwear for men; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3057. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain leathered footwear for women; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3058. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain leathered footwear for men; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3059. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on boys' knitted or crocheted shirts of man-made fibers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3060. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on girls' knitted or crocheted trousers and breeches of synthetic fibers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3061. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on women's sports bras of stretch fabric with textile or polymer-based electrodes knit into or attached to the fabric and that incorporate connectors designed to secure an electronic transmitter that transmits physiological information from the electrodes to a compatible monitor; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3062. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on knit tank tops of stretch fabric with textile or polymer-based electrodes knit into or attached to the fabric and that incorporate connectors designed to secure an electronic transmitter that transmits physiological information from the electrodes to a compatible monitor; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3063. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on knit garments of stretch fabric with textile or polymer-based electrodes knit into or attached to the fabric and that incorporate connectors designed to secure an electronic transmitter that transmits physiological information from the electrodes to a compatible monitor; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3064. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on girls' knitted or crocheted shorts of synthetic fibers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3065. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on certain sports footwear for men with outer soles of rubber or plastics and uppers of textile materials; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3066. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain sports footwear with cleats valued at $10/pair or more but not over $13/pair; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3067. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain sports footwear with cleats valued at $6.50/pair or more but not over $10/pair; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3068. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain footwear with open toes or open heels or of the slip-on type; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3069. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on certain sports footwear valued over $6.50 but not over $12/pair; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3070. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on mixtures comprising titanium dioxide and decyl(trimethoxy)silane; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3071. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on manganese ferrite carrier covered with acrylic resin; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3072. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on mixtures comprising poly(methyl methacrylate) and zinc acetate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3073. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to clarify the classification of recreational performance outerwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 3074. A bill to prohibit employers from compelling or coercing any person to authorize access to a protected computer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3075. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on mixtures comprising titanium dioxide, silica, and decyl(trimethoxy)silane; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. Res. 448. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERRY:

S. Res. 449. A resolution calling on all governments to assist in the safe return of children abducted from or wrongfully retained outside the country of their habitual residence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. KERRY, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. BURR, and Mr. INOUYE):

S. Res. 450. A resolution designating May 15, 2012, as ''National MPS Awareness Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. KIRK, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HELLER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. WARNER):

S. Res. 451. A resolution recognizing the goals of National Travel and Tourism Week and honoring the valuable contributions of travel and tourism to the United States of America; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. Res. 452. A resolution designating July 13, 2012, as ''Collector Car Appreciation Day'' and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 491

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of the Armed Forces of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law, and for other purposes.

S. 705

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 705, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 752

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 752, a bill to establish a comprehensive interagency response to reduce lung cancer mortality in a timely manner.

S. 755

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 755, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an offset

against income tax refunds to pay for restitution and other State judicial debts that are past-due.

S. 941

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 941, a bill to strengthen families' engagement in the education of their children.

S. 974

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 974, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the tip tax credit to employers of cosmetologists and to promote tax compliance in the cosmetology sector.

S. 1368

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1368, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal distributions for medicine qualified only if for prescribed drug or insulin.

S. 1460

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1460, a bill to grant the congressional gold medal, collectively, to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

S. 1591

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1591, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Raoul Wallenberg, in recognition of his achievements and heroic actions during the Holocaust.

S. 1882

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1882, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure that valid generic drugs may enter the market.

S. 1929

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1929, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Mark Twain.

S. 1935

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) 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. 1989

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1989, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the minimum low-income housing tax credit rate for unsubsidized buildings and to provide a minimum 4 percent credit rate for existing buildings.

S. 2125

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2125, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify the designation of accreditation organizations for orthotics and prosthetics, to apply accreditation and licensure requirements to suppliers of such devices and items for purposes of payment under the Medicare program, and to modify the payment rules for such devices and items under such program to account for practitioner qualifications and complexity of care.

S. 2160

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2160, a bill to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2175

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2175, a bill to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 to provide for the trial of covered persons detained in the United States pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force and to repeal the requirement for military custody.

S. 2205

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2205, a bill to prohibit funding to negotiate a United Nations Arms Trade Treaty that restricts the Second Amendment rights of United States citizens.

S. 2237

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2237, a bill to provide a temporary income tax credit for increased payroll and extend bonus depreciation for an additional year, and for other purposes.

S. 2320

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2320, a bill to direct the American Battle Monuments Commission to provide for the ongoing maintenance of Clark Veterans Cemetery in the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

S. 2365

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2365, a bill to promote the economic and energy security of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2366

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2366, a bill to extend student loan interest rates for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans.

S. 2554

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2554, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2017.

S. 2884

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2884, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

S. CON. RES. 42

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 42, 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.

S. RES. 401

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 401, a resolution expressing appreciation for Foreign Service and Civil Service professionals who represent the United States around the globe.

S. RES. 435

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 435, a resolution calling for democratic change in Syria, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 3047. A bill to encourage responsible homeowners to refinance mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Expanding Refinancing Opportunities Act of 2012.

This bill will allow homeowners who are struggling to stay in their homes to refinance their loans at today's historically low mortgage rates.

The administration's current refinancing programs are designed to help homeowners whose loans are guaranteed by Federal housing agencies. The problem is, those programs do nothing to help homeowners whose loans are owned by banks and mortgage trusts.

This bill would create a fund in the Federal Housing Administration that would allow underwater homeowners whose loans are not guaranteed by the GSEs or FHA to refinance into today's low mortgage rates. The FHA would be able to insure these loans, greatly reducing the interest rates charged by lenders.

Currently, these homeowners are completely locked out of refinancing and are not being served by the private markets.

A homeowner paying 7 percent interest on their mortgage could reduce their interest rate by 2.5 percent or more through this program.

The average American homeowner could save up to three thousand dollars a year in lower interest payments.

The Expanding Refinancing Opportunities Act of 2012 is modeled after a proposal President Obama outlined in his State of the Union address in February.

Eligibility requirements for this new program are very straightforward.

Homeowners must be current on their mortgage. They must meet a minimum credit score. Their loan must be under the FHA conforming loan limit. They must be living in a single-family, owner-occupied home that is their principal residence.

Additionally, the program requires that loans not be higher than 140 percent of a home's value. Housing data shows that homeowners with loan-to-value ratios under 140 percent are significantly less likely to default than those with higher ratios.

An added benefit of the 140 percent loan-to-value limit is that it could encourage lenders to write down the principal amount owed on the mortgage to allow homeowners to qualify for participation. This would be tremendously helpful for homeowners whose home values have fallen dramatically after the collapse of the housing bubble.

Some will criticize this proposal, suggesting the government must get out of the housing market for it to recover.

I believe the government can play a vital role in making sure that home values don't continue their steep declines. Robert Shiller, the noted housing bear and respected housing economist who publishes the closely watched Case-Shiller housing index, believes that home prices have reached normal levels.

To those who would oppose this bill, I ask: how much further would you have home values decline?

While many economic indicators are increasing, falling home prices and foreclosures continue to burden the economy. Here is a quick inventory of the state of America's homeowners:

Case-Shiller found home prices in February rising for the first time in 10 months, although that gain was a nominal 0.2 percent.

Nationally, more than 11 million homeowners, or 23 percent, are upside down on their mortgage, meaning they owe more than the value of their home. Almost 30 percent of homes in California are underwater.

Median home prices are at levels not seen since the late 1990s, with the gains in the intervening years completely wiped out. Home values on average have dropped by more than 30%, with $7 trillion in household wealth lost.

And Core Logic found that home prices increased 0.6 percent last month, but are still down 0.6 percent from a year ago.

Many housing economists believe the market is at its bottom, but that doesn't mean we are out of the woods. Further increases in foreclosures would undoubtedly put further downward pressure on home prices, which could further threaten underwater homeowners and feed into a vicious negative cycle.

This is also a matter of fairness.

When homeowners take on a mortgage, they have no control over whether their bank will slice-and-dice that loan, selling it to third-party investors. If that happens, chances of refinancing into lower interest rates plummet.

I have worked closely with the administration to make sure this added responsibility does not increase the financial risk to the FHA.

The Expanding Refinancing Opportunities Act would create a new insurance fund at the FHA, totally separate from the existing mortgage insurance fund that is currently under-capitalized.

The new fund would receive its own appropriation and would be audited separately from the existing mortgage insurance fund. Furthermore, I have worked to put safeguards in place to reduce FHA's risk. Most notably, homeowners must be current on their mortgages in order to participate.

Finally, the cost of the new program would be completely offset by a 0.1 percent increase in guarantee fees for loans backed by Fannie and Freddie in 2022.

The benefits of this proposal are clear: Refinancing into lower interest rates could save the average homeowner upwards of $3,000 a year.

Recent statistics show that the expanded refinancing program the administration announced in November is seeing tangible results. According to the Mortgage Bankers Association, refinance applications have jumped by as much as 70 percent in some of the hardest-hit States.

Clearly, efforts to expand refinancing opportunities are working. Similar benefits should be afforded to those homeowners whose loans—through no fault of their own—are not insured by the Federal Government.

Beyond providing relief to American families, savings on mortgage payments would have a broader benefit for the economy.

Since the beginning of the financial crisis, the Federal Reserve has maintained an extremely low interest rate policy to encourage the availability of affordable credit.

There is no question that these measures have had an effect.

The stock market is climbing again after falling off a cliff in late 2008.

Mortgage rates have fallen to near-historic lows, recently dipping below 4 percent.

Consumers are spending less of their income paying down debt, from a high of 9.1 percent in 2007 to 5.8 percent today.

As a result, consumers are saving more and spending more on purchases that have been put off for years. This is a boost to the economy. For proof, look no further than the rebound in vehicle sales that has fueled the resurgence of American auto manufacturers.

However, there is also no doubt that the effects of the Fed's low interest rate policies have been dampened by problems in the housing market. The Fed has noted that home foreclosures are one of the biggest drags on the economic recovery.

Allowing all homeowners to lower their mortgage payments through refinancing is one way to help stop this downward spiral.

We cannot have a robust economic recovery while the housing market languishes. Just as a dilapidated foreclosure erodes the value of every home on the block, a sputtering housing market affects all aspects of the economy.

The sooner we reverse declines in the housing market, the sooner we can foster a robust economic recovery. We owe that to every American, and I encourage my colleagues to support The Expanding Refinancing Opportunities Act of 2012.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 3049. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to expand the definition of homeless veteran for purposes of benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, today I rise with my colleague from Arkansas, Senator BOOZMAN, to introduce a bill that will help veterans who have been forced out of their homes because of domestic violence. This bill will expand the definition of homeless veteran to include domestic violence.

Due to an oversight in the law, the legal definition of ''homeless veterans'' differs significantly from the existing definition of homelessness. Existing law recognizes individuals who have

been forced from their homes by domestic violence as ''homeless'' but for the purposes of special ''homeless veteran'' benefits, this situation is overlooked. The small wording change in our bill will allow those veterans who are in a domestic violence situation access to the same benefits available to other homeless veterans. In order to qualify for benefits offered to homeless veterans through the Department of Veterans Affairs, must meet the definition of homeless in the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. That is all we are changing.

One out of four women will experience domestic violence sometime in her lifetime, including veterans who have served honorably for this country. They should qualify for the benefits they deserve and need to protect them.

This bill simply updates the legal definition of ''homeless veteran'' to bring it to the same standard as the rest of the law—correcting a grievous oversight that could deny those who served our country the support and benefits they earned a thousand times over with their patriotism and courage.

In closing, it is an honor for me to serve as a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee. I feel very privileged to work on behalf of our veterans. I appreciate the work of my distinguished colleagues on the committee and ask them and all senators to join me in supporting this small but very important expanded definition of homeless veterans.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 3053. A bill to require Regional Administrators of the Environmental Protection Agency to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, in an attempt to refresh our memory on what happened with the overreach of the EPA, we might remember that it was from this podium, I guess, 2 weeks ago—it was on a Friday that we found out and we had access to a tape that we released to the public. It has been on the TV and everyone has seen it now. It is a tape of the region 6 administrator of the EPA, Mr. Armendariz. At that time, when talking to the regulators who were under his jurisdiction and along with the public at a public meeting that was taking place in Texas, he said:

> But as I said, oil and gas is an enforcement priority. . . . I was in a meeting once and I gave an analogy to my staff about my philosophy of enforcement, and I think it was probably a little crude and maybe not appropriate for the meeting but I'll go ahead and tell you what I said. It was kind of like how the Romans used to conquer little villages in the Mediterranean. They'd go into a little Turkish town somewhere, they'd find the first five guys they saw and they would crucify them.

And let them die on a cross. Everyone would look at that. Then he said:

> And then you know that town was really easy to manage for the next few years. . . . So, that's our general philosophy.

This is the EPA we are talking about, and this is 1 of 10 of the regulators. This happens to be the region 6 administrator. This regional administrator recently resigned when not only his statement received attention but also following public awareness about the manner in which he initiated the enforcement actions in region 6.

We know about—and I have already mentioned in my previous remarks—the company down in Texas. This company was cited by Armendariz. They are accused of groundwater contamination. They are accused of perhaps misusing hydraulic fracturing. All these were just accusations. But then they sent a letter to them and said we are going to fine you $33,000 a day—$33,000 a day. If we read those letters carefully, we will find out that decision isn't already made, it is not going to start, but to the person who is reading the letter, who receives the letter, they will think, I can stay in business for 30 more days and that is it.

One has to ask the question: How many companies are out there that have received a letter such as this from the EPA and assumed they are going to have to start paying this fine, so they folded up their tent and they quit? This is what they want. They want to put people out of business.

I told the story from this podium about a company in my State of Oklahoma. This was back probably 10 years ago. I received a letter—we had a lumber company in Oklahoma and the president of the lumber company said: I don't know what to do. The EPA has just put us out of business.

I said: What did you do wrong?

He said: I don't think I did anything wrong. He said: I have been selling our used crankcase oil to the same licensed operation for the last 10 years and some of that—this contractor was licensed by the State of Oklahoma and the Federal Government in the County of Tulsa. He said: We have been selling it to the same group, this organization, for 10 years. He said: Some of that has been traced to a site where they have said this came from our used crankcase oil, and they said for that reason you have violated the law and we are going to fine you $5,000 a day.

Now, $5,000 a day, this is to a relatively middle-sized lumber company, Mill Creek Lumber, it is called—and they are still in business today—and that would have put them out of business. I said: Send the letter to me and let me read it. I read it and I told him they are just threatening you and trying to run you out of business.

We have to wonder as to how many companies out there are closed now or out of business because of actions such as this. How many of these companies received a letter such as the operation did down in Texas saying we are going to impose $33,000 a day and, finally, they just fold up their tent and quit? We don't know that. There is no way of knowing. We have invited people from this podium to call and we have received calls from people who have been out of business. This is an intentional effort we are dealing with and have been dealing with for quite some time.

So we introduced today, just a few minutes ago, S. 3053. I have a whole bunch of cosponsors—it looks like about 20 cosponsors—on the bill. What we do is a very simple thing. I have found in my experience in both the House and the Senate that the shorter and simpler we make something, the easier it is to understand. This is a little, small, two-page bill, and all it does is say that anyone who is going to be appointed—or nominated, I should say—as a regional administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency would have to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. We have a list in our laws as to what has to have Senate confirmation. The Administrator of the EPA has to—and she went through that process and that person is Lisa Jackson—but not these 10 regional directors. So we are saying they should be subjected to the same advice and consent of this Senate, and we wouldn't have these kinds of problems. I suspect the Administrator of the EPA did not know what was going on in region 6 with Mr. Armendariz. I will give her the benefit of the doubt that she didn't. In fact, she was very critical of him once we stood here and exposed what was going on.

This will solve the problem. I am going to invite people to join in. We have already introduced it. It is S. 3053. It is one that would force the administrators to be subjected to confirmation by this Senate. Keep in mind that these administrators, these regional administrators, have the power of life and death over many companies in America.

I believe this will solve that problem, and I look forward to passing this bill and having it become law.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. PRYOR, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 3054. A bill to provide strategic workload to Army arsenals in their function as a critical component of the organic defense industrial base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3054

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 ''Army Arsenal Strategic Workload Enhancement Act of 2012''.

SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE USE OF ARSENALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 143 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2425. Department of Defense use of arsenals

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop and promulgate measurable and enforceable guidelines for the Department of Defense, defense agencies, and the military services to have supplies, components, end items, parts, assemblies, and sub-assemblies made in factories or arsenals owned by the United States, to the extent those factories or arsenals can make those supplies, components, end items, parts, assemblies, and sub-assemblies on an economical basis while preserving the ability to provide an effective and timely response to mobilizations, national defense contingency situations, and other emergency requirements.

''(b) DETERMINATION OF ECONOMICAL BASIS.—For purposes of determining whether supplies, components, end items, parts, assemblies, and sub-assemblies can be made on an 'economical basis' under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall analyze the direct costs associated with the manufacture of such supplies, components, end items, parts, assemblies, and sub-assemblies. If an analysis is not performed, the Secretary of Defense or the relevant defense agency or military service shall promptly report to the congressional defense committees the justification for not performing an analysis.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2425. Department of Defense use of arsenals.''.

SEC. 3. ASSIGNMENT OF WORKLOAD AT ARMY FACTORIES AND ARSENALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4532 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 4532. Assignment of workload at Army factories and arsenals

''(a) ASSIGNMENT OF WORKLOAD.—(1) The Secretary of the Army shall assign Government-owned and Government-operated Department of the Army factories and arsenals sufficient workload to ensure cost efficiency and technical competence in peacetime, while preserving the ability to provide an effective and timely response to mobilizations, national defense contingency situations, and other emergency requirements.

''(2) At a minimum, workload may be derived from manufacturing of supplies, components, parts, systems, subsystems, and foreign military sales.

''(3) The Secretary of the Army shall develop and promulgate guidelines to make the arsenals available to the Department of Defense, defense agencies, and military services for procurement of supplies, components, parts, systems, and subsystems.

''(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary of the Army may waive the requirement under subsection (a)(1) if such a waiver is necessary for the national defense.

''(2) A waiver under paragraph (1) shall not take effect until 30 days after the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a notification of the determination, together with the justification for the determination.

''(3) The authority to grant a waiver under paragraph (1) may not be delegated.

''(c) ANNUAL ARSENAL REPORT.—In 2013 and each year thereafter, not later than 60 days after the date on which the budget of the President for a fiscal year is submitted to Congress, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report for the Army identifying, for the relevant fiscal year, each of the following:

''(1) The core arsenal manufacturing capability.

''(2) The workload required to cost-effectively support the arsenals and the manufacturing capability inherent in these installations.

''(3) The Secretary of the Army's performance in maintaining the Department of the Army's factories and arsenals with sufficient workload to ensure affordability and technical competence in peacetime.

''(4) The capital investments required to be made in order to ensure compliance and operational capacity.

''(d) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.—The Comptroller General shall review each report required under subsection (c) for completeness and compliance and provide findings and recommendations to the congressional defense committees not later than 60 days after the report is submitted to Congress.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 433 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 4532 and inserting the following new item:

''4532. Assignment of workload at Army factories and arsenals.''.

(c) INITIAL WORKLOAD PLAN REPORT.—The first report required under subsection (c) of section 4532 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a), shall be submitted not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 448—RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF HADASSAH, THE WOMEN'S ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA, INC.

Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 448

Whereas Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc. (referred to in this preamble as ''Hadassah'') was established by Henrietta Szold on February 24, 1912;

Whereas Hadassah is now the largest Zionist organization for Jewish women, with more than 300,000 active members;

Whereas Hadassah celebrated the 100th anniversary of its founding on February 24, 2012;

Whereas, since its founding, Hadassah has consistently promoted the unity of the Jewish people and worked for the betterment of communities in the United States and what is now present-day Israel;

Whereas Hadassah was nominated for the 2005 Nobel Peace Prize for its ongoing initiatives to use medicine as a bridge to peace;

Whereas Hadassah conducts a wide variety of training programs for medical personnel and students throughout the world;

Whereas, in Israel, Hadassah initiates and supports pace-setting health care, education, and youth institutions;

Whereas the world-class Hadassah Medical Organization in Israel is renowned for cutting-edge medical research;

Whereas the Hadassah Medical Organization is constructing the Sarah Wetsman Davidson Hospital Tower at Hadassah Medical Center as a gift to Israel, to be officially dedicated at the Hadassah Centennial Convention in October 2012;

Whereas, in the United States, Hadassah—

(1) enhances the quality of American and Jewish life through education and Zionist youth programs;

(2) promotes health awareness; and

(3) provides personal enrichment and growth for members; and

Whereas Hadassah helps support young people by providing scholarships for students and educating disadvantaged children: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc. on its 100th anniversary; and

(2) recognizes the important contributions that Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc. has made to medical research and care, the health of communities, the relationship between the United States and Israel, and the continuity of Jewish heritage.

SENATE RESOLUTION 449—CALLING ON ALL GOVERNMENTS TO ASSIST IN THE SAFE RETURN OF CHILDREN ABDUCTED FROM OR WRONGFULLY RETAINED OUTSIDE THE COUNTRY OF THEIR HABITUAL RESIDENCE

Mr. KERRY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 449

Whereas children should be protected internationally from the harmful effects of their wrongful removal or retention;

Whereas people and governments around the world value the importance of family and respect the rights of custody and access of other countries;

Whereas governments should take all possible measures to determine the location of abducted children;

Whereas Colin Bower's two young sons, Noor and Ramsay Bower, were illegally abducted from the United States by their mother in August 2009 and taken to Egypt; and

Whereas the United States and 68 other countries that are partners to the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, done at the Hague October 25, 1980, have agreed, and encourage all other countries to concur, that the appropriate court for determining the best interests of children in custody matters is the court in the country of their habitual residence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate calls on officials of all governments and the competent courts to assist in the safe return of all abducted and wrongfully retained children to the state of their habitual residence, including the return of Noor and Ramsay Bower to the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 450—DESIGNATING MAY 15, 2012, AS ''NATIONAL MPS AWARENESS DAY''

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. KERRY, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. BURR, and Mr. INOUYE) submitted the

following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 450

Whereas mucopolysaccharidosis (referred to in this resolution as ''MPS'') are a group of genetically determined lysosomal storage diseases that render the human body incapable of producing certain enzymes needed to break down complex carbohydrates;

Whereas MPS diseases cause complex carbohydrates to be stored in almost every cell in the body and progressively cause cellular damage;

Whereas the cellular damage caused by MPS—

(1) adversely affects the human body by damaging the heart, respiratory system, bones, internal organs, and central nervous system; and

(2) often results in intellectual disabilities, short stature, corneal damage, joint stiffness, loss of mobility, speech and hearing impairment, heart disease, hyperactivity, chronic respiratory problems, and, most importantly, a drastically shortened life span;

Whereas symptoms of MPS are usually not apparent at birth;

Whereas, without treatment, the life expectancy of an individual afflicted with MPS begins to decrease at a very early stage in the life of the individual;

Whereas research has resulted in the development of limited treatments for some MPS diseases;

Whereas promising advancements in the pursuit of treatments for additional MPS diseases are underway as of the date of agreement to this resolution;

Whereas, despite the creation of new remedies, the blood-brain barrier continues to be a significant impediment to effectively treating the brain, which prevents the treatment of many of the symptoms of MPS;

Whereas the quality of life of the individuals afflicted with MPS, and the treatments available to those individuals, will be enhanced through the development of early detection techniques and early intervention;

Whereas treatments and research advancements for MPS are limited by a lack of awareness about MPS diseases;

Whereas the lack of awareness about MPS diseases extends to individuals within the medical community;

Whereas the cellular damage that is caused by MPS makes MPS a model for the study of many other degenerative genetic diseases; and

Whereas the development of effective therapies and a potential cure for MPS diseases can be accomplished by increased awareness, research, data collection, and information distribution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 15, 2012, as ''National MPS Awareness Day''; and

(2) supports the goals and ideals of ''National MPS Awareness Day''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 451—RECOGNIZING THE GOALS OF NATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM WEEK AND HONORING THE VALUABLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF TRAVEL AND TOURISM TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. KIRK, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HELLER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. WARNER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 451

Whereas National Travel and Tourism Week was established in 1983 when Congress passed the Joint Resolution entitled ''Joint Resolution to designate the week beginning May 27, 1984, as 'National Tourism Week' '', approved November 29, 1983 (Public Law 98–178; 97 Stat. 1126), which recognized the value of travel and tourism;

Whereas National Travel and Tourism Week is celebrated across the United States from May 5 through 13, 2012;

Whereas more than 120 travel destinations throughout the United States are holding events in honor of National Travel and Tourism Week;

Whereas the travel and tourism industry supports more than 14,000,000 jobs in the United States;

Whereas the travel and tourism industry employs individuals in all 50 States and all the territories of the United States;

Whereas international travel to the United States is the single largest export industry in the country;

Whereas the travel and tourism industry, Congress, and the executive branch have worked to streamline the visa process and make the United States welcoming to visitors from other countries;

Whereas travel and tourism provide significant economic benefits to the United States by generating nearly $2,000,000,000,000 in annual economic output;

Whereas leisure travel allows individuals to experience the rich cultural heritage and educational opportunities of the United States and its communities; and

Whereas, the immense value of travel and tourism cannot be overstated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes May 5 through 13, 2012, as National Travel and Tourism Week;

(2) commends the travel and tourism industry for its important contributions to the United States of America; and

(3) commends the employees of the travel and tourism industry for their important contributions to the United States of America.

SENATE RESOLUTION 452—DESIGNATING JULY 13, 2012, AS ''COLLECTOR CAR APPRECIATION DAY'' AND RECOGNIZING THAT THE COLLECTION AND RESTORATION OF HISTORIC AND CLASSIC CARS IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF PRESERVING THE TECHNOLOGICAL ACHIEVEMENTS AND CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 452

Whereas many people in the United States maintain classic automobiles as a pastime and do so with great passion and as a means of individual expression;

Whereas the Senate recognizes the effect that the more than 100-year history of the automobile has had on the economic progress of the United States and supports wholeheartedly all activities involved in the restoration and exhibition of classic automobiles;

Whereas the collection, restoration, and preservation of automobiles is an activity shared across generations and across all segments of society;

Whereas thousands of local car clubs and related businesses have been instrumental in preserving a historic part of the heritage of the United States by encouraging the restoration and exhibition of such vintage works of art;

Whereas automotive restoration provides well-paying, high-skilled jobs for people in all 50 States; and

Whereas automobiles have provided the inspiration for music, photography, cinema, fashion, and other artistic pursuits that have become part of the popular culture of the United States: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 13, 2012, as ''Collector Car Appreciation Day'';

(2) recognizes that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to engage in events and commemorations of Collector Car Appreciation Day that create opportunities for collector car owners to educate young people about the importance of preserving the cultural heritage of the United States, including through the collection and restoration of collector cars.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2098. Mr. REID (for Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. WEBB)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2224, to require the President to report to Congress on issues related to Syria.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2098. Mr. REID (for Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. WEBB)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2224, to require the President to report to Congress on issues related to Syria; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORT ON OPPOSITION GROUPS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report describing in detail all the known opposition groups, both independent and state-sponsored, inside and outside of Syria, operating directly or indirectly to oppose the Government of Syria.

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) An assessment of the current military capacity of opposition forces.

(B) An assessment of the ability of opposition forces inside and outside of Syria to establish military and political activities impacting Syria, together with a practicable timetable for accomplishing these objectives.

(C) An assessment of the ability of any of the opposition groups to establish effective military and political control in Syria.

(D) A description of the composition and political agenda of each of the known opposition groups inside and outside of Syria, and an assessment of the degree to which such groups represent the views of the people of Syria as a whole.

(E) A description of the financial resources currently available to opposition groups and known potential sources of continued financing.

(F) An assessment of the relationship between each of the Syrian opposition groups

and the Muslim Brotherhood, al Qaeda, Hezbollah, Hamas, and any other groups that have promoted an agenda that would negatively impact United States national interests.

(G) An assessment of whether active support from the United States to opposition forces would have a positive or negative impact on the factors discussed in subparagraphs (A) through (F).

(b) REPORT ON WEAPONS STOCKPILES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress an assessment of the size and security of conventional and non-conventional weapons stockpiles in Syria.

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A description of who has or may have access to the stockpiles.

(B) A description of the sources and types of weapons flowing from outside Syria to both government and opposition forces.

(C) A detailed plan to prevent the proliferation of conventional, biological, chemical, and other types of weapons in Syria.

(c) REPORT ON CURRENT ACTIVITIES AND FUTURE PLANS TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO SYRIA'S POLITICAL OPPOSITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report on all the support provided to opposition political forces in Syria.

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A full description of the current technical assistance democracy programs conducted by the Department of State and United States Agency for International Development to support the political opposition in Syria.

(B) A full summary of the communications equipment that is currently being provided to the political opposition in Syria, including a description of the entities that have received and that will continue to receive such equipment.

(C) A description of any additional activities the United States plans to undertake in support of the political opposition in Syria.

(D) A description of the funding levels currently dedicated to support the political opposition in Syria.

(d) FORM.—The reports required by this section may be submitted in a classified form, but shall include an unclassified summary.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 9, 2012, at 2:30 p.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, ''The Need for Privacy Protections: Perspectives from the Administration and the Federal Trade Commission.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 9, 2012, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 9, 2012, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Office of the Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 9, 2012, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 9, 2012, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Economic Policy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 9, 2012, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''The National Flood Insurance Program: The Need for Long-Term Reauthorization and Reform.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 9, 2012, at 2 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Is Simpler Better? Limiting Federal Support For Financial Institutions.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 9, 2012, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled; ''Building and Maintaining an Effective Human Resource Workforce in the Federal Government.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Sidd Gejji, a detailee from the Commerce Committee, be granted the privilege of the floor during the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator CARDIN I ask unanimous consent the privilege of the floor be granted to Caroline Goodbody and Amanda Mendoze, two of Senator CARDIN's staff members, during today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that William Carol, a detailee in the Senate HELP Committee Majority Education Office, be granted the privilege of the floor for the duration of debate on S. 2343, the Stop the Student Loan Interest Rate Hike of 2012.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Sarah Watt and Erica Kaldenberg be granted floor privileges for the duration of S. 2343, the Stop Student Loan Interest Rate Hike Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENTIAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate move to calendar No. 385.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2224) to require the President to report to Congress on issues relating to Syria.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Corker-Webb substitute amendment be agreed to, that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to this matter be placed in the RECORD at the appropriate place as if read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2098) was agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2098

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORT ON OPPOSITION GROUPS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report describing in detail all the known opposition groups, both independent and state-sponsored, inside and outside of Syria, operating directly or indirectly to oppose the Government of Syria.

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) An assessment of the current military capacity of opposition forces.

(B) An assessment of the ability of opposition forces inside and outside of Syria to establish military and political activities impacting Syria, together with a practicable timetable for accomplishing these objectives.

(C) An assessment of the ability of any of the opposition groups to establish effective military and political control in Syria.

(D) A description of the composition and political agenda of each of the known opposition groups inside and outside of Syria, and an assessment of the degree to which such groups represent the views of the people of Syria as a whole.

(E) A description of the financial resources currently available to opposition groups and known potential sources of continued financing.

(F) An assessment of the relationship between each of the Syrian opposition groups and the Muslim Brotherhood, al Qaeda, Hezbollah, Hamas, and any other groups that have promoted an agenda that would negatively impact United States national interests.

(G) An assessment of whether active support from the United States to opposition forces would have a positive or negative impact on the factors discussed in subparagraphs (A) through (F).

(b) REPORT ON WEAPONS STOCKPILES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress an assessment of the size and security of conventional and non-conventional weapons stockpiles in Syria.

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A description of who has or may have access to the stockpiles.

(B) A description of the sources and types of weapons flowing from outside Syria to both government and opposition forces.

(C) A detailed plan to prevent the proliferation of conventional, biological, chemical, and other types of weapons in Syria.

(c) REPORT ON CURRENT ACTIVITIES AND FUTURE PLANS TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO SYRIA'S POLITICAL OPPOSITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report on all the support provided to opposition political forces in Syria.

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A full description of the current technical assistance democracy programs conducted by the Department of State and United States Agency for International Development to support the political opposition in Syria.

(B) A full summary of the communications equipment that is currently being provided to the political opposition in Syria, including a description of the entities that have received and that will continue to receive such equipment.

(C) A description of any additional activities the United States plans to undertake in support of the political opposition in Syria.

(D) A description of the funding levels currently dedicated to support the political opposition in Syria.

(d) FORM.—The reports required by this section may be submitted in a classified form, but shall include an unclassified summary.

The bill (S. 2224), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR AN EVENT TO CELEBRATE THE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA

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

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

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed en bloc to the consideration of some concurrent resolutions: Resolutions numbered H. Con. Res. 105, H. Con. Res. 106, H. Con. Res. 117, and H. Con. Res. 118.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolutions en bloc.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolutions be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid on the table en bloc, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolutions (H. Con. Res. 105, H. Con. Res. 106, H. Con. Res. 117, and H. Con. Res. 118) were agreed to.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. REID. I now ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 450, S. Res. 451, and S. Res. 452, which were submitted earlier today.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid on the table for all three of these, that there be no intervening action or debate, and any statements relating to any one of these three matters 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. 450

(Designating May 15, 2012, as ''National MPS Awareness Day'')

Whereas mucopolysaccharidosis (referred to in this resolution as ''MPS'') are a group of genetically determined lysosomal storage diseases that render the human body incapable of producing certain enzymes needed to break down complex carbohydrates;

Whereas MPS diseases cause complex carbohydrates to be stored in almost every cell in the body and progressively cause cellular damage;

Whereas the cellular damage caused by MPS—

(1) adversely affects the human body by damaging the heart, respiratory system, bones, internal organs, and central nervous system; and

(2) often results in intellectual disabilities, short stature, corneal damage, joint stiffness, loss of mobility, speech and hearing impairment, heart disease, hyperactivity, chronic respiratory problems, and, most importantly, a drastically shortened life span;

Whereas symptoms of MPS are usually not apparent at birth;

Whereas, without treatment, the life expectancy of an individual afflicted with MPS begins to decrease at a very early stage in the life of the individual;

Whereas research has resulted in the development of limited treatments for some MPS diseases;

Whereas promising advancements in the pursuit of treatments for additional MPS diseases are underway as of the date of agreement to this resolution;

Whereas, despite the creation of new remedies, the blood-brain barrier continues to be a significant impediment to effectively treating the brain, which prevents the treatment of many of the symptoms of MPS;

Whereas the quality of life of the individuals afflicted with MPS, and the treatments available to those individuals, will be enhanced through the development of early detection techniques and early intervention;

Whereas treatments and research advancements for MPS are limited by a lack of awareness about MPS diseases;

Whereas the lack of awareness about MPS diseases extends to individuals within the medical community;

Whereas the cellular damage that is caused by MPS makes MPS a model for the study of many other degenerative genetic diseases; and

Whereas the development of effective therapies and a potential cure for MPS diseases can be accomplished by increased awareness, research, data collection, and information distribution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 15, 2012, as ''National MPS Awareness Day''; and

(2) supports the goals and ideals of ''National MPS Awareness Day''.

S. RES. 451

(Recognizing the goals of National Travel and Tourism Week and honoring the valuable contributions of travel and tourism to the United States of America)

Whereas National Travel and Tourism Week was established in 1983 when Congress passed the Joint Resolution entitled ''Joint Resolution to designate the week beginning May 27, 1984, as 'National Tourism Week' '', approved November 29, 1983 (Public Law 98–

178; 97 Stat. 1126), which recognized the value of travel and tourism;

Whereas National Travel and Tourism Week is celebrated across the United States from May 5 through 13, 2012;

Whereas more than 120 travel destinations throughout the United States are holding events in honor of National Travel and Tourism Week;

Whereas the travel and tourism industry supports more than 14,000,000 jobs in the United States;

Whereas the travel and tourism industry employs individuals in all 50 States and all the territories of the United States;

Whereas international travel to the United States is the single largest export industry in the country;

Whereas the travel and tourism industry, Congress, and the executive branch have worked to streamline the visa process and make the United States welcoming to visitors from other countries;

Whereas travel and tourism provide significant economic benefits to the United States by generating nearly $2,000,000,000,000 in annual economic output;

Whereas leisure travel allows individuals to experience the rich cultural heritage and educational opportunities of the United States and its communities; and

Whereas, the immense value of travel and tourism cannot be overstated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes May 5 through 13, 2012, as National Travel and Tourism Week;

(2) commends the travel and tourism industry for its important contributions to the United States of America; and

(3) commends the employees of the travel and tourism industry for their important contributions to the United States of America.

S. RES. 452

(Designating July 13, 2012, as ''Collector Car Appreciation Day'' and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States)

Whereas many people in the United States maintain classic automobiles as a pastime and do so with great passion and as a means of individual expression;

Whereas the Senate recognizes the effect that the more than 100-year history of the automobile has had on the economic progress of the United States and supports wholeheartedly all activities involved in the restoration and exhibition of classic automobiles;

Whereas the collection, restoration, and preservation of automobiles is an activity shared across generations and across all segments of society;

Whereas thousands of local car clubs and related businesses have been instrumental in preserving a historic part of the heritage of the United States by encouraging the restoration and exhibition of such vintage works of art;

Whereas automotive restoration provides well-paying, high-skilled jobs for people in all 50 States; and

Whereas automobiles have provided the inspiration for music, photography, cinema, fashion, and other artistic pursuits that have become part of the popular culture of the United States: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 13, 2012, as ''Collector Car Appreciation Day'';

(2) recognizes that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to engage in events and commemorations of Collector Car Appreciation Day that create opportunities for collector car owners to educate young people about the importance of preserving the cultural heritage of the United States, including through the collection and restoration of collector cars.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 10, 2012

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, May 10, at 9:30 a.m.; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and finally when we come in tomorrow morning I be the person first recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. During tomorrow's session, it is possible that the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to the Student Loan Interest Rate Hike Act as well as the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act. That should be easy. That should be something we should agree to. We tried to get the Ex-Im Bank done. Everyone wanted to get it done. The chamber of commerce, labor, aircraft companies—all wanted it done. Everybody wanted it done. But, as a lot of things go here in the Senate, it didn't get done because Republicans wouldn't let us get it done.

It went to the House, and they sent us back a bill that is virtually the same as the one we weren't able to pass here, so I can't imagine anyone would want to slow that one down. I hope I don't have to file cloture on it because if I do, I will do it because we will have another chance to vote on it just as it came from the House. Every Democrat voted for it over there. There were 90 Republicans who voted against it. We all know who they are. But they voted against it. We are going to have a chance to vote on the exact bill that passed the House.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:48 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 10, 2012, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EMILY CARRUTHERS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Emily Carruthers for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Emily Carruthers is an 8th grader at Oberon Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Emily Carruthers is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Emily Carruthers for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

ALAN SKOBIN

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to pay tribute to Police Commissioner Alan J. Skobin for his outstanding contributions to both community and civic service in Los Angeles County.

Alan Skobin was appointed to the Board of Police Commissioners by Mayor James K. Hahn in July 2003 and reappointed by Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa, serving two five-year terms as Police Commissioner. His breadth of experience as Commissioner includes unwavering leadership on various fronts including the establishment of the LAPD Purple Heart Award—an award recognizing the sacrifice of officers seriously injured or slain while on duty; the development of a program to regularly replace outdated, vital police equipment, and the initiation of a prevention program for officer-involved traffic collisions.

Commissioner Skobin has also served as a Reserve Deputy Sheriff with the Los Angeles County Sheriffs Department (LASD) for more than 30 years, currently holding the rank of Reserve Chief. If that weren't enough, Commissioner Skobin is also the Vice President and Counsel at Galpin Motors in the San Fernando Valley.

Commissioner Skobin's accomplishments have been recognized with commendations and awards from virtually every level of the government and the private sector, including the California Peace Officers Association, naming him Officer of the Year, and Baseballers Against Drugs, which honored him with their Positive Image Award. Additionally, he was honored as one of the top 25 lawyers of the San Fernando Valley, and has received awards from the Los Angeles Police Reserve Foundation.

As a longtime San Fernando Valley resident, Commissioner Skobin's tremendous legacy in both law enforcement and the community is nothing short of remarkable. His unwavering dedication to public service has brought about significant positive impacts on the communities of Los Angeles. As his tenure with the Los Angeles Police Commission comes to an end, I am grateful that he will continue serving our community with the Los Angeles Fire Commission.

Mr. Speaker and distinguished colleagues, I ask you to join me in recognizing Police Commissioner Alan Skobin for his years of service and dedication to protecting the citizens of Los Angeles.

HONORING 100 YEARS OF FT. WORTH'S GLEN GARDEN GOLF AND COUNTRY CLUB

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a longtime American institution, the Glen Garden Golf and Country Club of Fort Worth, Texas, celebrating its centennial anniversary. Founded in 1912 by Mr. H.H. Cobb, it was at the time one of only two country clubs in Fort Worth and was a popular spot for activities in addition to golf for picnics, walks and family outings. Most notably, the club's place in history serves as the starting point for three great talents who changed the game of golf immeasurably.

Two of the greatest names in golf, Byron Nelson and Ben Hogan, began their long, successful golf careers as caddies for the club in the early 1920s. They honed their skills on the fairways and greens of the club after hours. Nelson and Hogan developed a friendly rivalry early, when 15-year-old Nelson beat Hogan in a caddy tournament by one stroke. From those humble beginnings, these two greats rose to become cultural icons not just in golf, but throughout American popular culture as well. Hogan would win a career 64 tour wins, including nine majors. Nelson's career was shorter but equally illustrious with 52 tour wins; five of them majors. In 2006, for his significant contributions to the game of golf as a player, a teacher, and a commentator, I was pleased to sponsor the resolution awarding Byron Nelson the Congressional Gold Medal.

Women also honed their skills on Glen Garden's links. LPGA great Sandra Palmer was still in high school in the late 1950s, developing her golf game when she was not on the basketball court. She would go on to win 19 tournaments, including two majors. Sandra Palmer remains active in golf today, on the LPGA Legends tour and serving as a role model for girls and young women achieving in sports.

From its humble beginnings as a small nine-hole course, to a beloved Fort Worth institution today, the last 100 years have been an unqualified success for Glen Garden. I express my best wishes for Glen Garden's next 100 years to be equally successful. I am proud to represent the City of Fort Worth in the U.S. House of Representatives.

HONORING A CHAMPION OF LITERACY AND PUBLIC SERVICE, MRS. SHIRLEY MORGAN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a true champion of literacy, Mrs. Shirley Morgan. Mrs. Morgan serves as librarian at Madison Shannon Palmer High School in Marks, Mississippi. She is the wife of Elton Morgan, mother of one daughter, the second of twelve siblings and a 26-year resident of Crenshaw, Mississippi.

Shirley is a graduate of Grambling State University where she received her Bachelor of Arts in Journalism. She has also received her certification in Library Media Science from Delta State University in Cleveland, Mississippi, which allowed her to further her career as a teacher consultant with Mississippi Valley State University Writing Project and serve as a mentor for new teachers. Mrs. Morgan has also worked as Site Coordinator with the North Delta 21st Century Community Learning Center's after school tutorial program for the Quitman County School District.

Mrs. Morgan believes reading is a tool of empowerment and a lifelong skill that increases one's ability to learn. She encourages reading at all levels, so much that she urges pregnant women to read to their unborn children with hopes of increasing their learning capabilities.

In addition to her commitment to education, Mrs. Morgan has a firm commitment to public service. She formerly served as Alderwoman for the Town of Crenshaw for 4 years and volunteers extensively with the Crenshaw Interested Community Builders, Inc., Food Bank of Crenshaw and the Tri-County Workforce Alliance in Clarksdale, Mississippi.

Mrs. Morgan is also active in her church, New St. John Missionary Baptist Church, where she serves as church clerk and Sunday School Superintendent.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Shirley Morgan as a committed educator, public servant, mother and wife.

IN RECOGNITION OF IRA LOMIS FLOWERS OF THOMASVILLE, GEORGIA

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to extend my personal congratulations and best wishes to Mr. Ira Lomis Flowers, a beloved citizen of Thomasville, Georgia, who will be honored at the 23rd Annual Black and White Scholarship Ball hosted by the Thomasville, Georgia Alumni Chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi, Inc.

The upcoming Black and White Scholarship Ball will take place on Friday, June 1, 2012 at 1200 West Jackson Street in Thomasville. During the event, Mr. Flowers will be presented with the Joseph R. Jenkins Award, the highest award that can be bestowed upon a member of Kappa Alpha Psi, Inc.'s Southeastern Province.

A native of Thomasville, Mr. Flowers is a graduate of Thomasville High School. Following high school, he went on to complete his undergraduate studies at Stillman College in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. Mr. Flowers also has his Certification in Secondary Education in English and Reading from Valdosta State University.

Mr. Flowers spent most of his professional life working as an educator and serving as a positive role model and influential mentor to children in Middle and Southwest Georgia. Throughout his dynamic and distinguished career he served as the Director of the Francis F. Weston YMCA in Thomasville; CEO & General Director of the A.J. McClung YMCA in Columbus, Georgia; Executive Director of the Thomasville Community Resource Center; and Senior YMCA Director for the USA YMCA Institute.

Despite the multiple and pressing demands associated with his professional career, Mr. Flowers always has and continues to play an integral role in several social, civic and community service oriented organizations in Georgia. He is a member of Kappa Alpha Psi, Inc. and has held memberships in the S.P. Masonic Lodge #118 and the Jones Masonic Lodge #118.

Mr. Flowers has achieved numerous successes in his life, but none of this would have been possible without the grace of God and the love imparted upon him by his late wife, Thedora Belinda Flowers, and his wonderful daughter Hope Allen Ellis-Flowers. He is also the proud grandfather of his adorable grandchildren Brianna and Christen.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Mr. Ira Lomis Flowers, an outstanding individual who has tirelessly devoted himself to progressively developing the academic and social skill sets of youth throughout the State of Georgia.

On a personal note, my wife, Vivian, and I would like to applaud Mr. Flowers and his family for his distinguished record of service on behalf of our Nation's children and his outstanding legacy of service to the communities of Middle and Southwest Georgia.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, 2012, I missed rollcall votes 202–223 because of my primary election in Indiana. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall 202, ''no'' on rollcall 203, ''no'' on rollcall 204, ''yes'' on rollcall 205, ''no'' on rollcall 206, ''no'' on rollcall 207, ''no'' on rollcall 208, ''no'' on rollcall 209, ''yes'' on rollcall 210, ''no'' on rollcall 211, ''no'' on rollcall 212, ''yes'' on rollcall 213, ''yes'' on rollcall 214, ''no'' on rollcall 215, ''no'' on rollcall 216, ''no'' on rollcall 217, ''no'' on rollcall 218, ''no'' on rollcall 219, ''no'' on rollcall 220, ''no'' on rollcall 221, ''no'' on rollcall 222, and ''no'' on rollcall 223.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE OF C. DONALD BABERS

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished federal public servant, Mr. C. Donald Babers, as he retires from his position as the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Southwest Regional Administrator on June 1, 2012. Over the last 42 years, all of it with HUD, he has provided dedicated service to the American public in a variety of positions.

Mr. Babers began his career in June 1970 as an unpaid intern in HUD's Fort Worth Office. He then moved on to Little Rock, Arkansas working in the local field office as an Equal Opportunity Specialist before being appointed the Acting Director of the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity. He was next assigned to the Dallas Field Office where he held a number of positions, including 15 years as the Field Office Director.

In 2002, he was promoted again, this time to the position of Deputy Regional Director in the Fort Worth Regional Office. In 2006, he assumed additional responsibilities when he was appointed by the Secretary of HUD as the Recovery Advisor and Chairman of the Board for the Housing Authority of New Orleans, where he oversaw recovery efforts due to Hurricane Katrina. On May 27, 2010, he was recognized again for his hard work and dedication to the mission of HUD with a promotion to Regional Administrator of HUD's Region VI in Fort Worth. In this position, he is responsible for managing the operations of the Fort Worth office as well as eleven field offices in Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Arkansas and Louisiana.

Over the years, Mr Babers has been the recipient of many prestigious awards for his work. In 2006, he received the Presidential Rank Award for Meritorious Executive, one of the highest awards given to career civil servants and restricted to no more than five percent of executives per year. In 2007, he also received the Interagency Resources Management Conference Award from the General Services Administration, which is given to those government employees who have shown exceptional ability to operate across organizational boundaries and improve the public's experience with the government.

As Mr. Babers retires from a long and dedicated career, I would like to recognize his service and congratulate him on a job well done. His experience and skills will certainly be missed by both the employees he worked with and the citizens he served. I wish Don Babers and his wife Sheila a long and happy retirement.

CONGRATULATING THE CITY OF LANCASTER, WISCONSIN, ON ITS 175TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise before you today to honor the historic City of Lancaster as we celebrate its 175th anniversary.

Lancaster was established for its central location in Grant County. Though it wasn't located on a stream or major source of power, its location was ideal for the efficiency and accessibility of a county government. Shortly after its founding, Lancaster was named the seat of Grant County. In fact, the county courthouse was built before Lancaster's founding, creating a unique opportunity for entrepreneurs once Lancaster was established. Hotels and stores were among the first establishments to be built. But, growth in Lancaster was slow with only 350 residents in 1853. However, the dedication of a few people, including Wisconsin's first Governor, Nelson Dewey, was all Lancaster needed to thrive. After the construction of houses, commercial buildings, warehouses, stores, and a railroad depot, Lancaster's population surpassed 1,000 residents by 1880, enough to allow incorporation.

Just as Lancaster was beginning to mature, a fire destroyed half of the square and the city was faced with the challenge of starting anew. The folks of Lancaster took on that challenge and as they always have; the people of Lancaster worked together and the square was built again. Many of these buildings still stand today, signifying the deep historical roots in Lancaster and its ability to endure the test of time. The Grant County Courthouse, Lancaster Municipal Building, and the Lancaster Post Office are all listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Today, Lancaster is home to more than 3,800 people. Lancaster embodies the quintessential small town that is a staple in rural Wisconsin. The historically rich community still thrives on the agricultural successes of surrounding farms and its quaint and pure atmosphere make Lancaster a beautiful place to call home. I wish the City of Lancaster and its residents a happy 175th anniversary and all the best in the years to come.

DONOVAN NICHOLS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Donovan Nichols for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Donovan Nichols is a 12th grader at Jefferson High and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Donovan Nichols is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Donovan Nichols for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all his future accomplishments.

HONORING ROBERT F. JORDAN

HON. RANDY HULTGREN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the attention of the House of Representatives to a momentous occasion, the 85th birthday of Mr. Robert F. Jordan, to be celebrated on May 25, 2012, and to recognize the work he has done, first as a United States diplomat for more than 36 years, and in retirement, as an integral part of the US-Asia Institute.

Mr. Robert F. Jordan was born and raised in Framingham, Massachusetts. He served overseas in the U.S. Army from 1945 to 1947 and then attended the University of Massachusetts, graduating in 1951. From 1951 to 1956 he was a high school teacher of Algebra and Spanish.

In 1956 he started a 36-year diplomatic career with the U.S. Information Agency, serving as the Public Affairs Officer and director of the United States Information Service in 11 countries in Asia, Europe and Latin America with responsibility for all U.S. government press and cultural exchange programs. Mr. Jordan learned four foreign languages—Spanish, Italian, French, and Portuguese. He was president of the Fulbright Commission in several countries and was also president of the Government of Ireland's scholarship board. While on a Washington tour he was assigned to USIA's inspection corps and conducted policy and public diplomacy inspections of American embassies in some 40 countries worldwide.

Mr. Jordan is the recipient of several meritorious and superior honor awards and performance pay awards from USIA, the Department of Defense and the Department of State. He also received the Order of Merit from the Government of Portugal.

Following retirement in 1992 Mr. Jordan was called back by both USIA and the Department of State to conduct policy inspections of some 20 embassies worldwide. Then from 1995 to 2001 he worked for the Federal Emergency Management Agency handling the Spanish-speaking media on disasters around the country. All total during his career, he has honorably represented the United States in over 100 countries around the world.

In 1994–95 and then since 2007, Mr. Jordan has volunteered his time at the US-Asia Institute as a senior advisor and serving as Vice President of International and Government Affairs. In this role, he works closely with the Asian diplomatic community as well as with the U.S. Congress, and numerous delegations from Asia. He is committed to the mission and goals of the US-Asia Institute, promoting dialogue on international issues of common interest to the United States and Asian nations, whenever and however possible. In the course of his work, Mr. Jordan has led numerous delegations of Congressional staff to China and Singapore. He spent his 80th birthday on the Great Wall of China.

In his retirement, Mr. Jordan continues to work tirelessly to promote mutual understanding and communication between the U.S. and the countries and people of Asia. As he celebrates this latest milestone, we say thank you to Mr. Jordan for his sage counsel, his inimitable vision, his quiet behind-the-scenes diplomacy, and his unwavering commitment to the U.S.-Asia relationship.

IN HONOR OF THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF FLORENCE LARIVIERE

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Florence LaRiviere, a passionate citizen activist responsible for creating our country's first urban national wildlife refuge. Without Florence, it is safe to say that thousands of acres of wetlands and salt ponds along the San Francisco Bay would have been destroyed and developed. The Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge, in my Congressional District, is the result of her tireless commitment to preventing urban sprawl from taking over unspoiled natural area.

On May 10th, Florence is being rightly honored for her decades of environmental and community service with the National Wetlands Award from the Environmental Law Institute of Washington, DC. Although Florence is being honored now, at the age of 88, her work to preserve the Bay spans seven decades.

In the 1950's Florence would take her children to enjoy the Bay's natural marshes and wetlands. Even then, development was steadily encroaching on this fragile ecosystem and threatened its very survival. Marshes were being drained and filled and the Bay's health was in severe decline. Florence organized other concerned citizens and launched a battle to preserve the wetlands and restore the Bay. They took their fight to then Representative Don Edwards, who championed legislation to create the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge in 1972. She didn't stop there. In the 1980s, she established the Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge and led the fight to expand the refuge by 20,000 acres.

After all these accomplishments, Florence LaRiviere still works to preserve and protect California's wetlands. In the last few years, I've been honored to work with Florence to restore the Eden Landing salt ponds along the Hayward Shoreline. Now, instead of sterile ponds, we have a thriving marsh where hundreds of bird species can be seen and the public can access the bay for hiking and kayaking.

The National Wetlands Awards are presented annually to individuals who have excelled in wetlands protection and is administered by the Environmental Law Institute and is supported by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, USDA Forest Service, and Federal Highway Administration. A committee of wetlands experts representing federal and state agencies, academia, conservation organizations, and the private sector selects the Award recipients.

Florence is well deserving of this award. Her work to create and preserve the refuge has produced enormous benefits. It has sustained an immense number of birds and endangered species. It has also brought awareness to the Bay Area of the value of wetlands, and vastly improved residents' quality of life by providing them with public spaces to escape from the hustle and bustle of urban life. Florence is an inspiration to all of us who care about passing on a healthy environment to future generations.

RECOGNIZING DOWNTOWN WASHINGTON INC.

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Downtown Washington, Inc. On April 2, 2012, Downtown Washington was named a recipient of The Great American Main Street Award. The winners of this award are recognized for their exceptional accomplishments in revitalizing the nations' historic Main Street commercial district by using the National Trust's Main Street Four-Point Approach.

I ask that you join me in recognizing Downtown Washington, Inc. for its work to nurture and enhance its downtown area. A key part of Downtown Washington's success is due to the dedication and determination of Downtown Washington, Inc.'s board of directors and staff. With its outstanding leadership, the board of directors and staff have spearheaded the renovation of several historic buildings that have and will continue to attract fellow residents and visitors to the downtown area for years to come.

In addition, one of their top priorities is business retention, and Downtown Washington, Inc. works to make sure business owners have the latest information on grants and other incentives. Through their partnerships with the local chamber of commerce and city government, Downtown Washington, Inc. organizes many public events throughout the year, which truly help showcase the city's success.

In closing, I ask all my colleagues to join me in wishing the members Downtown Washington, Inc. congratulations on receiving this award.

DRISZELLE RICHARDSON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Driszelle Richardson for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Driszelle Richardson is a 12th grader at Jefferson Senior High and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Driszelle Richardson is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Driszelle Richardson for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING MRS. SHIRLEY W. SIMMONS FOR HER COMMITMENT TO LITERACY

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Mrs. Shirley W. Simmons. Mrs. Simmons is a lifelong resident of Jackson, Mississippi and a graduate of Brinkley High School and Jackson State University. After college, Mrs. Simmons worked in early childhood education for a number of years. She then took time off from education to focus on raising her children. During those years, she took an active interest in the Parent Teachers Association, PTA, and volunteered with school fundraisers and local Girl Scout troops.

In 1996, she was hired as a Circulation Assistant with the Jackson/Hinds Library System-Medgar Evers Branch. While there, she was promoted to Professional Assistant and then to her current position of Branch Supervisor.

As Branch Supervisor, Mrs. Simmons continuously seeks new ways to involve the community in programs and activities being held by the library and has planned and participated in many library activities. Some of these include library story times, Medgar Evers celebrations, Medgar Evers parades, the Books for Tots program, the Medgar Evers Book Club, and annual summer reading programs.

Mrs. Simmons assists annually with the Jackson State University Alumni Association fundraising initiatives and participates in breast cancer awareness activities. She is also a Silver Life member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP. Mrs. Simmons is a devoted wife and mother and grandmother of three children and one grandchild.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and our colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Shirley W. Simmons for her commitment to the community and others.

RECOGNIZING JUDGE JACQUELINE H. NGUYEN

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Honorable Jacqueline H. Nguyen of California, whom the Senate confirmed yesterday to the United States Court of Appeals for The Ninth Circuit by a vote of 91–3. Judge Nguyen becomes the first woman of Asian descent to serve on the federal bench. What a wonderful way to begin Asian Pacific Islander Heritage Month!

Mr. Speaker, Judge Nguyen is a testament to this truly being the land of opportunity. She was born in Dalat, Vietnam and at the age of nine, she fled Vietnam with her family during the fall of Saigon. Upon arriving in the United States, her family lived for a time in a refugee tent city at Camp Pendleton before settling in the Los Angeles area. She helped her family operate a doughnut shop in North Hollywood, where she studied between helping customers. At a very young age she was put in a difficult situation but her circumstances did not deter her from her dreams.

Judge Nguyen received her A.B. from Occidental College in 1987, and her J.D. from UCLA School of Law in 1991. From 1995 to 2002, she worked in the United States Attorney's Office in the Central District of California. Serving in the criminal division as an Assistant United States Attorney, she worked as a federal prosecutor in the General Crimes section from 1995–1996 and in the Public Corruption and Government Fraud section from 1996–1999. She took on the role of the General Crimes section's Deputy Chief from 2000–2002.

In 2002, she was appointed to serve on the state bench as a Judge of the Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles, becoming the first female Vietnamese-American judge in California's history. In July 2009, President Obama nominated Judge Nguyen for a seat on the bench of the United States District Court for the Central District of California. After being confirmed 97–0 she became the first Vietnamese-American to serve on the federal bench. Judge Nguyen brought to the federal bench substantial civil and criminal experience both as a lawyer and as a judge.

Like many other great Americans, she has followed in the American tradition of giving back. She is a founding member of the Asian Pacific American Bar Association. She is the recipient of numerous awards from legal associations, including the Women's Leadership Award, National Asian Pacific American Bar Association (2010), and the Trailblazer Award from both the National Conference of Vietnamese American Attorneys (2009) and the National Asian Pacific American Bar Association (2006).

I congratulate Judge Nguyen on her appointment and looking forward to having this exceptional jurist serve with distinction for many years to come.

H.R. 4967, THE ''TEMPORARY BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIPS EXTENSION ACT OF 2012''

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following exchange of letters:

MAY 9, 2012.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: I am writing concerning H.R. 4967, the ''Temporary Bankruptcy Judgeships Extension Act of 2012,'' which is scheduled for Floor consideration today.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means maintains jurisdiction over revenue measures generally. H.R. 4967, contains a provision that raises revenue by increasing the Chapter 11 filing fees for the operation and maintenance of the courts of the United States, which falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. In order to expedite this bill for Floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on the 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 in the future.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 4967, 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 THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2012.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4967, the ''Temporary Bankruptcy Judgeships Extension Act of 2012,'' which is soon scheduled for consideration by the House.

I am most appreciative of your decision to forgo consideration of H.R. 4967 so that it may move expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Ways and Means is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in the bill. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that Ways and Means be represented therein.

Finally, I shall be pleased to include this letter and your letter of even date herewith in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 4967.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

EDWIN SAENZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Edwin Saenz for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Edwin Saenz is a 10th grader at Jefferson Senior High and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Edwin Saenz is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Edwin Saenz for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all his future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote No. 206 on the evening of May 7, 2012. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: rollcall vote No. 206—Scalise (LA) Amendment: ''no.''

2012 14TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT ART COMPETITION

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the artistic ability of a young woman from my Congressional District, Iesha Grady from Penn Hills High School. Ms. Grady is the winner of the 2012 14th Congressional District of Pennsylvania's High School Art Competition, ''An Artistic Discovery.'' Ms. Grady's artwork, a composition in oil pastels entitled ''Harmless Apple Juice?'' was selected from a number of outstanding entries to this year's competition.

In fact, 45 works from ten different schools in Pennsylvania's 14th Congressional District were submitted to our panel of respected local artists. It's a real tribute to her skill and vision that her work was chosen as the winner of this year's competition. I am certain that Ms. Grady's family is proud of her artistic talents and this impressive accomplishment.

Ms. Grady's artwork will represent the 14th Congressional District of Pennsylvania in the national exhibit of high school students' artwork that will be displayed in the United States Capitol over the coming year. I encourage my colleagues as well as any visitor to Capitol Hill to view Ms. Grady's artwork, along with the winning entries from the high school art contests held in other Congressional Districts, which will be on display in the Capitol tunnel. It is amazing to walk through this corridor and see the interpretation of life through the eyes of these young artists from all across our country.

Maggie Morgans from West Mifflin High School was awarded second place for her pastel composition ''Snowmaggedon.'' Sara Hopkins from Northgate High School received third place for her pencil drawing entitled ''Britney.'' Jasper Means from Penn Hills High School was awarded fourth place for his watercolor ''Life Saving Station #7.'' Stephanie Taylor from South Allegheny High School was given fifth place for her oil painting ''Shades of Green.'' I should note, by the way, that this is the third year in a row that one of Stephanie's works has placed in this competition. Last year she took Second Place, and in 2010 her painting was the winner. Clearly, this young lady has a lot of talent.

In addition, Honorable Mention Awards were presented to works by Erin Hart of Riverview High School, Julian Moriarty from Woodland Hills High School, Alexis Yauch of McKeesport High School, Morgan Turner of Northgate High School, Mikaila Hoffman from Pittsburgh Allderdice High School, Dan O'Leary of Riverview High School, Stephanie Taylor of South Allegheny High School, Elizabeth Thornton from Sto-Rox High School, Sara Hopkins of Northgate High School, and Ashley Reid of Riverview High School.

I would like to recognize all of the participants in this year's 14th Congressional District High School Art Competition, ''An Artistic Discovery:'' from the Pittsburgh High School for the Creative and Performing Arts, Adam Linn; from McKeesport High School, Jordan Armstrong, Jake Hall, Cortez Snooks, and Alexis Yauch; from Northgate High School, Sara Hopkins and Morgan Turner; from Penn Hills High School, Ebony Black-Yancey, Serena English, Stephan Godbolt, Iesha Grady, Jasper Means, and Roomel Reese; from Pittsburgh Allderdice High School, Justin E. Dumas, Sarah Fehl, Mikaila Hoffman, Asma Qutyan, and Olivia Savisky; from Riverview High School, Bailey Conroy, Erin Hart, Demetrius Kokales, Lauren McKee, Dan O'Leary, and Ashley Reid; from South Allegheny High School, Eric Raynes and Stephanie Taylor; from Sto-Rox High School, Shane Jenkins, Melissa Fowkes Palitti, Samantha Reiss, and Elizabeth Thornton; from West Mifflin High School, Kasey Angel, Victoria Cooper, Chelsey Earnest, Katie Fahringer, Kristine Lype, and Maggie Morgans; and from Woodland Hills High School, Madison Harding, Julian Moriarty, Manuel Russell, and Jacqueline Zollner.

I would like to thank these impressive young artists for allowing us to share and celebrate their talents, imagination, and creativity. The efforts of these students in expressing themselves in a powerful and positive manner are no less than spectacular.

I hope that all of these individuals continue to utilize their artistic talents, and I wish them all the best of luck in their future endeavors.

HONORING TOM LEONARD

HON. JOHN F. TIERNEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and commend, Tom Leonard, who will be receiving the 2012 Essex Heritage Hero Award tonight.

Having championed heritage preservation and responsible stewardship of the region's historic, cultural, and natural resources during his eight-year tenure as the founding president of the Essex National Heritage Commission and now as its president emeritus, Tom is certainly deserving of this honor.

However, those in attendance at tonight's award dinner will know that Tom's service to his community did not begin with nor is it limited to his work with the Essex National Heritage Commission. Throughout his life, Tom has been dedicated to making our neighborhoods better places to live, work, and raise a family as well as increasing opportunities for children and young adults, particularly those who attend his alma mater, St. John's Preparatory School in Danvers. Tom is a selfless leader, a man of integrity, and a true citizen.

Tom's awards and accomplishments are too long to list, but I would be remiss if! did not mention that, in 2006, Essex Heritage established the Thomas M. Leonard Partnership Grant Program. This unique effort is focused on educating our youth and increasing their awareness about our region's natural and historic resources. Grants have been awarded to local schools and the National Park Service to enable more kids from outside of Salem to visit the Salem Maritime and Saugus Iron Works National Historic sites. Additionally, over the years, Tom has been recognized by the American Cancer Society, the Salem Harbor Community Development Corporation, the Salem Chamber of Commerce, the Salem Rotary Club, and the Danvers Community Council.

Mr. Speaker, that impressive list will grow when Tom receives the 2012 Essex Heritage Hero Award this evening. I want to congratulate Tom and his wife, Marge, and their sons, Michael and Mark, and their entire extended family on this great honor.

EDITE MALOKU

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Edite Maloku for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Edite Maloku is an 11th grader at Jefferson Senior High and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Edite Maloku is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Edite Maloku for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

PRIVATE SECTOR GROWTH SUFFOCATED BY HIGH TAXES

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I highlight an example of how private sector businesses grow and contribute to our society when they're not suffocated by unnecessarily high taxes, and to dispel a myth that our colleagues continue to perpetuate about energy taxes. On April 24, The Wall Street Journal ran an article calling Apple Inc. ''the most valuable company'' in the world.

Am I happy about that? Am I happy about Apple's success? You bet I am, and so are most people in the United States.

Later that week, on April 28, The New York Times wrote a similar article that reported on Apple's creative, but legal, tax strategy that saves them billions in tax payments each year. The Times article reported ''the company paid cash taxes of $3.3 billion around the world on its reported profits of $34.2 billion last year, a tax rate of 9.8 percent.'' Comparatively, Wal-Mart paid a tax rate of 24 percent.

When Apple was asked for comments on their exceptionally low tax rate, they responded: ''By focusing on innovation, we've created entirely new products and industries, and more than 500,000 jobs for U.S. workers—from the people who create components for our products to the people who deliver them to our customers.''

They also mentioned: ''In the first half of fiscal year 2012, our U.S. operations have generated almost $5 billion.''

Mr. Speaker, Apple's experiences are instructive to us.

First, the Federal Tax Code is too complicated. It allows only the largest companies who can afford to hire tax code interpreters to benefit from lower taxes. We should simplify the tax code by closing the loopholes and lower rates across the board to boost American competitiveness for all companies, large and small.

Both history and Apple's experience underscore how increasing taxes without accompanying comprehensive reform has never and will never represent a sustainable, long-term strategy to any budgetary problems. On the contrary, cutting taxes does create economic growth, which fuels Federal revenue windfalls for reducing the deficit.

These lessons should be applied to the entire tax code. Instead of increasing taxes on American energy producers, we should focus on simplifying the federal code to encourage the development of domestic energy resources which, in turn, bolsters employment opportunities here at home.

Again, am I pleased about Apple's success? Absolutely.

But we never hear from our Democrat friends about the low tax rates paid by companies like Apple. However, they attack domestic energy producers and ignore the simple truth that it is the American people who actually own these companies and benefit from the respective profits that they make. According to the American Petroleum Institute, mutual funds hold almost 30 percent of oil stocks; pension funds hold 27 percent; individual investors hold 23 percent; 14 percent is held in individual retirement accounts; other institutional investments hold 5 percent; and corporate management holds just 1.5 percent.

Despite what liberal Democrats would have you believe, increasing domestic energy production not only helps lower prices and produce jobs; it also helps boost stocks, mutual funds, IRAs, and pension funds owned by millions of Americans.

It is also worth recognizing how hypocritical it is for liberal Democrats to complain about the federal tax treatment of domestic energy production while ignoring the market distorting impact of their favored subsidization of failed wind, solar and ''green car'' projects. The simple truth is that American energy producers, such as those in the oil development business, receive the same tax treatment as other U.S. industries. For those truly interested in ''fairness,'' the difference between ''subsidies'' and ''deductions'' should not be ignored or distorted.

It's time that we as government officials get out of the way. Instead of increasing the bureaucracy and red tape, we need to focus on creating an environment for American private sector businesses to compete more easily in the global marketplace and give back to local communities in the form of jobs rather than sending more money to the Federal Government.

HONORING THE LATE MRS. CRYSTIANA SMITH RANDLE FOR HER COMMITMENT TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, the late, Crystiana Smith Randle. Mrs. Randle was born August 26, 1924 in Gulfport, Mississippi to John and Annie Bell Smith.

She was a graduate of Thirty-Third High School in Gulfport, Mississippi. Later she attended Tougaloo College, in Tougaloo, Mississippi, receiving a Bachelors of Arts in English and Atlanta University in Atlanta, Georgia, with a Masters in Library Science.

After completing her college education, she worked at Mileston High School and Harmony High School before her tenure at McNair High School and Humphreys County High School as the school's librarian.

She worked delightfully and diligently for thirty-four years teaching and illuminating the lives of thousands of boys and girls until her retirement in 1986.

She was active in many professional organizations and served as a member of the Humphreys County Library Board. She dedicated her years as her family's personal Genealogist.

She was married to Thomas C. Randle and was the mother of two daughters, Santa and Regina. Mrs. Randle passed away on April 20, 2005.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Crystiana Smith Randle for her dedication to serving others.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JUDY BIGGERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on rollcall 214, I inadvertently voted ''no.'' I should be recorded as voting ''aye.''

ELIZABETH BLUE-NORTON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Elizabeth Blue-Norton for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Elizabeth Blue-Norton is an 8th grader at Moore Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Elizabeth Blue-Norton is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Elizabeth Blue-Norton for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

HONORING COLONEL MARY G. LOCKHART ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT FROM THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

HON. MARK S. CRITZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. CRITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Colonel Mary G. Lockhart on the occasion of her retirement from the United States Air Force. I have a great appreciation for Colonel Lockhart's professional and distinguished career, and her dedicated service to our great Nation. Although it is difficult to encapsulate her Air Force career of 30 years in just a few brief remarks, I would like to highlight her contributions to the Air Force and our country by offering the following tribute.

In some aspects, Colonel Lockhart's career may appear to be similar to those of the many thousands of senior officers who have served in the Air Force since its creation in 1947. However, upon closer examination, it becomes clear that Colonel Lockhart has performed highly sensitive roles in critical Air Force missions with a level of skill that few other officers

can match. Equally important, she has served as a mentor to numerous young officers throughout her career, inculcating them with the Air Force's core values of integrity first, service before self, and excellence.

Colonel Lockhart received her commission in 1982 through the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) at the College of Holy Cross. As a freshly minted 2nd Lieutenant, she attended meteorology school for a year, where she began to build the skills necessary for a successful career in the Air Weather Service. Shortly after arriving to her first duty station at Griffiss AFB, NY she was recognized for her initiative, intellect, and quick grasp of the operational requirements. She was given responsibilities generally reserved for more senior weather officers in SAC and NORAD, and continued to establish herself as an exceptional meteorologist. As a 1st Lieutenant, she was credited with improving the overall readiness of her squadron and wing, and protecting valuable resources with her accurate forecasts and astute weather warnings. She was routinely tasked to handle the most delicate and time sensitive weather briefings to missile warning and space surveillance centers. In 1986, Colonel Lockhart transferred from active duty to the Air Force Reserve as a Captain, and continued to serve in the weather field as an Individual Mobilization Augmentee (IMA) at Peterson AFB, CO. Her active duty experience would prove invaluable as a new Reservist who would go on to provide years of support to the Air Force's active, guard, and reserve components in a variety of positions and assignments.

As an IMA weather officer, she helped develop combat plans to support strategic, conventional, and special operations, to include leading weather forces for a deployment of KC–135 aircraft during Operation DESERT STORM. As a Major assigned to Eglin AFB, FL, she was handpicked to provide specialized on-site support to two high-visibility Space Shuttle landings at Edwards AFB, CA. While serving as an IMA Weather Officer at McConnell AFB, KS, she provided operational forecast, weather advisories, watches and warnings to a major refueling wing, and the Kansas and Oklahoma Air National Guard. Colonel Lockhart became an expert and innovator in the electro-optics arena, provided exceptional weather support during Hurricane Opal, and prepared critical climatology packages for the wing's F–16 deployments around the world. While assigned to an operations support squadron at Nellis AFB, NV, Col Lockhart commanded a weather flight that provided 24-hour weather support to the HQ Air Warfare Center and two of Air Combat Command's busiest and complex wings. Her successes and expertise led to her being selected as the first weather officer assigned to the Air Force's Weapons School. There, she helped to integrate and establish 21st century combat weather support into the warfighter's contingency operations. She was tasked to model critical targets post 9/11, maintain direct contact with Operation ENDURING FREEDOM deployed units and aircrew, and cited as the most operations oriented, bombs-on-target-on-time weather officer ever assigned to her wing. Colonel Lockhart was asked to bring her experience and natural diplomatic talents to Washington, D.C. to serve as the IMA to the Chief of the Air Force House Liaison Office on Capitol Hill.

Over the past four years Colonel Lockhart has carried out the delicate tasks of managing the House Liaison Office while her active duty colleagues have traveled on CODELs and deployed. She has been an important part of building strong relationships between Capitol Hill, the Pentagon, and senior Air Force leadership. Colonel Lockhart is trusted and relied upon by Members of Congress and their staffs to help facilitate legislative and programmatic matters. We have benefited greatly from her kind, professional, and capable ways.

Throughout Colonel Lockhart's career, her commanders have referred to her as, ''the brightest junior officer on my staff'', ''brilliant'', ''superior and visionary leader'', and ''Total Force ace.'' Simply stated, Colonel Mary Lockhart has made lasting and important contributions to the United States Air Force. Our Nation is indebted to her and her family for their selfless years of service and unquestioned devotion to peace and security at home and abroad. Mr. Speaker, I wish Mary, her husband Paul, and daughters Jenna and Marisa, Godspeed and much happiness as she begins her retirement from the United States Air Force.

RECOGNIZING RONNIE CHIH-CHIEN LU

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise, along with the other co-chairs of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus—Representative SHELLEY BERKLEY, Representative MARIO DIAZ-BALART, and Representative PHIL GINGREY—to recognize the service of Ronnie Chih-chien Lu. Mr. Lu is the outgoing Senior Officer in the Congressional Liaison Division of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office, TECRO. Mr. Lu is returning to Taiwan for his next assignment as a diplomat. During his service as the TECRO contact for the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Congressional Caucus on Taiwan, Mr. Lu has served as an invaluable resource for us.

In 2005, Mr. Lu was hand-picked to serve as a congressional liaison for TECRO. During his almost 7 year tenure in this position, Mr. Lu oversaw Congressional Delegation visits for over 30 Members of the House of Representatives and organized 12 Congressional Staff Delegation visits to Taiwan. Mr. Lu was also part of the TECRO team that worked toward the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 55, which commemorated the 30th Anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979. He also worked to garner support for House Concurrent Resolution 266 (H. Con. Res. 266), which called for Taiwan's active participation in the International Civil Aviation Organization. H. Con. Res. 266 passed the House of Representatives in 2010.

Mr. Lu has served in Taiwan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs since 2000. Early in his diplomatic career, he served in both the Department of Protocol and Department of African Affairs. Mr. Lu received a Master of Arts degree from National Chengchi University in Taiwan.

Though he secured many legislative victories for Taiwan while he served in Washington, DC, he made even more long-lasting relationships. My colleagues and our staff are proud to call him a friend, and we hope to see him back in Washington, DC one day.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 222, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

RECOGNIZING THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize our strong friendship and strategic alliance with the Republic of Turkey.

Turkey has continuously stood with the United States in our efforts to promote democracy and freedom throughout the world. As a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO, Turkey has committed troops and necessary resources to efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan through the years, and serves as a crucial transit point for supplies and personnel going to these countries. Additionally, Turkey announced last year that it would lead the International Security Assistance Force, ISAF, regional command in Kabul for a third year. Turkey is also at the beginning operational stages of a NATO radar facility in its southeast region as part of a missile defense system intended to protect NATO allies from ballistic missiles.

In addition to cooperation on NATO-led efforts, Turkey plays a critical role in promoting democracy throughout the region. Over the last year, Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan has traveled throughout Egypt, Tunisia, and other countries affected by uprisings to encourage secular constitutions and democratic reforms that are vital to U.S. interests. Turkey has also taken a leading role in addressing the ongoing situation in Syria, opening its borders to tens of thousands of Syrian refugees and encouraging Arab countries to lead a coordinated effort to find a peaceful resolution in Syria.

Turkey continues to increase efforts to support religious minorities in its own borders as well. Last August, Turkey issued a decree for the return of hundreds of properties, including cemeteries, hospitals, and schools, to non-Muslim communities. This announcement also provides compensation to the non-Muslim community foundations for properties currently registered to third parties. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton applauded Turkey's efforts to ''take serious steps to improve the climate for religious tolerance.''

Turkey remains a vital ally of the United States, and I am encouraged by the steps that Turkey has taken to improve its own commitment to democracy and to promote democracy throughout the Middle East. Turkey has

earned our respect, gratitude, and recognition for its efforts over the last 60 years. I look forward to continuing to work in support of our mutual interests.

DENIS ANGHEL

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Denis Anghel for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Denis is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Denis Anghel is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Denis Anghel for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all his future accomplishments.

HONORING VICE ADMIRAL (VADM) SALERNO FOR HIS SERVICE IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD

HON. FRANK A. LoBIONDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a true leader for his extraordinary service in the United States Coast Guard, Vice Admiral (VADM) Brian M. Salerno. VADM Salerno served his country for 37 years in the Coast Guard and on June 5th, he will retire as the Deputy Commandant for Operations at Coast Guard Headquarters, a position he has held since May 2010. We all owe him a debt of gratitude for his commitment to service and to our country.

As the Deputy Commandant for Operations, Vice Admiral Salerno oversaw policy development and strategic planning for all Coast Guard maritime safety, security and response operations. Assuming the duties as the Deputy Commandant for Operations shortly after the initial response to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, Vice Admiral Salerno was responsible for the Coast Guard's in-depth investigation and after action review of the incident, and directed implementation of numerous improvements to the Coast Guard's Spill of National Significance response and management protocols. He was also instrumental in establishing vital joint operating plans and processes, such as the Maritime Operations Coordination Plan, which greatly advanced the Department of Homeland Security's ''One-DHS'' initiative to increase the Nation's ability to respond to maritime threats. When Somalian pirates began attacking merchant vessels in the Gulf of Aden, Vice Admiral Salerno led the United States' efforts to establish internationally accepted and highly effective shipboard procedures to minimize the likelihood of a successful attack. These measures have proven essential to helping mariners and the shipping industry protect themselves and combat piracy while transiting in high-risk waters. Using his nearly four decades of experience working on some of the most complex maritime safety and security issues, Vice Admiral Salerno laid the foundation for the continued development of interagency, international, and industry partnerships that will prove increasingly more important to national security, sovereignty and prosperity as emerging threats and opportunities in the Arctic and other outer-continental shelf maritime activity increases.

Vice Admiral Salerno was commissioned as an Ensign in December 1976 after attending Coast Guard Officer Candidate School. His assignments have predominantly been within the Coast Guard's marine safety program, where he commanded Coast Guard units in Boston, MA and San Juan, PR, and was responsible for carrying out vital Captain of the Port, Officer-in-Charge of Marine Inspection, Federal Maritime Security Coordinator, and Federal On-Scene Coordinator duties. His other field assignments include units in Baltimore, MD, Port Arthur, TX and Portland, ME as well as serving as the marine safety advisor to the Panama Canal Authority. Prior to assuming his current position, Vice Admiral Salerno was the Assistant Commandant for Marine Safety, Security and Stewardship and he also served as the Assistant Commandant for Policy and Planning and as the Director of Inspections and Compliance at Coast Guard Headquarters.

Vice Admiral Salerno is a 2000 graduate of the U.S. Army War College, with a master's degree in Strategic Studies. He is also a graduate of the Naval War College and holds a master's degree in Management from the Johns Hopkins University. He is a licensed master of small passenger vessels. His personal military decorations include three Legion of Merit Medals, two Meritorious Service Medals, two Coast Guard Commendation Medals, and the Coast Guard Achievement Medal.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents and a grateful Nation, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing the extraordinary career of Vice Admiral Brian M. Salerno. There are few opportunities for us to recognize the accomplishments of those who selflessly dedicate their lives to the service of our country, and having had the pleasure of working with Vice Admiral Salerno as the Chairman of the Coast Guard's oversight Subcommittee, I cannot thank him enough for everything he has done to protect our Nation's waters and the millions of Americans who live, work, and visit them every day.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION REGARDING RECORDED VOTE ON ROLL CALL 220 DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5236

HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, during Floor consideration of H.R. 5326 on May 8, 2012, I mistakenly recorded my vote on rollcall 220 as ''yea'' on the question on agreeing to the amendment offered by Ms. BLACK of Tennessee.

I intended to vote ''no'', on the Black amendment, which sought to prohibit the Attorney General of the United States from using any funds appropriated by H.R. 5326 for the purpose of originating or joining in any lawsuit which seeks to overturn, enjoin, or invalidate a series of specified statutes related to immigration. Again, I would like reiterate my strong opposition to the Black amendment and express my significant concern that its language of limitation would unduly abrogate the longstanding prosecutorial discretion of the Department of Justice as well as undermine and violate the basic principle of separation of powers embodied by our Constitution.

TEURLINGS CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL LADY REBELS SOFTBALL TEAM CROWNED STATE CHAMPIONS

HON. CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Teurlings Catholic High School Lady Rebels softball team for recently being crowned class 4–A state champions by the Louisiana High School Athletic Association. This team truly has the heart of a champion. En route to the state championship, the strength and will of this team was tested time and time again. In the end, this team triumphed and defeated the Leesville High School Lady Cats to become the undisputed state champions on April 28, 2012.

The team's five seniors: Corin Voinche, Halie Green, Delilah Melancon, Julienne Broussard, and Megan Fuselier, tasted additional success each year they played. In 2009, the team made the state quarterfinals. In 2010, the team reached the state semifinals. In 2011, the team played in the state finals. This year, it attained the ultimate goal and won the state championship. This group embodies the term perseverance. Having overcome adversity and never allowing its determination to waver, I commend the efforts of the entire Teurlings Lady Rebels softball team.

Congratulations to coach Callie Gautreaux and her coaching staff of Lana Bowers, Vallie Gaspard, and Caleb Castille. This team had an outstanding year and saved its best performance for the year's largest stage. I look forward to next year's softball season and wish the Lady Rebels team good luck in defending its crown.

HONORING TUTT S. BRADFORD

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to honor one of the most well-known and selfless men in my District.

Tutt S. Bradford passed away recently at the age of 94 following a long life of community service and philanthropy. I knew him as a

good family man, but he was also a long time friend of my father.

He is perhaps best known as the former owner of The Daily Times newspaper in Maryville, Tennessee, a scenic community in my District located in the foothills of the Smoky Mountains.

The Daily Times had a circulation of only 7,500 when Tutt took it over in 1955; by the time he sold it in 1989, circulation had grown to 22,000. A close friend of Tutt, Sam Kennedy, told The Daily Times on the news of his passing that, ''He had the ability to understand what his people wanted. He knew how to produce a local, small daily newspaper that contained news that people were interested in.''

He transformed the paper into the pride of Blount County, and it still operates today as a model newspaper, frequently being ranked among the top three newspapers in the Nation in penetration of its circulation area. It has also been recognized as the fastest growing daily newspaper in Tennessee.

When Tutt sold The Daily Times, he devoted the rest of his life to philanthropy. His support of educational institutions, charities, and various causes is too great to list in this space, but Blount County and this Nation are better places because of his life and work.

When trying to decide whether to support a cause, Tutt would simply ask one question: Will it help the community grow? He undoubtedly touched the lives of thousands of people in my District in many positive ways.

I offer my condolences to his two daughters, Nancy and Debbie; step daughter, Frances; five grandchildren; 13 great grandchildren; sister, Dot; and brother, Randolph.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD to join me in celebrating the remarkable life of Tutt S. Bradford.

I can think of no more fitting tribute to Tutt than to request The Daily Times article highlighting his life and accomplishments be reprinted into the RECORD below.

TUTT BRADFORD, NEWSPAPER OWNER, COMMUNITY LEADER, DIES AT 94

(From staff reports)

Tutt S. Bradford, publisher/owner of The Daily Times for 34 years and a tireless community leader and philanthropist, died at Shannondale of Maryville Friday afternoon. He was 94.

Bradford became the fifth owner of The Daily Times in November 1955, and served as publisher until 1984. He continued as chairman of the board until the paper was sold in 1989.

Funeral arrangements are incomplete and will be announced later by McCammon-Ammons-Click Funeral Home.

Gregg Jones, president and CEO of Jones Media, parent company of The Daily Times, said, ''Blount County has lost a wonderful citizen, and my family and the staff of The Daily Times have lost a dear friend. Few have worked harder for the progress of this community than Tuft Bradford. He was never bashful about volunteering his time, leadership and personal financial resources to help Blount County address its challenges and fight for its opportunities. We all are better off because of Tutt's passionate love for his home. To his family we offer our deepest condolences for his loss as well as our heartfelt gratitude for having been blessed to have crossed his path.''

SUCCESSFUL CAREER

Bradford was born in Columbia, S.C., the second of five children. His first venture into print media began when he had a paper route as a child in the 1920s.

After his military service during World War II, Bradford moved into newspaper advertising. His successes led to his promotion to publisher of a newspaper in Cleveland, Tenn., then later as publisher of a Bristol newspaper.

In a 2008 interview with Daily Times reporter Linda Braden Albert, Bradford said, ''When (the Southern Newspapers Group) bought the paper in Bristol, it was just barely breaking even. In five years, I made $5 million. So the president of the company called me and said, 'Tutt, what would you like to do next?' I said, 'What do you mean?' He said, 'Well, wouldn't you like to own a paper?' ''

Bradford replied that he would if he had the money, and he was offered the opportunity to purchase The Daily Times with financing from the Southern Newspapers Group.

When Bradford—who served as owner, publisher and occasionally, editor—bought The Times in 1955, circulation was 7,500.

He involved his daughters Nancy Cain and Debbie Bradford Moon in the publication. Jerome F. Moon, a native Blount countian and husband of Debbie Bradford, became president and publisher in 1984.

When Bradford sold the newspaper to the Persis Group of Honolulu, Hawaii, in 1989, circulation had increased to 22,000.

In the 2008 interview, Bradford said one of the highlights of his career at The Daily Times was bringing a new press to the company. A repairman working on the old press told him about a three-color unit that would do all the colors in one unit.

''Every time we did a color we had to clean off everything, rollers and everything, and put the right ink on them,'' Bradford said. ''This way, they were put all in one unit like we have there now. It was really great.'' Bradford put in his order for one of the units and he said The Daily Times was one of the first newspapers in the country to get a press where the colors were ''left in there.''

''I knew him quite well,'' said Sam Kennedy, former owner of the Kennedy Newspapers and Columbia Dispatch. ''He took the Maryville paper and literally outdid the Knoxville papers.

''He had the ability to understand what his people wanted,'' Kennedy added. ''He knew how to produce a local, small daily newspaper that contained news that people were interested in.''

COMMUNITY ICON

During his newspaper career and long after he retired, Bradford remained very active as a community leader and benefactor.

''Will it help the community grow?'' Bradford asked himself when he needed to decide what causes he would support.

One such project dear to his heart is the Hearing and Speech Foundation, cofounded by Bradford and John Berry, owner of Blount Hearing and Speech Services, to provide such services for people who could not otherwise afford them.

''The reason I started the foundation was that my ears were blasted out during World War II,'' Bradford said in the 2008 interview. He sought treatment at many places for his hearing loss but none helped him until he met Berry. In 2003, Bradford was honored for his continuing support of the foundation.

According to long-time Daily Times Editor Dean Stone, Bradford also worked for funding for the still-uncompleted Foothills Parkway in Great Smoky Mountains National Park. First it was to get the state to purchase the right-of-way for federal construction. Later it was for federal construction money.

Bradford also worked successfully to get Cades Cove placed into a historical district in the Smokies' master plan in order to preserve some of the structures and its open nature, protecting the Cove as we know it for the enjoyment of millions annually.

BECAUSE OF RELIGION

Bradford also served on the boards of many organizations. A few of the beneficiaries were Maryville College, Blount County Chamber of Commerce, Blount County Industrial Development Board, United Way of Blount County, Pellissippi State Community College and the Blount County Public Library.

In 1991, he was named Outstanding Philanthropist of the Year by the National Society of Fundraising Executives.

''It's because of my religion,'' he said. ''The Lord said to love other people, and I have. I've really tried to help other people, particularly when they were down.''

HONORING ARTHUR EDWARDS

HON. JOHN P. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Arthur Edwards who has been an outstanding citizen and a major figure in promoting the arts in Annapolis. His unceasing devotion to Maryland Hall, the Annapolis Symphony Orchestra, ASO, and other art activities has raised the visibility and quality of those organizations.

When working with the ASO, Mr. Edwards embodied its core values. His commitment to the highest quality of music, outreach and engagement with the community, the cultivation of its legacy, and his creativity all helped to mold the ASO into the premier orchestra it is today. Through the Patricia and Arthur Edwards Family Foundation charitable trust, Mr. Edwards was able to fund the Orfeo Alliance, a partnership between The Key School and the Annapolis Symphony Orchestra that produces an annual artist-in-residence program that benefits music education programs at Key School as well as artistic programs for the Orchestra. By supporting this program, Mr. Edwards ensured that the ASO would have a long term, tight knit relationship with its surrounding community as well as the opportunity to influence young minds through the arts.

Arthur has been a driving force for the betterment of the City of Annapolis and its citizens. He is the kind of person every community cherishes. Arthur's generosity with his time is well known and is only matched by his good humor. From the first day I met him, I have been amazed at the quiet humility of this man who has done so much for so many. The Annapolis area will forever be indebted for his outstanding work in bringing music and the arts to the community as a whole.

DITZA PEREZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ditza Perez

for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Ditza Perez is a 12th grader at Arvada Senior High and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Ditza Perez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ditza Perez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EAST SIDE CLUB

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 100th anniversary of the East Side Club and to recognize its outstanding commitment and contribution to our community.

In 1912, a group of businessmen from Madison's East side formed the East Side Advancement Association, which would eventually become the East Side Businessmen's Association (ESBMA) in 1922. Originally, the clubhouse was located in the old Hudson Hotel on Atwood Avenue and served as a place where members could gather for both business and recreational purposes. In 1947, as membership grew, the members purchased a prime piece of land located on the banks of Lake Monona and opened their new clubhouse on the site in 1955. This scenic location is where the East Side Club stands to this very day.

The East Side Club, as it has been known since 2006, is a hub for activity. The location along Lake Monona makes the club ideal for celebrations and has hosted countless weddings, birthdays, anniversaries, class reunions, and much more. In addition to private events, the East Side Club's Tiki Bar and Grill, bocce ball courts, Friday fish fry, and Sunday brunches offer families and friends a great setting to not only unwind and catch up with old friends, but also meet new ones.

Over the past century, the East Side Club has also proven to be much more than a social gathering place. The members' longstanding commitment to the surrounding community is an invaluable asset. For 72 years, the club held an annual Fall Festival establishing itself as an organization that cares deeply about the community. From hosting fundraisers for local charities to providing scholarships for local students, the East Side Club is always searching for new ways to give back to the community.

The East Side Club has provided entertainment and support to our community for 100 years and I offer hearty congratulations to the past and present staff and members on the celebration of this tremendous milestone. It is because of organizations like the East Side Club that I am so proud to represent the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin. I wish the club and its members nothing but the best and many more years of continued success.

IN HONOR OF MR. LARRY BALDWIN

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mr. Larry Baldwin as he is celebrated for his dedicated work on behalf of the environment.

In 2001, Larry graduated from Shippensburg University with a degree in GeoEnvironmental Studies. While earning his degree, Larry worked as an intern with the Chesapeake Bay Foundation where he was also an active volunteer for more than a decade. He began working for the Neuse River Foundation (NRF) in North Carolina in October, 2002 as the Lower Neuse RIVERKEEPER®.

During his nine years with NRF, Larry worked to engage countless volunteers and raise educational awareness on the importance of a healthy Neuse River. He was instrumental in establishing the Neuse RIVERKEEPER® RiverKids program and mobilizing RiverWatch and Muddy Water Watch volunteers to help monitor the Neuse River and its tributaries.

Today, Larry serves as the North Carolina Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFO) Coordinator for Waterkeeper Alliance. He is focused on training and educating Riverkeepers worldwide on CAFO pollution. Additionally, his expertise has given Larry the opportunity to educate not only the public, but the government on environmental issues. Just last month, Larry was in Washington, D.C. educating Congress on the public health and environmental hazards created by factory farm facilities.

He is also active with numerous environmental groups including the Waterkeeper Alliance, America Rivers, River Network, North Carolina Conservation Network and the Eastern Carolina Coastal Caucus. He is a member of the Craven County Water Use Reduction Committee, Emergency Planning Committee and the Crystal Coast Disaster Coalition.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Mr. Larry Baldwin, an outspoken advocate for environmental protection.

A TRIBUTE TO ALFRED L. DESERIO

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Alfred L. DeSerio. A 42-year veteran of the U.S. Marine Corps and respected member of the community, Alfred died Saturday at the age of 105.

DeSerio was born and raised in Philadelphia where his family operated a bakery. He would help deliver Italian bread on a horse-drawn carriage. Before his 18th birthday, he lied about his age to enlist in the Marines where he attained the rank of master sergeant.

Mr. DeSerio was a perfect example of the "Greatest Generation." He served our nation with distinction in the Pacific Theater of World War II and in the Korean War. During World War II, one of DeSerio's duties was to escort the honored remains of fellow Marines home to their families. It was a job he took very seriously.

Mr. DeSerio served his country twice during the Vietnam War.

After retiring from the service in 1970, DeSerio moved to Collingdale. He was a maintenance worker at Mercy Fitzgerald Hospital in Darby until his retirement in 1988. Unfortunately, he lost his wife Mary in 1985.

A resident at St. Francis Country House since 2002, he was often recognized for his years of service while receiving proclamations from state government and a challenge coin from the commandant of the Marine Corps. His military decorations include the World War II Victory Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal with one star, the Vietnam Gallantry Cross with palms and frame, the National Defense Service Medal and the United Nations Service Medal.

DeSerio was a longtime member of the Upper Darby Marine Corps League Detachment No. 884, which named him Citizen of the Year in January.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you, and my other distinguished colleagues join me in recognizing the life of Alfred L. DeSerio and his service to our nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 223, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

ONE LAPTOP PER CHILD

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ketaki Desai, Elizabeth Cullinan, Tim Kelly, and Reginald Cox, four graduate students from Carnegie Mellon's Heinz School of Public Policy and Management, for their first place finish at the Hult Global Case Challenge.

Their innovative program, One Laptop Per Child, seeks to provide durable, low energy laptops for children in 3rd world countries with limited educational resources. This idea garnered the top prize at the Hult Challenge, where these CMU grad students were awarded $333,000 to encourage and further their initiative.

The Hult Global Case Challenge, now in its third year, is focused on bringing some of the brightest minds in the world together to find ways to solve key social challenges. This year, the three categories—education, energy,

and housing—had hundreds of entrants from over 130 countries around the world. Such luminaries as Muhammad Yunus, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize judged the final round; and President Bill Clinton handed out the top awards for each category. CMU's Ketaki Desai, Elizabeth Cullinan, Tim Kelly, and Reginald Cox won first place in the education category.

One Laptop Per Child seeks to provide greater educational resources for children ages 6 through 12 in impoverished areas of the world. OLPC has designed laptops with several key features geared towards helping these children. They cost significantly less to manufacture than the standard laptops we use here in the US; they are pre-loaded with lots of educational software, and have wireless internet built in; they are low energy, ensuring that even children in communities without electricity can use them, then recharge the laptops using solar energy; the laptops' screens can be read in sunlight—an important feature because so many of these children go to school outside; and, perhaps most importantly, these laptops are extremely durable and rugged, because, let's face it, kids are going to be kids, no matter where they are in the world.

By providing children with these laptops, One Laptop Per Child hopes to broaden children's worldview, and enrich their educational experiences, because, as they see it, education is the foundation for the other solutions to problems like a lack of shelter or running water. Their goal is to donate and distribute 20 million laptops to poor children throughout the world over the next 5 years.

This is just one more example of the innovative work that's being done in Pittsburgh, and I am proud to be their representative. Congratulations to these grad students and to all the bright minds in Pittsburgh working so hard to solve the world's problems. I thank them for their dedication.

RECOGNIZING SERGEANT CHRISTOPHER OSBORNE

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sergeant Christopher Osborne of Labadie, Missouri, who was awarded the Purple Heart due to injuries he sustained while serving in Afghanistan. I am honored to recognize Sergeant Osborne for his service to our nation.

Sergeant Osborne was presented the Purple Heart medal on December 29, 2011, at Bagram Airfield by Major General Stephen L. Danner, adjutant general of the Missouri National Guard. The Purple Heart is awarded in the name of the President of the United States to any member of the Armed Forces of the United States who has been wounded or killed.

Sergeant Osborne serves in the 1138th Transportation Company, a medium truck unit headquartered at Jefferson Barracks in south St. Louis County. The 1138th has been performing convoy operations, delivering supplies to coalition forces throughout Afghanistan. On a night mission in October 2011 while serving as a Scout truck commander, Sergeant Osborne and his convoy came under attack from an improvised explosive device (IED). The IED heavily damaged Sergeant Osborne's vehicle, but he and his three fellow crew members survived the assault. Sergeant Osborne returned to full duty within a few weeks of the attack.

He is a veteran of Operation Iraqi Freedom and is currently serving in Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring Sergeant Christopher Osborne and thanking him for his continued service to our county.

CONGRATULATING MR. MA YING-JEOU, PRESIDENT OF TAIWAN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the people of Taiwan on the occasion of their presidential inauguration this May 20. Mr. Ma Ying-jeou was re-elected to a second term on January 14th. May the long-term ongoing relationship between Taiwan and the United States continue to develop and grow and may there be permanent peace and security in the Taiwan Strait. Congratulations to President Ma Ying-jeou and his people.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MAURICE D. HINCHEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 215 I inadvertently voted ''aye'' when I intended to vote ''no'' on the Huizenga Amendment to H.R. 5326, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

I would like the RECORD to reflect this error as I reiterate my strong opposition to this amendment and reaffirm my support for our nation's public sector employees, who are adversely affected by OMB Circular A-76's methodology.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL NURSES WEEK

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Nurses Week.

This week it is important for us to come together and pay special tribute to the women and men who make up the largest segment of our healthcare workforce.

Nurses are truly the backbone of our healthcare system.

They not only work in our hospitals and clinics, but are present in our schools, our workplaces, and in so many facets of our everyday lives.

However, our increasing demand for nurses continues to grow at a rate faster than the current supply can alleviate.

By 2020, the overall need for new nurses is expected to reach a staggering 1.2 million.

For the nursing workforce to meet this demand, we must ensure that federal investment in nursing does not falter.

The Nurse Reinvestment Act, which I authored and was signed into law in 2002, set the framework to do this.

But we all must come together, on both sides of the aisle, to support these crucial programs and to support nursing education and a robust nursing workforce.

I encourage my colleagues and all Americans to take time out this week to thank the nurses in your life and to join me in recognition of these professionals who tirelessly care for the health of ourselves and our loved ones.

RECOGNIZING LT. COL. DAVID CARROLL FOR HIS TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF SERVICE IN THE U.S. AIR FORCE.

HON. DAVID SCHWEIKERT

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Lieutenant Colonel David Carroll for his twenty-five years of honorable service to our country and the United States Air Force.

Our community is proud of all our men and women in uniform and it is always a great experience to see so many of them thrive and succeed in service to their country.

I join the United States Air Force and wish Lt. Col. Carroll all the best in his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I submit a clarification of my vote on rollcall No. 233 the Flores Amendment No. 10, to H.R. 5326. I mistakenly voted ''nay'' when I intended to vote ''yea''. The amendment would remove a standing prohibition on federal purchases of coal-to-liquid fuels, which have the potential to greatly increase our energy security.

I am a strong supporter of coal-to-liquid technology and am a cosponsor of H.R. 2036, the American Alternative Fuels Act, which would repeal the very same prohibition this amendment defunds. My vote against the Flores amendment was accidental. I regret my error and appreciate the opportunity for clarification.

HONORING THE LIFE AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF JOHNNY MAESTRO

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a great singer and humanitarian, John Mastrangelo, known to his fans, friends, and fellow musicians as Johnny Maestro. Johnny would have been 73 years old this week, and his influence on popular music and on the New York neighborhoods he loved so dearly is still being felt.

John Mastrangelo was born on Manhattan's Lower East Side on May 7, 1939, graduated from Charles Evans Hughes High School in 1956, and attended Borough of Manhattan Community College.

In 1956, John Mastrangelo joined four teenage singers from Manhattan's Lower East Side to form The Crests. Their vocal harmony was innovative, combining elements of jazz, R&B, and early rock 'n' roll to become true pioneers of rock and roll music. They were one of the first integrated popular vocal groups. While the rest of the country was still struggling with the legacy of Jim Crow, The Crests—Johnny Maestro, who was Italian-American; three African Americans: J. T. Carter, Talmoudge Gough, and Patricia Van Dross (older sister of R&B great Luther Vandross); and Harold Torres, who was Puerto Rican—were recording groundbreaking music. With Johnny Maestro as the lead singer, The Crests recorded hits like ''16 Candles,'' ''Trouble in Paradise,'' ''The Angels Listened In'' and ''Step by Step.''

Following his time with The Crests, Johnny Maestro had a short solo career, and then joined another popular New York group, the Del-Satins, as lead singer. In 1968, they merged with a Long Island group, The Rhythm Method, to form The Brooklyn Bridge. The Brooklyn Bridge recorded a series of hits, including ''Welcome Me Love,'' ''You'll Never Walk Alone,'' and ''Your Husband, My Wife.'' They had their biggest hit with Jimmy Webb's ''The Worst That Could Happen.'' Johnny Maestro and The Brooklyn Bridge continued to perform for forty-two years. Johnny Maestro's exceptional tenor voice won accolades from fans and fellow musicians alike. His distinctive voice remained vibrant and strong throughout his fifty-three year career.

Johnny Maestro was more than a great musician; he was also a great humanitarian. Johnny and the Brooklyn Bridge gave generously of their time, performing benefit concerts for numerous good causes.

He performed at many fundraising events on Staten Island such as the Borough President's ''Back to the Beach'' concert. He also performed for the New York City Fire Department and Police Department, the United States Military, Italian American Association, as well as church and school fundraisers. He performed on the Jerry Lewis Telethon and as part of ''We Are the World,'' which raised funds for worldwide hunger relief.

Johnny Maestro and The Brooklyn Bridge were inducted into the Vocal Group Hall of Fame in 2005, the Long Island Hall of Fame in 2006, and the South Carolina Rhythm and Blues Hall of Fame, just to name a few of their many honors.

On March 26, 2011, the City of New York honored him by renaming the intersection of Mason Avenue and Midland Avenue on Staten Island as ''Johnny Maestro Way.''

Johnny Maestro and The Brooklyn Bridge were unswerving supporters of our police, fire, military, and Italian-American benevolent associations. The communities I represent warmly remember the benefit concerts Johnny Maestro and The Brooklyn Bridge participated in to aid 9/11 responders and their families. In 2007, Johnny Maestro sang at a concert digitally filmed and sent to bases of our Armed Forces overseas. Johnny Maestro and The Brooklyn Bridge ended their concerts by singing ''You'll Never Walk Alone'' and dedicated the song to the men and women in uniform. Today, the surviving members of The Brooklyn Bridge continue to honor Johnny's legacy by performing the songs he sang with The Crests and The Brooklyn Bridge, and supporting the humanitarian causes he held so dear.

Sadly, that great voice was stilled when Johnny Maestro died at the age of 70, following a valiant struggle with cancer. He continued to perform up until two months before his death.

Mr. Speaker, Johnny Maestro was the consummate New Yorker. He was talented, and he gave of his gifts and his success for the betterment of his City and those most in need. His life and his art are an example of what is best in our City and in our Nation. I urge all members of the House to join me in remembering and honoring Johnny's Maestro's life and work, and to remember a man whose musical accomplishments and humanitarian deeds have touched the lives of so many people.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 2012

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5326) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes:

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chair, I oppose H.R. 5326, the FY13 Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies Appropriations and am deeply concerned about provisions included in the bill that will roll back important civil rights protections and undermine key protections for youth in the juvenile justice system.

SECTION 540: EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION RIDER TO UNDERMINE THE AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT

Despite passage of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, ADEA, forty-five years ago, older workers continue to face discrimination in the workplace. They are demoted, denied promotions and fired simply because of their age. While the ADEA provides important protections, older workers continue to be hard hit during these difficult economic times. The challenges they face are substantial. As compared to their younger colleagues, older workers have greater difficulty finding new employment and are twice as likely to be out of work for 99 weeks or longer. The EEOC reports that the number of age discrimination charges filed increased by over 70 percent between 2006 and 2011. And according to the AARP, 60 percent of workers interviewed report experiencing or witnessing age discrimination in the workplace.

The protections afforded older workers have been under assault in recent years. In 2009, the Supreme Court rolled back workplace protections for older workers in Gross v. FBL Financial decision. In this case, the Supreme Court held that victims of age discrimination must meet a higher burden than other forms of workplace discrimination when bringing a claim. Rather than having to prove age was a motivating factor for an adverse employment action, older workers are now required to show age was the decisive factor when raising an ADEA claim.

The bill before us today would be another significant setback for older workers in this country. H.R. 5326 would prohibit funds made available by the Act to be used to implement, administer, or enforce the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's, EEOC, final regulations on Disparate Impact and Reasonable Factors Other than Age under the ADEA published in March 2012. According to the EEOC, the rider in H.R. 5326 ''would undermine vigorous enforcement of the nation's age discrimination laws at a time when older workers are particularly vulnerable.''

The EEOC regulation at issue should not be controversial. It gives employers greater clarity on how to avoid unlawful disparate impacts under the ADEA. This clarity should be welcomed not rejected. EEOC's intent behind the regulation is straightforward, ''to bring . . . existing [EEOC] regulation into conformance with . . . Supreme Court precedent and to explain the meaning of RFOA [Reasonable Factor Other than Age] defense to employees, employers, and courts.''

Eliminating this regulation would create new confusion on what standards—even outdated ones—might apply in its stead. As a result, H.R. 5326 would create legal uncertainty and uneven results in these cases and would also eliminate important tools for EEOC to use to help employers comply with their obligations under the law.

Instead of spending time rolling back the rights of older workers and creating more legal uncertainty for those who are victims of age discrimination, Congress should be fighting for the rights of older workers in the workplace and working together on a bipartisan basis to reverse the Supreme Court's decision in Gross v. FBL Financial Group.

I am also deeply concerned that H.R. 5326 would fund the EEOC at a level which is $7 million less than the President's request. Last year, the agency received nearly one-million discrimination charge filings—the fourth straight year of record filings. The EEOC must have the resources necessary to combat workplace discrimination and retaliation. Without it, workers will see longer waits as case backlogs increase and the agency's ability to enforce nondiscrimination protections will be undermined.

SECTION 218: DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE RIDER TO WEAKEN AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT PROTECTIONS

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, ADA, is intended ''to provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities.'' The ADA provides nondiscrimination protection to ensure that individuals with disabilities have access to and can participate in all aspects of society.

A component of these protections requires that public accommodations construct facilities to be accessible and that existing facilities become accessible when it is ''readily achievable.'' The ''readily achievable'' expectation is defined as ''easily accomplishable and able to be carried out without much difficulty or expense.'' There is considerable flexibility to determine what is achievable based on a business' particular circumstances.

The Department of Justice has the authority to carry out the mandate to eliminate discrimination against individuals with disabilities under the ADA. In doing so, the Department of Justice finalized regulations in September 2010 which included regulations regarding accessibility of swimming pools. These regulations are based on accessibility standards established by the Access Board that takes into consideration the needs of individuals with disabilities as well as the needs of business.

To comply with the regulation, businesses would need to make an assessment and take steps to accomplish what is ''readily achievable'' for swimming pool accessibility for that business. For some businesses that may require fixed or portable lifts, while for other business if may not require doing anything until increasing accessibility is ''readily achievable'' for that business. H.R. 5326 rolls back protections within the ADA by prohibiting the Department of Justice to use funds to implement the standards for swimming pool accessibility. This bill would establish an extremely dangerous precedent weakening the Department of Justice's authority to enforce the ADA weakening critical civil rights protections.

Regardless of whether a person has a disability or not, that person should have the right to access swimming pools. To enable individuals with disabilities to participate fully in their communities, their communities must be accessible to them. Congress should focus on increasing access to community life rather than establishing dangerous precedents which prevent individuals from accessing their communities.

TITLE II

I am strongly opposed to the funding cuts for Title II of the Juvenile Justice Delinquency and Prevention Act, JJDPA. The JJDPA was first written in 1974 with the goal of supporting states' actions to prevent youth crime and provide certain core protections for children. The law rightfully recognized that clear biological differences between teenagers and adults meant that youth should not be treated in the same manner as adults. Without question, youth must be held accountable for their actions. But justice should not be driven by fads or politics. The juvenile justice system in this country currently affects thousands of children and youth, and the core protections in JJDPA are critical to efforts that help reduce youth crime, keep our communities safe, and ensure our juvenile justice system preserves basic rights for the children it serves. The juvenile justice system can be a place of redemption and rehabilitation or a place where children are thrown away. The funding cuts to Title II of JJDPA threaten the existence of these protections, and if this appropriation were enacted, our nation's children, families, and communities would undoubtedly suffer.

LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL WE THE PEOPLE COMPETITION

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last week an outstanding group of young men and women from Portland, Oregon's Lincoln High School placed first in the national ''We the People Competition,'' a contest sponsored by the Classroom Law Project. It is an extraordinary program that allows young men and women to dive deeply into constitutional theory and the legislative process, and understand what it all means for contemporary America in an all-too-often dysfunctional political arena.

Over the years, it's been my privilege to work with instructors and students on these programs, to have watched them prepare for hours at a time, and watch them celebrate their successes. In the Portland Public School District, we are particularly proud of our high schools Lincoln and Grant, who have competed against each other for the State title for more than 2 dozen years, and consistently are strong contenders at the national level.

Their achievements are testimony not only to the hard work and intelligence of the student competitors, but also to a dedicated core of teachers and citizen volunteers, often prominent judges and lawyers, and alumni of the program who continue their involvement long after they cease to be students. A special shout-out this year and every year should go to Lincoln instructor Tim Swinehart, local attorney Steve Griffith and his volunteer team, and the extraordinarily supportive principal, Peyton Chapman.

As I met with the Lincoln team earlier this spring in preparation for the national championships, it was clear to me that this was a stellar team even by the standards of this terrific program. That they won this year with a team largely composed of sophomores makes it all the more an extraordinary accomplishment. I would willingly grant them voting privileges here in Congress.

In addition to the dedicated coaches and volunteers, I want to recognize this year's winning student team. They are: Avery Ballato, Catherine Barton, Marty Berger, Hallie Blashfield, Ryan Bloom, Danny Brillhart, John Carey, Julian Dann, Julia Eckelmann, Michael Field, Natina Gilbert, Nikhil Goyal, Kendra Hong, Robin Jayaswal, Katie Kelly, Sierra Killian, John Kim, Emma Lane, Duncan MacEachern, William Mao, Olnita Martini, Evan Neuhausen, Sara Newman, Vicki Niu, Sammy Purnell, Justin Richter, Beckett Rueda, Emma Simmons, Sage Smiley, Nita Sridharan, Eri Stern, Mara Strauss, Molly Walls, Carolyn Wheatley, Ajeya Woods and Cole Zollinger.

I urge my colleagues to become acquainted with their local high school constitution competition. I hope the day will come when Congress again gives the financial support to the Classroom Law Project for the civic education that is so important and so critical to preparing students to participate as citizens. With a stronger investment in the Classroom Law Project and programs like We the People, I believe we would all feel better about the future of the Republic.

TRIBUTE TO HONOR FLIGHT OF OREGON

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 28 World War II veterans from Oregon who will be visiting their memorial this Saturday in Washington, DC through Honor Flight of Oregon. On behalf of a grateful state and country, we welcome these heroes to the nation's capital.

The veterans on this flight from Oregon are: Melvin Dagsland, U.S. Army; Kenneth Graves, U.S. Army; Frank Hernandez, U.S. Army; Jesse Pollard, U.S. Army; Harold Hayes, U.S. Army; Milton Anderson, U.S. Army Air Forces; James Holbrook, U.S. Army Air Forces; Clarence Mahan, U.S. Army Air Forces; Paul Nielsen, U.S. Army Air Forces; Carl Orndoff, U.S. Army Air Forces; Jack Owens, U.S. Army Air Forces; Donicio Padilla, U.S. Army Air Forces; James Stone, U.S. Army Air Forces; James Hanley, U.S. Army Air Forces; Melvin Pearigen, U.S. Coast Guard; Floyd Burt, U.S. Marine Corps; Delbert Littrell, U.S. Marine Corps; Edward Montagne, U.S. Marine Corps; Eldon Branson, U.S. Navy; Calvin Gorte, U.S. Navy; GL Hamblin, U.S. Navy; Lester Herring, U.S. Navy; Richard Laubert, U.S. Navy; Donald Lister, U.S. Navy; Vincent Monzel, U.S. Navy; Otis Pierce, U.S. Navy; Forest Scott, U.S. Navy; Raymond Woods, U.S. Navy.

These 28 heroes join more than 81,000 veterans from across the country who, since 2005, have journeyed from their home states to Washington, DC to reflect at the memorials built in honor of our nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, each of us is humbled by the courage of these soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines who put themselves in harm's way for our country and way of life. As a nation, we can never fully repay the debt of gratitude owed to them for their honor, commitment, and sacrifice in defense of the freedoms we have today.

My colleagues, please join me in thanking these veterans and the volunteers of Honor Flight of Oregon for their exemplary dedication and service to this great country. I especially want to recognize and thank Gail Yakopatz for her tireless work as president of Honor Flight of Oregon.

RECOGNIZING THE RESILIENCE OF JOPLIN, MISSOURI

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the resilience of the Joplin, Missouri community.

One year ago the Joplin community was devastated by an EF–5 tornado but showed the Nation and the world what it means to help your neighbors in their greatest time of need.

The tornado that wreaked havoc on our friends and neighbors was a ½ mile to ¾ mile wide and traveled approximately 13 miles, forever changing the landscape of the community and lives of those who call Joplin home. This destructive force of nature claimed 161 lives, damaged an estimated 7,500 residential dwellings, damaged nine schools, and damaged 545 businesses.

I saw the immediate aftermath of this disaster with my own eyes, and I know it is vital to get the right resources to the right people as quickly as possible, because lives depend on it. As Joplin's representative in Congress it was my job to make sure the Federal Government worked with local and state officials to provide disaster relief. As a neighbor it was my job to help in any way I could, from setting up cots in aid stations with other volunteers to helping with search and rescue. Missouri is called the Show-Me State, and Missourians and Americans from across our great country showed the Nation and the world the compassion and generosity of the American spirit. Over 120,000 volunteers poured into the Joplin area to offer their help and support, and some are still assisting with rebuilding efforts.

Before the life-changing event of May 22, 2011, Joplin was just a town in Missouri, but now its sense of community is known throughout the Nation. While the Joplin community is still picking up the pieces from that fateful day, I know they have a bright future ahead. Though lives were lost and homes and businesses destroyed the one thing the tornado did not take is the sense of community that makes Joplin a welcoming place to live, work and visit. Joplin is stronger despite this unfortunate disaster.

As we commemorate the one-year anniversary which changed the lives of all families impacted by this horrific disaster we treasure the good times in the past and look forward to a promising future for Joplin and all who call this wonderful place home.

Even though we can't explain why tragedy strikes, we can use what happened here to remind us of the good inside us all and to remind us that even though we lost a lot, we did not lose everything. Joplin has faced challenges that most communities will not ever experience, but the outpouring of support is also something any community would be fortunate enough to receive.

If anyone thinks that there are not good, generous and compassionate people in this world, then they need to come down to Joplin to see firsthand how this community came together during their time of need.

MISSING CHILDREN'S AND EXPLOITED CHILDREN PROGRAMS

HON. TIMOTHY J. WALZ

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, child abuse is an unacceptable behavior in our society that must be condemned and prevented. Our children deserve to grow up in safe and loving environments. As a parent and teacher, I am always in search of ways to eliminate this problem in homes, schools and child care centers. I would like to commend the committee for its support of the Missing Children's and Exploited Children programs. This funding is essential to combating child abuse, which is a national problem.

In order to end child abuse, it is essential we support programs that train child protection professionals to better recognize, react and respond to abuse. Each and every day, child protection professionals work directly with maltreated children across the country. They fight tirelessly to reduce cases of child abuse and to respond effectively to child maltreatment. Unfortunately, the vast majority of these professionals leave college inadequately trained to handle cases of child maltreatment. And, once in the workforce, it is often far too difficult for them to access the quality training they need to do their jobs more effectively.

In my district, I am proud to have the National Child Protection Center located in my district at Winona State University. The National Child Protection Center works to end child abuse, neglect and other forms of child maltreatment through education, training, awareness, prevention, advocacy and the pursuit of justice. The Center trains future and front-line child protection professionals around the nation so that they will be prepared to recognize and report the abuse of a child. This work should be applauded and supported.

I.would like to commend the Senate Commerce Justice and Science committee for including language in their Committee report that would support efforts to train current child protection professionals, continue prevention programs and to develop undergraduate and graduate curricula on the maltreatment and exploitation of children. As we continue through the appropriations process, I would like to encourage my colleagues in the House to support this language and to include it in the final report.

BAHRAIN

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, tonight I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the situation in Bahrain. Since gained independence from the British in the 1970's, Bahrain has forged close links with the United States, and become one of our most important allies in the strategically important Persian Gulf region. In fact, Bahrain is home to the U.S. Navy's Fifth Fleet.

Since last year, however, the country has been disrupted by a series of anti-government demonstrations. Understanding how important our relationship with Bahrain is, especially to our efforts to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons, I recently traveled to Bahrain to assess the situation first-hand. And I would like to thank Dr. Al Khalafalla and the Bahrain American Council for helping to make my visit a success.

I think it's important that we get the proper perspective on what's going on over there. There is no question there have been problems in the past. There has been overreaction by the police in certain instances in the past year, year and a half. As a result, there were people who were hurt severely when they were demonstrating in the streets of Bahrain. But the King and the Crown Prince have worked very hard to solve this problem. As a matter of fact, the King appointed an outside commission, and the commission's report and reform recommendations are strongly supported by both sides of the dispute. Yet, the parties involved seem to be having difficulty approaching the conference table. Why?

One of the problems they have over there is the Iranian Government is working to try to undermine many of the countries in the Persian Gulf, and Bahrain is one of them. Some have suggested that the demonstrations have been infiltrated by outside radical elements—supported by Iran—dedicated to destabilizing and undermining the Bahrain Government. The evidence is inconclusive but the possibility of Iran doing just that is plausible. Whatever the reasons, for the demonstrators, this conflict is not going to be resolved in Bahrain, it must be resolved through negotiation.

I am submitting an article from the May 1, 2012 edition of the New York Times for the RECORD which I believe lays out the case for the United States to actively encourage both sides to to take a step back, take a deep breath, and commit to resolving their differences around the conference table. I strongly urge my colleagues to read these articles.

[From the New York Times, May 1, 2012]

THE PRINCE AND THE AYATOLLAH

(By Ed Husain)

When I was invited to visit Bahrain by members of the royal family, I hesitated. They had crushed peaceful protesters last year, and their police had used tear gas against human rights activists. Like everybody else, including some of the Bahraini policemen I later spoke with, I was appalled at the violence and thought the monarchy had blood on its hands. But I felt that declining the offer was irresponsible. I wanted to know the monarchy's side of the story. So I accepted the invitation—on the condition that I was free to meet Bahrain's opposition.

Bahrain is a tiny island nation of 600,000 citizens, with a Parliament of only 40 members, and it cannot be understood if looked at in isolation. For one thing, it stands at the forefront of a regional cold war. Saudi Arabia lies to the west, connected by a 25-kilometer causeway built jointly by the Saudis and Bahrainis. To the east, across the waters of the Gulf, lies Iran. Both Tehran and Riyadh have major stakes in Bahrain.

En route to Bahrain, I stopped by in Riyadh and had many conversations with top government officials, journalists and academics. Their views were clear: Saudi Arabia would not stand by and see Bahrain's ruling al-Khalifa family fall from power. The Saudis sent in soldiers to help the al-Khalifas regain control of Bahrain in March 2011 and are prepared to do so again.

If King Hamad bin Isa al-Khalifa abdicates, they asked, then who would be next among Arab kings? What consequences would the ensuing chaos have on global energy supplies? If power falls into the hands of the main Shiite opposition group, Bahrain could join Hamas, Hezbollah, Iraq, Syria and Lebanon under the Iranian sphere of influence in the Middle East.

In Bahrain, I was a guest of the king's son, Crown Prince Salman bin Hamad bin Isa al-Khalifa, who, in the context of the country's current political climate, is a liberal's liberal. Educated in Washington and Cambridge, England, the 42-year-old prince spoke

about Britain's constitutional monarchy, the dire need for political reform in his country, and his yearning for a political settlement with the opposition.

He appeared genuinely contrite about the excesses of the government in Bahrain, but also convinced that the opposition has no vision of how to improve matters. ''The path to hell is paved with good intentions,'' he said. Constantly, he referred to the need for ''evolution'' rather than ''revolution.''

Within the ruling family, he led the charge for reform last year, but was abandoned by Al Wefaq, the main opposition party, midway through discussions. The party kept changing its demands and the leaders were divided over what they wanted. This strengthened the hand of the more conservative wing of the royal family, led by the conservative, long-serving prime minister, Prince Khalifa bin Sulman al-Khalifa, 74.

The opposition wants the prime minister to resign, but neither the king nor the crown prince can dare ask a family elder to depart in ignominy.

Just as there are divisions within the royal family, there are serious splits in Bahrain's Shiite political scene. Not all the Shiites in Bahrain want to topple the monarchy. Nor is the opposition composed only of democrats who simply want to oust a monarchy.

Again and again, in villages and in meetings with Shiite opposition figures, one name kept coming up: Ayatollah Issa Qassim, spiritual leader of Al Wefaq, whose writ runs large across the Shiite opposition movement. Educated in Iran, his sermons are generally anti-American, anti-democracy and vehemently pro-Iran. When Iran's green movement challenged the mullahs in Tehran, Ayatollah Qassim accused the West of ''trying to divide an otherwise peaceful country'' and of ''hatred toward Islam.''

He is also intolerant of Shiites with divergent views back home. Three Shiite members of Bahrain's Parliament explained to me the consequences of daring to challenge Ayatollah Qassim. When they decided not to honor Al Wefaq's call to boycott elections last October, Al Wefaq-controlled mosques called on people to attack them; firebombs were thrown at their homes and their children were harassed on the streets. They live in fear for their lives, and they are not alone.

Ayatollah Qassim's supporters not only undermined the crown prince's efforts at reconciliation, but in recent weeks have taken to rioting in villages across Bahrain. In Sitra, one such village outside Manama, I spoke in Arabic with a police official, a Shiite, who said: ''I am Bahraini before I am Shiite. We must live as Bahrainis and do what's right for our country, and not be controlled by Iran's clerics.''

Like Bahraini Sunnis, the official felt the monarchy was not giving him the means to respond to the rioters. They have no guns, he complained, which left them at the mercy of rioters with home-made arrows and Molotov cocktails. ''Last year, my colleagues in the army and interrogation units were wrong to torture protesters,'' he said. ''But what about the attacks on us now? How are we to defend ourselves?''

Ayatollah Qassim has not called on his supporters to cease violence against the police, government and dissenting Shiite leaders. Instead, he has demanded that Jawad Hussain, one of the legislators I spoke with, and other dissenting Shiite political leaders and clerics come to the ayatollah's mosque during Friday services and publicly repent for betraying ''the community.''

Ayatollah Qassim's message does not justify the torture and human rights violations exercised by the government of Bahrain. The demands of the opposition for an end to discrimination in government jobs and for greater political freedoms are valid. But calls for greater human rights must not be selective. Last year the opposition blocked bills that gave women equality and freedom in Bahrain because the ayatollahs opposed it, while the monarchy and Sunni parties supported it.

Bahrain is an important nation because it is a focal point of what is happening in the Middle East today—the battle to find a balance between preserving the best values of the Islamic tradition while the region eases its way into the modern world.

It is crucial that Western nations help the country achieve this balance, and that they not provide diplomatic cover for rioters and clerics in the name of human rights and democracy.

Instead, they should be using every pressure point to strengthen the reformist strands within the monarchy in support of political change, equal right's for women and an end to the language of Shiite sectarianism in Bahrain. Negotiations around the political table are the only way forward in Bahrain.

Ed Husain is a senior fellow for Middle Eastern Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations.

HONORING AWARD-WINNING BROADCAST JOURNALIST STEPHEN DEAN

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor award-winning broadcast journalist Stephen Dean, whose dedicated investigative reporting exposes abuses of power and government missteps. Arrests and indictments tend to follow his in-depth reporting of shady dealings, including those by judges and other elected officials.

A master of the hidden camera, Stephen Dean and his team at Local 2 Investigates get results from Houston to Austin to Washington, DC. Even the venerable Washington Post has reported on one of his award-winning investigations.

From catching seven Houston law enforcement officers cheating in a traffic investigation class to reporting that Houston police were using mentally ill prisoners to practice drawing blood for DWI arrests, Stephen Dean has never been afraid to dig for information no one else will.

For nearly three decades, Stephen Dean's hard work has earned him award after award including the highest honor in broadcasting. He was honored with a Peabody Award for his series of reports on how the U.S. military used to investigate crimes. Dean's reporting documented how the armed services were ignoring crucial evidence in crimes against their own soldiers, prompting Congress to force changes with a law that was signed by the President.

For nearly two decades from radio to television, the Houston area has counted on Dean's watchdog eye on law enforcement. His dogged pursuit of M.U.D. policing led to a change in Texas law.

In addition to the Peabody Award, his national investigative reporting honors include the Society of Professional Journalists' Sigma Delta Chi Award, the Radio Television News Directors Edward R. Murrow Award and several State Bar of Texas ''Gavel Awards'' for legal reporting. In 2005, Dean was named Best Reporter by the Texas Associated Press Broadcasters for his live coverage of breaking news. The TAPB also named him the sole winner of its ''Freedom of Information Award'' four years in a row for his ability to overcome obstacles in digging through public records.

A nationally published author, Dean's 2011 book ''PR Misfires Under the Gun'', detailed costly public relations mistakes that people make in emergencies. Stephen Dean, his wife Cindy, and his precious Harley Davidson will soon ride out of Houston to start a new journalistic chapter in their home state. We wish them safe travels and we feel obligated to warn Ohio wrongdoers, he is on the way.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. FRANCISCO ''QUICO'' CANSECO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. CANSECO. Mr. Speaker, due to a family emergency that required me to return to Texas, I missed several votes during two separate vote series on April 26, 2011 and April 27, 2011. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay'' on rollcall vote 184, ''aye'' on rollcall vote 185, ''aye'' on rollcall vote 186, ''aye'' on rollcall vote 187, ''aye'' on rollcall vote 188, ''aye'' on rollcall vote 189, ''aye'' on rollcall vote 190, ''nay'' on rollcall vote 191, ''aye'' on rollcall vote 192, ''aye'' on rollcall vote 193, ''nay'' on rollcall vote 194 and ''aye'' on rollcall vote 195.

RECOGNIZING CITIZENS' VIETNAMESE HUMAN RIGHTS PETITION TO WHITE HOUSE

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, in honor of the 18th annual Vietnam Human Rights Day on Friday, May 11, 2012, I would like to highlight a petition that can be found on the ''We the People'' section of the White House's Web site. This particular petition, which collected over 150,000 signatures from across the country, urges the administration to ''stop expanding trade at the expense of human rights.''

Vietnam's human rights record remains disgraceful and I look forward to the day when we can gather together to celebrate true freedom in Vietnam. This administration must show the world that promotion of human rights is a priority in U.S. foreign policy.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. PEDRO R. PIERLUISI

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 2012

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under

consideration the bill (H.R. 5326) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes:

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chair, I rise to reinforce the comments made by our colleague from Guam, Ms. BORDALLO, regarding the importance of funding in Fiscal Year 2013 and future years for coral reef research conducted by NOAA and its external partners. I represent Puerto Rico, one of the several U.S. jurisdictions that has tropical shallow-water coral reefs located off its coasts. Additionally, last year as a result of a federally-funded mission led by NOAA deep sea corals located off the southwestern coast of Puerto Rico were discovered at a depth of 500 feet and in an area spanning 12 miles across.

These reefs are the ''rainforests of the sea'' and their protection is linked to the success of our ecotourism economy, the integrity of our coastlines, the quality of our water, and the health of the rich and diverse marine life that surrounds our islands. Corals are threatened by a variety of stressors. Last month, NOAA released a status review of 82 coral species currently being evaluated for potential protection under the Endangered Species Act. The report indicates that 50 coral species found in U.S. waters are likely to become extinct, with seven Caribbean corals extremely likely to go extinct, five of which are among the most imperiled species.

Simply put, corals are decreasing around Puerto Rico and elsewhere in U.S. waters. The science that stands to be funded by this bill, H.R. 5326, is important for both monitoring the health of these corals and understanding the causes of their decline. Once understood, local, state and federal managers will be able to work together on mitigation and protection strategies. The decisions made in the final bill will determine whether and to what extent NOAA will be able to engage external partners, especially in the jurisdictions where coral reefs are located, to conduct this important science. I hope that, at the end of this process, NOAA will have the resources it needs from Congress to increase its collaboration with external research partners and to fund the science needed to inform management decisions for protecting coral reefs in U.S. waters. I, too, thank the Chairman, Mr. WOLF, and the Ranking Member, Mr. FATTAH, for their commitment to work with the other body in ensuring this priority is sufficiently funded during the conference process.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL TEACHERS APPRECIATION WEEK

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize our teachers for their dedication and tireless efforts in educating America's students. National Teachers Appreciation Week is a wonderful opportunity to honor the hard work our teachers perform daily to make a difference in the lives of students across the country.

While teaching is one of the most challenging jobs in the world, it is undoubtedly one of the most rewarding. I strongly believe that we must give unconditional support to our educators so that future generations of young Americans will have the ability to succeed in a global economy and face the challenges of tomorrow.

On National Teachers' Day, we honor our local educators and acknowledge the crucial role each teacher plays in making sure that every child receives a quality education. Throughout my Congressional District there are stories of young people who are succeeding, not only because of test scores, but also because of a teacher who realized their talent, believed in them, and helped them to believe in themselves. It is because of these great teachers who make a positive impact on the youth, achievements gaps between poor and minority students and their non-minority peers are beginning to close.

It is also my pleasure to thank our teachers in the military community this week. More than 1.2 million school-age military children are being educated by dedicated teachers in classrooms across the country. These educators help young ones ease transitions into a different school and a new community as they relocate from a military base to another.

This week and throughout the year, I encourage parents to thank teachers for their hard work, care and sacrifice. I will continue to offer my gratitude and appreciation to our spirited teaching champions for their outstanding achievements on behalf our nation's students and their future.

INTRODUCTION OF THE OVERDRAFT PROTECTION ACT OF 2012

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Overdraft Protection Act of 2012.

With the rise of debit cards and the constant presence of swipe terminals to use those cards to pay for everything from McDonald's to gas to candy bars, it's easier than ever for consumers to overdraw their checking accounts and incur overdraft fees.

That's how a fancy $5 cup of coffee can become a $35 cup of coffee faster than you can say 'overdrawn'! Some institutions have responded to consumer outrage over these fees by implementing a policy of denying debit card transactions that would overdraw an account and I applaud them.

But too many financial institutions don't make consumers aware of the perils of overdrafts, and most reorder the posting of transactions in a way that maximizes their fees.

Although the Federal Reserve issued a rule requiring institutions to obtain affirmative consent from consumers to opt into overdraft coverage two years ago, it is quite clear more needs to be done in the area of consumer disclosures and to help consumers avoid multiple overdrafts.

A survey released last week by Pew Charitable Trusts highlights the need for the bill I am introducing today.

More than one-third of those surveyed—people who had overdrawn their accounts in the past year—didn't know their bank offered overdraft coverage until they incurred a penalty fee, and more than half of people did not believe they had opted in. The Pew study also found that most of the people who overdraft their accounts do so more than once.

According to Moebs Services, overdraft fees brought in over $31 billion dollars in revenue to financial institutions in 2011.

As a result of the Federal Reserve's opt-in requirement the number of overdrafts has fallen, but some institutions have responded to the drop by increasing the cost of overdraft fees and continuing to intentionally manipulate the transactions' posting order in a way that maximizes the fees they can earn from this service.

My bill increases disclosure to consumers, limits the fees' price and frequency, and bans the manipulation of transactions.

Specifically, the Overdraft Protection Act will:

Require consumer consent before banks can permit overdraft fees to paper checks, automated charges and debit card swipe-terminal transactions.

Require that fees be 'reasonable and proportional' to the amount of the overdraft.

Cap the number of fees that can be charged at one per month and six per year.

Prohibit banks from manipulating the sequence in which checks and other debits are posted if it causes more overdrafts and maximizes fees paid to banks.

Require that consumers be warned at ATMs if their withdrawals will trigger an overdraft.

Require the CFPB to study the practices of pre-paid cards and if necessary extend these provisions to those products.

The Overdraft Protection Act will ensure consumers are protected from misleading practices and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

HONORING DR. LYNDA YOUNG

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend and congratulate Dr. Lynda Young on her successful term as President of the Massachusetts Medical Society.

Dr. Young has a long and distinguished record of activity in organized medicine. She practiced at Chandler Pediatrics in Worcester, Massachusetts for 34 years and was Chief of the Division of Community Pediatrics at the University of Massachusetts Memorial Children's Medical Center for over 30 years.

During her presidency, Dr. Young expertly and deftly represented the interests of physicians and their patients throughout the pioneering state negotiations over health care delivery and payment reform. At the national level, her expertise and leadership style have frequently been recognized as other policymakers learn from the Massachusetts experience.

She has also served as president of the Massachusetts Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics and has chaired its Committee on Continuing Education. A past president of the Worcester District Medical Society, she has held every office in the district. She has served as MMS President-Elect and Vice President, respectively, and has been a member of the Board of Trustees and House of Delegates.

Dr. Young's dedication to her patients, her family and physician colleagues has earned her a number of professional and civic accolades, including from the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Pernet Family Health Service, the YWCA of Central Massachusetts, the Montachusett Girl Scout Council, Notre Dame Academy in Worcester, and the City of Worcester's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women. This year Dr. Young will serve as the commencement speaker at the Mass. College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, where she will receive an honorary Doctorate of Science.

In addition to her busy pediatric practice, Dr. Young is a respected presence in the Worcester community. She is active in a number of Worcester organizations, serving as a member of the Board of Directors of the Health Foundation of Central Massachusetts, the International Center of Worcester, the Parent Family Health Service, and the City of Worcester Board of Health, among others.

I have had the utmost pleasure of knowing Dr. Young both professionally and personally for a number of years, including as my own children's pediatrician. Dr. Young epitomizes the compassionate pediatrician. Her exuberance and enthusiasm for her young patients are matched only by her expertise and medical knowledge.

I want to thank Dr. Young for her immense contributions and dedication to the pediatric and larger medical community in Central Massachusetts, and I wish her continued happiness with her family, Dr. Bob Sorrenti, their two sons and daughters-in-law and their precious grandson, Jack.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DR. MARY RITTLING, PRESIDENT OF DAVIDSON COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an outstanding leader in the North Carolina community college system, Dr. Mary Rittling, president of Davidson County Community College.

Dr. Rittling was honored in April as the 2012 North Carolina Community College President of the Year.

This award is designed to honor outstanding leaders within North Carolina's community college system.

Dr. Rittling's relentless focus on "what can be" versus "what is" drove critical changes to the college that helped the community adapt during a time when Davidson County and the rest of America suffered from job loss.

This is not the first time Dr. Rittling has been recognized for her efforts on behalf of the students and the community.

She has been recognized in the Triad as an Exceptional Leader in both 2009 and 2010. She was also named as the Outstanding Woman in Business by the Lexington Area Chamber of Commerce in 2009.

Thanks to Dr. Rittling for her dedication to serving her community and her investment in Davidson and Davie Counties. Congratulations on her many achievements and recognition of her student-centered philosophy.

HANOVER TOWNSHIP POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Hanover Township Police Department, which will celebrate its 100th anniversary on May 14, 2012.

Hanover Township was founded in 1770 by Captain Lazarus Stewart who fought for Connecticut against the Pennsylvanians in the Wyoming Valley. For his services, Captain Stewart and his company of forty men were granted the tract of land which became Hanover Township. Captain Stewart named the town after his hometown of Hanover in Dauphin County. In the 1820's, coal was discovered and by 1838, mining became a leading industry in the area. However, prior to the 1900's Hanover Township had very little in the way of municipal services.

Therefore in 1912, the Hanover Township Commissioners established a paid police force to secure the safety of persons and property within Hanover Township. The first force consisted of six officers and was led by Police Chief James H. Campbell. Today, there are fourteen officers, eight cruisers and a K–9 unit which provide for the safety of Hanover Township residents under the leadership of Police Chief Albert Walker.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 100 years, the Hanover Township Police Department has proudly served the citizens of Hanover, Pennsylvania. Therefore, I commend all those officers who have dedicated their lives to protecting their community and to all those who have gone on to their eternal rest.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE PENCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on May 8, 2012, because I was in my home state for the Indiana primary elections. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall votes 199, 200, 201, 203, 204, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 215, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223 and "nay" on rollcall votes 202, 205, 213, 214, 216.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF MRS. VIOLA JACKSON

HON. FREDERICA S. WILSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th birthday of Mrs. Viola Jackson, my constituent. Mrs. Jackson was born May 9, 1912 in Sharon, Taliaferro County, Georgia. She was the eleventh of thirteen children born to Tom and Mary Edwards. She has managed to outlive both her parents and siblings. Throughout her life, Mrs. Jackson has worked tirelessly to provide a better life for herself and her family.

From her childhood into her early adulthood, Mrs. Jackson worked on a farm as a tiller. However, her life would change considerably after meeting sharecropper Johnny Jackson, in 1938—a period of racial prejudice and injustice. After marrying Mr. Jackson, she continued working on the farm, where she later gave birth to Virginia Jackson on January 25, 1939, the couple's first child. In pursuit of better educational opportunities for Virginia, Mrs. Jackson sent her to live with her brother, in Miami Florida. In 1950, the Jacksons relocated to Miami, FL.

Shortly after arriving in Miami, Viola was employed by John Lieberman as a live-in housekeeper and nanny in Sunny Isles, FL. There, she worked six days a week, with only Thursdays off to spend with her family. However, her husband was gainfully employed in the saw mills of Opa-Locka as a lumberjack. Together, they saved enough money to buy their first home on Washington Street in Opa-Locka, which is located in the heart of District 17.

After years of working with the Lieberman family, Viola transitioned to the Frances Liebler family, where she worked as a housekeeper in their residence and hotel. Her work ethic and loyalty earned her a promotion as the Housekeeping Manager, a position she held until her retirement in 1965. However, she resumed working in 1973, after her love of children inspired her to launch a day care. Throughout her life, Viola was known for being more than an exceptional caretaker and employee; she was also known for her faith.

Her journey with God led her to many churches including Greater New Macedonia Missionary Baptist Church, Greater Tabernacle Missionary Baptist Church, United Christian Baptist Church, Fellowship Missionary Baptist Church and New Christ Tabernacle Church, where Mrs. Jackson serves as Church Mother. Her faith has sustained her through 100 years of hardships, health challenges and losses. I am hopeful that she will continue to serve as a role model and an inspiration to everyone around her.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent Mrs. Viola Jackson. She's not only a treasure to my district, but also to our nation. I encourage members of Congress to join me in celebrating her 100th birthday. Lastly, I pray that she may continue to have longevity and happiness for many more years to come.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 2012

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5326) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes:

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, I rise today out of concern for the language in this bill that would hinder the access of people with disabilities to swimming pools.

The standards that this language would undermine were based on standards first adopted under the Bush Administration. They are common-sense, flexible, and an important step for our constituents with disabilities.

Yet the language in this bill would prohibit the Department of Justice from enforcing these regulations, even though swimming venues only need to satisfy these standards if doing so is ''readily achievable'' and does not cause an undue burden.

These regulations would allow disabled Americans seeking to swim for physical relief, emotional therapy, or simple enjoyment the ability to do so, thus enjoying the same benefits that you or I would receive from swimming. And the regulations ensure that no business faces an undue hardship in doing so.

I'm disappointed that this language made its way into the bill.

Sometimes it feels like there is little we can agree on here, and I would hope that providing physical, emotional, and social relief to Americans struggling with physical disabilities while not imposing on businesses would be something we could come together on. I hope that as this bill goes to conference, this harmful language is removed so that all Americans—regardless of abilities—can enjoy one of life's simple pleasures.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

HON. SILVESTRE REYES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, during National Teacher Appreciation Week, I rise to honor our teachers.

Teachers are at the heart of our community, and this week we commemorate the hard-working men and women who educate and inspire our children. As part of National Teacher Appreciation Week, I was asked by the National Education Association to name a teacher who had a significant impact on my education. My journalism and debate coach, Mr. Ralph Chavez, quickly came to mind. He was not only a teacher but a mentor, friend and counselor. He inspired me to push myself, and helped me become the person I am today. This week, I am proud to help recognize all of our dedicated teachers who, like Mr. Chavez, have educated and motivated their students. As a parent and grandparent, I am grateful for the contributions of all of our educators, and am particularly proud of the teachers in the El Paso community.

As a Member of Congress, one of the best ways I can help make National Teacher Appreciation Week more meaningful is to continue working to provide our teachers with the resources they need to educate their students. Today's teachers face many challenges and deserve not only our recognition, but our full measure of support for their efforts.

Education has always been one of my top priorities, and I will continue to fight for our teachers, our students, our school districts, and for parents who want their children to have the best education possible.

HONORING DR. F.X. JAMES KENEALY

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Dr. F.X. James Kenealy for his successful tenure as Chair of the Massachusetts Medical Society Committee on Legislation. Dr. Kenealy is a practicing otolaryngologist and a partner at Metro West ENT Associates, with locations in Framingham and Milford, Massachusetts.

The Massachusetts Medical Society Committee on Legislation is comprised of physicians responsible for advising the Society on its legislative positions at both the federal and state levels. Dr. Kenealy led the committee through its negotiations on some of the most pivotal legislative issues of this decade, including the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

He masterfully led the Committee and helped establish the Massachusetts Medical Society as a leading voice on health care reform initiatives in Massachusetts, many of which have served as the model for national legislation. Under his tutelage, physicians in Massachusetts have become better informed and more engaged in the grassroots legislative process.

Dr. Kenealy's commitment to his family, patients, local community, and the legislative process are exemplary. He brings his expertise as a physician to public policy discussions and reminds us how essential civic engagement is to the democratic process. I wish Dr. Kenealy continued success and happiness in his future pursuits and with his family, Vanessa and Aidan.

HONORING SOPHIA GREENWALT OF MISSOURI

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Sophia Greenwalt, a truly outstanding young Missourian.

Sophia is a seventh grade student at Reeds Spring Middle School in Reeds Spring, Missouri. She was recently honored by the American Red Cross with their Everyday Hero Award for her charitable activities.

While in sixth grade, Sophia came up with a plan to help others. In consultation with her mother, Nettie Greenwalt, teachers and school district administrators, she received approval to create the Helping Hats program for students in the Reeds Spring school district. The Helping Hats program grants students the privilege to wear hats to school once a month for a one-dollar fee. The fees collected from the Helping Hats program are distributed to local charities monthly. Currently, the program has collected over $13,000 for local charitable organizations. Sophia's endeavors are a truly exemplary investment in our community.

On May 22, 2011, an EF–5 tornado struck Joplin, Missouri, devastating the once quiet Missouri town. Based on Sophia's efforts, the Helping Hats program was able to raise more than $8,000 to donate to the Joplin school district to help with recovery and rebuilding.

Sophia has also been honored for her outstanding charitable activities by the Missouri House of Representatives and the Reeds Spring Board of Education. I would like to add my voice to the growing choir praising the accomplishments of this truly exceptional young woman.

I am proud and humbled by the accomplishments of Sophia Greenwalt and look forward to following her future in the 7th Congressional District of Missouri.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 2012

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5326) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, Aloha. I rise today in support of the Lee-Pascrell-Pierluisi-Welch-Sherman-Hirono-DeLauro-Israel-Himes amendment, which reverses the $126 million cut to the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Program in H.R. 5326, the Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2013. While I am a proud cosponsor of this amendment, last night I voted for the Grimm amendment to restore this important funding to keep our neighborhoods safe, which passed by two votes.

COPS grants provide funding to state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies to hire, preserve and/or rehire career law enforcement officers to increase their community policing capacity. COPS has been an unqualified success. Since this program was established, back when President Clinton was in office, violent crimes have declined throughout the country.

Our state and local law enforcement agencies in Hawaii and across the country have had to make tough choices and tough cuts to weather this economy. To date, COPS grants have funded over 500 additional law enforcement officers in the State of Hawaii, contributing to additional community patrols and other crime prevention efforts to protect lives and property. The restoration of COPS Program funding is critical to ensuring the safety of all our communities, while also protecting and creating jobs for the American people.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHELE BACHMANN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, during the evening of Tuesday, May 8, and during the

day of Wednesday, May 9, I missed House votes in order to attend the college graduation of my daughter, Elisa. Up to this point, I was proud to boast a 100 percent voting record in the Second Session of the 112th Congress. However, if I had been present for these votes, here is how I would have voted:

Davis (IL) amendment rollcall No. 213 vote no; Grimm amendment rollcall No. 214 vote no; Huizenga amendment rollcall No. 215 vote yes; Johnson (GA) amendment rollcall No. 216 vote no; Flake amendment rollcall No. 217 vote yes; Westmoreland amendment rollcall No. 218 vote yes; Scott (GA) amendment rollcall No. 219 vote yes; Black amendment rollcall No. 220 vote yes; Blackburn amendment rollcall No. 221 vote yes; Broun amendment rollcall No. 222 vote yes; Southerland amendment rollcall No. 223 vote yes; H.R. 2072 rollcall No. 224 vote no; H.R. 4133 rollcall No. 225 vote yes; Chaffetz amendment rollcall No. 226 vote yes; Tierney amendment rollcall No. 227 vote no; Blackburn amendment rollcall No. 228 vote yes; Duncan (SC) amendment rollcall No. 229 vote yes; Garrett amendment rollcall No. 230 vote yes; Schweikert amendment rollcall No. 231 vote yes; Webster amendment rollcall No. 232 vote yes; Flores amendment rollcall No. 233 vote yes; Flores amendment rollcall No. 234 vote yes.

STATEMENT ON SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT RECONCILIATION ACT

HON. DAVID RIVERA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. RIVERA. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I am going to vote in favor of the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012 (SRRA) because I firmly believe the government's budget deficit is far too big, bad for the economy, and compromises our Nation's future. Additionally, the automatic across-the-board sequestration enacted last year is not targeted and does not reflect good policy.

Most proposals to reduce the deficit are painful measures, requiring tough choices and trade-offs. On the whole, this legislation is a step in the right direction. It sends an important message about our seriousness in righting the Federal fiscal ship, and includes supportable measures.

But one provision of the bill in particular is inadvisable. The provision that would cut the Federal share of Medicaid in the territories approximately two-thirds through Fiscal Year 2019 should not be included in any budget legislation.

The Federal government already underfunds Medicaid in Puerto Rico and other territories, as the Republican Governors Association has recognized. The territories' Medicaid programs have not provided all services provided in the States and do not cover people who would otherwise be eligible in the States. If Puerto Rico were treated as a State, the Federal share of its Medicaid program would be about 80 percent. The unwise proposal in SSRA would cut the federal share of Puerto Rico's program by 65 percent, with the territory left to cover the bulk of the program with local funds. This inequitable treatment would not stand in any of the 50 states, and it should not be imposed on Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico and other territories do not have votes in the Federal system. This imposes on us a responsibility to ensure that their needs are met.

While I will be casting a yes vote for the SRRA today, I urge removal of this provision unfairly treating Puerto Rico's Federal Medicaid Funding. 4 million American Citizens in Puerto Rico deserve equal treatment as those living in the States.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 2012

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5326) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Lewis-Johnson amendment to H.R. 5326, the Fiscal Year 2013 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill. This amendment prevents funds in the FY13 CJS Appropriations bill from being used to shut down the regional Department of Justice Antitrust Division Offices in Atlanta, Dallas, Cleveland, and Philadelphia. These closures will have a serious adverse effect upon antitrust enforcement in 21 states including Texas, and my district in particular. The Dallas Antitrust Office has been responsible for approximately $1 billion in criminal fines to date. It has been a priority of this Administration to reign in waste, fraud, and abuse, and that is exactly what the Dallas Antitrust office has been doing.

Mr. Chair, I would ask to submit into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of my April 23, 2012, letter to Attorney General Holder highlighting the critical role the Dallas Field Office serves upholding vital antitrust laws in our region and the United States.

APRIL 23, 2011.

Hon. ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr.,
Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: In October 2011, the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) announced its plans to close the Dallas Antitrust Division Field Office. The Dallas Field Office is joined by three other offices planned for closure in Atlanta, Cleveland, and Philadelphia. I strongly oppose this proposal and believe that millions of Americans and many U.S. companies across multiple states stand to be severely impacted by this closure.

The Dallas Field Office serves Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, and Oklahoma in enforcing antitrust laws. By closing the Dallas Field Office and reassigning those enforcement positions to the remaining field offices, the Department is seriously curtailing the government's ability to enforce lawful business practices. DOJ's Antitrust Division has an extensive history of promoting fair competition in the marketplace. Shuttering the Dallas Field Office will significantly undo the progress that has been made during this Administration, paving the way for future corruption and abuse.

In DOJ's October 2011 press release, you cite the potential cost savings of nearly $8 million as one of the primary factors behind this decision. I respectfully reject any arguments for cost savings in this context, particularly because there is a failure to consider the millions of dollars that the Dallas Field Office has brought in through criminal fines. While the Dallas Office costs roughly $3.5 million to operate each year, it has returned approximately $1 billion in criminal fines to date. These gains do not include criminal fines levied through the Atlanta, Cleveland, or Philadelphia field offices. Thus, closure of the Dallas Field Office is short-sighted for both long-term enforcement of federal antitrust laws, and the lost revenues that criminal penalties bring back to the American people.

Another aspect of your reasoning centers around consolidating offices in order to focus on larger international investigations. Aside from the obvious implications that this would have for local or regional enforcement of antitrust laws, history has demonstrated the ongoing need to keep that focus at home in a similar, if not greater, capacity. The Dallas Field Office has served a vital role in numerous cases here in the U.S., while still managing to have an effective international presence, as demonstrated in the case of Hoffman-LaRoche. The $500 million fine paid by the global healthcare company still represents the largest criminal fine ever collected by the Antitrust Division or Department of Justice.

Understanding this, I am respectfully requesting additional insight into the agency's rationale behind this proposal. The Dallas Field Office serves a critical role in upholding vital antitrust laws in the United States. Closing this office will open the doors for further violations of federal antitrust and competitive bidding laws.

Should you have any questions or comments, please contact Justin Maturo of my staff at Justin.Maturo@mail.house.gov or (202) 225–8885.

Sincerely,

EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,
Member of Congress.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BETTY SUTTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, as a strong supporter of the Export-Import Bank, I regret that I was delayed in a constituent meeting and unable to reach the floor to cast my vote on rollcall No. 224, and I am glad to see it passed overwhelmingly, as I have advocated for. Had I not been delayed, I would have voted "yes," consistent with my position of working to create jobs and economic opportunities for working families.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference.

This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, May 10, 2012 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 15

10 a.m.
Finance
To hold hearings to examine tax reform, focusing on what it could mean for tribes and territories.
SD–215
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Primary Health and Aging Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the cost of HIV/AIDS drugs and the Prize Fund alternative.
SD–430

2:30 p.m.
Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.
SH–219
Aging
To hold hearings to examine solving the long-term unemployment crisis for older workers.
SD–562

MAY 16

10 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Children's Health and Environmental Responsibility Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine growing long-term value, focusing on corporate environmental responsibility and innovation.
SD–406
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine identifying opportunities for health care delivery system reform, focusing on lessons from the front line.
SD–430
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–342
Judiciary
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Bureau of Investigation.
SD–226
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine seamless transition, focusing on a review of the Integrated Disability Evaluation System.
SH–216

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Department of Defense Subcommittee
To receive a closed briefing on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2013 for Northern Command and Southern Command Programs.
SVC–217

2 p.m.
Joint Economic Committee
To hold hearings to examine how the taxation of labor and transfer payments affect growth and employment.
SD–G50

2:30 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Communications Commission.
SR–253
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Peter William Bodde, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal, Piper Anne Wind Campbell, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to Mongolia, and Dorothea-Maria Rosen, of California, to be Ambassador to the Federated States of Micronesia, all of the Department of State.
SD–419

MAY 17

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine S. 2146, to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to create a market-oriented standard for clean electric energy generation.
SD–366

10 a.m.
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine creating positive learning environments for all students.
SD–G50

2 p.m.
Appropriations
Department of Defense Subcommittee
To receive a closed briefing on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2013 for European Command and Special Operations Command Programs.
SVC–217

2:15 p.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine fulfilling the Federal trust responsibility, focusing on the foundation of the government-to-government relationship.
SD–628

MAY 22

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
SeaPower Subcommittee
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2013.
SR–232A

11 a.m.
Armed Services
Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2013.
SD–G50

2 p.m.
Armed Services
Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2013.
SR–232A

3:30 p.m.
Armed Services
Airland Subcommittee
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2013.
SR–232A

5 p.m.
Armed Services
Personnel Subcommittee
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2013.
SR–232A

MAY 23

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
Strategic Forces Subcommittee
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2013.
SR–232A

2:30 p.m.
Armed Services
Closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2013.
SR–222

MAY 24

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
Closed business meeting to continue markup of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2013.
SR–222

2:15 p.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine programs and services for native veterans.
SD–628

MAY 25

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
Closed business meeting to continue markup of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2013.
SR–222

JUNE 7

2:15 p.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine Universal Service Fund Reform, focusing on ensuring a sustainable and connected future for native communities.
SD–628

POSTPONEMENTS

MAY 15

10 a.m.
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine assessing grants management practices at Federal agencies.
SD–342

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2989–S3050

Measures Introduced: Forty-four bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3032–3075, and S. Res. 448–452. **Pages S3041–42**

Measures Passed:

Syria: Senate passed S. 2224, to require the President to report to Congress on issues related to Syria, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S3048–49**

Reid (for Corker/Webb) Amendment No. 2098, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S3048–49**

Authorizing the Use of Emancipation Hall: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 105, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha. **Page S3049**

Authorizing the Use of the Capitol Grounds: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 106, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby. **Page S3049**

Authorizing the Use of the Capitol Grounds: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 117, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service. **Page S3049**

Authorizing the Use of the Capitol Grounds: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 118, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run. **Page S3049**

National MPS Awareness Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 450, designating May 15, 2012, as "National MPS Awareness Day". **Pages S3049–50**

National Travel and Tourism Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 451, recognizing the goals of National Travel and Tourism Week and honoring the valuable contributions of travel and tourism to the United States of America. **Pages S3049–50**

Collector Car Appreciation Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 452, designating July 13, 2012, as "Collector Car Appreciation Day" and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States. **Pages S3049–50**

Measures Considered:

Stop the Student Loan Interest Rate Hike Act: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2343, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for Federal Direct Stafford Loans. **Pages S2989–S3035**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004, with respect to the blocking of property of certain persons and prohibition of exportation and re-exportation of certain goods to Syria; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–47) **Page S3040**

Messages from the House: **Page S3040**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S3040**

Executive Communications: **Pages S3040–41**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S3042–43**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S3043–47**

Additional Statements: **Pages S3038–40**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S3047–48**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S3048**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S3048**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:48 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, May 10, 2012. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3050.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: COAST GUARD

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2013 for the Coast Guard, after receiving testimony from Admiral Robert J. Papp, Jr., Commandant, Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security.

APPROPRIATIONS: U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND AND U.S. AFRICA COMMAND

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense received a closed briefing on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2013 for Central Command and Africa Command Programs from General James N. Mattis, USMC, Commander, United States Central Command, and General Carter F. Ham, USA, United States Africa Command, both of the Department of Defense.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Service and General Government concluded a hearing to examine expanding broadband access, promoting innovation, and protecting consumers in a communications revolution, focusing on fiscal year 2013 resource needs for the Federal Communications Commission, after receiving testimony from Julius Genachowski, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Policy concluded a hearing to examine the National Flood Insurance Program, focusing on the need for long-term reauthorization and reform, including S. 1940, to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund, S. 1958, to extend the National Flood Insurance Program until May 31, 2012, and S. 2344, to extend the National Flood Insurance Program until December 31, 2012, after receiving testimony from Todd S. Klietz, Association of Montana Floodplain Managers, Missoula; Dwayne Bourgeois, North Lafourche Conservation, Levee and Drainage District, Raceland, Louisiana; David A. Sampson, Property Casualty Insurers Association of America, Washington, D.C.; Jon Jensen, Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of America, Spartanburg, South Carolina; Moe Veissi, National Association of Realtors, Miami, Florida; and Sarah Murdock, Nature Conservancy, Scituate, Massachusetts.

LIMITING FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection concluded a hearing to examine limiting Federal support for financial institutions, including S. 3048, to provide for a safe, accountable, fair, and efficient banking system, after receiving testimony from Paul A. Volcker, former Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and Anthony J. Carfang, Treasury Strategies, Inc., both of New York, New York; Thomas M. Hoenig, Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, and Marc Jarsulic, Better Markets, Inc., both of Washington, D.C.; Randall S. Kroszner, University of Chicago Booth School of Business, and James Roselle, Northern Trust Corporation, both of Chicago, Illinois; and T. C. Frost, San Antonio, Texas.

PRIVACY PROTECTIONS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the need for privacy protections, focusing on perspectives from the Administration and the Federal Trade Commission, after receiving testimony from Jon Leibowitz, Chairman, and Maureen K. Ohlhausen, Commissioner, both of the Federal Trade Commission; and Cameron F. Kerry, General Counsel, Department of Commerce.

NOMINATION

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Joseph G. Jordan, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy, Executive Office of the President, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

HUMAN RESOURCE WORKFORCE IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia concluded a hearing to examine building and maintaining an effective human resource workforce in the Federal government, after receiving testimony from John Berry, Director, Office of Personnel Management; John U. Sepulveda, Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Human Resources and Administration; Anita Blair, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Human Resources and Chief Human Capital Officer; and John Palguta, Partnership for Public Service, and Sara Thompson, Catholic University of America Metropolitan School of Professional Studies, both of Washington, D.C.

OFFICE OF THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ENFORCEMENT COORDINATOR

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Office of the Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, after receiving testimony from Victoria A. Espinel, U.S. Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Office of Management and Budget.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Robert E. Bacharach, of Oklahoma, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, John E. Dowdell, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Oklahoma, who were both introduced by Senators Inhofe and Coburn, Paul William Grimm, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, who was introduced by Senators Mikulski and Cardin, and Mark E. Walker, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Florida, and Brian J. Davis, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, who were both introduced by Senators Nelson (FL) and Rubio, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 57 public bills, H.R. 5650–5651, 5653–5707; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 647, were introduced. **Pages H2565–67**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2569–70**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 4966, to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to replace the sequester established by the Budget Control Act of 2011, with an amendment (H. Rept. 112–469, Pt. 1);

H.R. 5652, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013 (H. Rept. 112–470);

H.R. 4235, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Commodity Exchange Act to repeal the indemnification requirements for regulatory authorities to obtain access to swap data required to be provided by swaps entities under such Acts, with an amendment (H. Rept. 112–471, Pt. 1); and

H. Res. 648, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5652) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013 (H. Rept. 112–472). **Page H2565**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Harper to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2451**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:51 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H2457**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act: H.R. 2072, amended, to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 330 yeas to 93 nays, Roll No. 224 and **Pages H2460–81, H2490–91**

United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012: H.R. 4133, amended, to express the sense of Congress regarding the United States-Israel strategic relationship, to direct the President to submit to Congress reports on United States actions to enhance this relationship and to assist in the defense of Israel, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 411 yeas to 2 nays with 9 answering "present", Roll No. 225. **Pages H2481–90, H2401–92**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow. **Page H2490**

Temporary Bankruptcy Judgeships Extension Act of 2012: The House agreed to discharge from committee and pass H.R. 4967, to prevent the termination of the temporary office of bankruptcy judges in certain judicial districts. **Pages H2492–93**

Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013: The House continued with consideration of H.R. 5326, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year

ending September 30, 2013. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, May 10th.

Pages H2493–H2515, H2515–51, H2551–57

Agreed to:

Quayle amendment that prohibits funds from being used to implement, administer, or enforce the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Enforcement Guidance Number 915.002 concerning ''Consideration of arrest and conviction records in employment decisions''; **Page H2502**

Poe amendment (No. 14 printed in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2012) that prohibits funds from being used to enforce section 221(a) of title 13, United States Code, with respect to the American Community Survey; **Pages H2505–07**

Chaffetz amendment that prohibits funds from being used in contravention of paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 1001(a) of title 18, United States Code (by a recorded vote of 381 ayes to 41 noes, Roll No. 226); **Pages H2493–96, H2516**

Blackburn amendment that prohibits funds from being used to defend against any action challenging any provision of Public Law 111–148 or any provision of title I or subtitle B of title II of Public Law 111–152; or any amendment to a provision of law made by any provision described in paragraph (1) (by a recorded vote of 229 ayes to 194 noes, Roll No. 228); **Pages H2498–H2500, H2517–18**

Duncan (SC) amendment (No. 38 printed in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2012) that prohibits funds from being used to litigate against any of the several States on behalf of the National Labor Relations Board pertaining to secret ballot union elections (by a recorded vote of 232 ayes to 192 noes, Roll No. 229); **Pages H2501–02, H2518**

Garrett amendment that prohibits funds from being used by the Department of Justice to be a party to a single or multi-state court settlement where funds are removed from any residential mortgage-backed securitization trust (by a recorded vote of 238 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 230); **Pages H2503–04, H2518–19**

Schweikert amendment that prohibits funds from being used by the Department of Justice to bring any action against any State for implementation of a State law requiring voter identification (by a recorded vote of 232 ayes to 190 noes, Roll No. 231); **Pages H2504–05, H2519–20**

Webster amendment that prohibits funds from being used to conduct the survey, conducted by the Secretary of Commerce, commonly referred to as the ''American Community Survey'' (by a recorded vote of 232 ayes to 190 noes, Roll No. 232) (agreed by unanimous consent to vacate the earlier proceedings by which the amendment was agreed to by voice vote); **Pages H2507–09, H2520**

Flores amendment that prohibits funds from being used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence Security Act of 2007 (by a recorded vote of 250 ayes to 173 noes, Roll No. 233); **Pages H2509–10, H2520–21**

Flores amendment that prohibits funds from being used to implement the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order 13547 (relating to the stewardship of oceans, coasts, and the Great Lakes) (by a recorded vote of 246 ayes to 174 noes, Roll No. 234); **Pages H2510–15, H2521–22**

Engel amendment (No. 28 printed in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2012) that prohibits funds from being used to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles, for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum-Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011; **Pages H2523–24**

Walsh (IL) amendment that prohibits funds made available in this Act for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program from being made available to any State or local government that violates section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996; **Page H2524**

Chaffetz amendment (No. 36 printed in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2012) that prohibits funds from being used to implement section 36.302(c)(9) of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations; **Page H2531**

Brown (FL) amendment that increases funding, by offset, for emergency federal law enforcement assistance, as authorized by section 609M of the Justice Assistance Act of 1984, by $20,000,000; **Page H2536**

Garamendi amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership by $443,000; **Pages H2537–38**

Denham amendment (No. 26 printed in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2012) that prohibits funds from being used to implement section 10011(b) of Public Law 111–11; **Pages H2538–39**

Denham amendment that prohibits funds from being used to provide services from or for the Executive Office for United States Attorneys, the United States Marshals Service, or employees of the Department of Justice, to carry out activities located at a newly constructed Federal courthouse located in Los Angeles, California; **Pages H2539–41**

Huelskamp amendment (No. 24 printed in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2012) that prohibits funds from being used in contravention of the Defense of Marriage Act (by a recorded vote of 245 ayes to 171 noes, Roll No. 235); **Pages H2547–51, H2551–52**

Landry amendment that prohibits funds from being used to implement a proposed rule for turtle

excluder devices as described in the Southeast Fishery Bulletin published by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration on May 8, 2012 (by a recorded vote of 218 ayes to 201 noes, Roll No. 236); **Pages H2522–23, H2552–53**

Gardner amendment (No. 32 printed in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2012) that prohibits funds from being used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce who uses amounts in the Fisheries Enforcement Asset Forfeiture Fund of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration that consists of the sums described in section 311(e)(1) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1861(e)(1)) for any purpose other than a purpose specifically authorized under such section (by a recorded vote of 357 ayes to 68 noes, Roll No. 237); **Pages H2523, H2553**

Cravaack amendment (No. 7 printed in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2012) that prohibits funds from being used to carry out the activities of the Climate Change Education program of the National Science Foundation (by a recorded vote of 238 ayes to 188 noes, Roll No. 241); and **Pages H2535–36, H2555–56**

Flake amendment that prohibits funds from being used to carry out the functions of the Political Science Program in the Division of Social and Economic Sciences of the Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences of the National Science Foundation (by a recorded 218 ayes to 208 noes, Roll No. 243). **Pages H2543–44, H2557**

Rejected:

Tierney amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for the John R. Justice Prosecutors and Defenders program by $10,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 160 ayes to 260 noes, Roll No. 227); **Pages H2496–98, H2516–17**

Rohrabacher amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used, with respect to the States of Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington to prevent such States from implementing their own State laws that authorize the use, distribution, possession, or cultivation of medical marijuana (by a recorded vote of 163 ayes to 262 noes, Roll No. 238); **Pages H2524–29, H2553–54**

Lewis (GA) amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used for the purpose of closing the regional field offices of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice (by a recorded vote of 189 ayes to 235 noes, Roll No. 239); **Pages H2529–31, H2554–55**

Holt amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used in contravention of any of the following: 1) The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States; 2) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (relating to nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs); 3) Section 809(c)(1) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (relating to prohibition of discrimination); and 4) Section 210401(a) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (relating to unlawful police pattern or practice) (by a recorded vote of 193 ayes to 232 noes, Roll No. 240); and **Pages H2532–35, H2555**

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used to carry out the SelectUSA initiative (by a recorded vote of 209 ayes to 217 noes, Roll No. 242). **Pages H2541–43, H2556–57**

Withdrawn:

Lee amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have increased funding, by offset, for Community Oriented Policing Services Programs by $177,087,000 and **Pages H2500–01**

Broun (GA) amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited funds from being used to carry out or enforce section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. **Pages H2544–47**

H. Res. 643, the rule providing for consideration of the measure, was agreed to yesterday, May 8th.

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency declared with respect to the actions of the Government of Syria is to continue in effect beyond May 11, 2012—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 112–107). **Page H2460**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H2460.

Senate Referral: S. 743 was referred to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and Homeland Security. **Page H2558**

Amendments: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages H2570.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and 18 recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2490–91, H2491–92, H2516, H2516–17, H2517–18, H2518, H2518–19, H2519–20, H2520, H2520–21, H2521–22, H2551–52, H2552–53, H2553, H2553–54, H2554–55, H2555, H2555–56, H2556–57, and H2557. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 12:01 a.m. on Thursday, May 10th.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a markup of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill FY 2013. The bill was forwarded, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs held a markup of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill FY 2013. The bill was forwarded, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee began a markup of H.R. 4310, 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.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee began a markup of H.R. 5651, the ''Food and Drug Administration Reform Act of 2012''.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE; AND HYDROPOWER REGULATORY EFFICIENCY ACT OF 2012

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing on H.R. 4273, the ''Resolving Environmental and Grid Reliability Conflicts Act of 2012''; and discussion draft of the ''Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2012''. Testimony was heard from Patricia Hoffman, Assistant Secretary for the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, Department of Energy; Gina McCarthy, Assistant Administrator for the Office of Air and Radiation,Environmental Protection Agency; Phillip D. Moeller, Commissioner, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; Jeffrey C. Wright, Director, Office of Energy Projects, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; Betty Ann Kane,Chairman, D.C. Public Service Commission; and public witnesses.

BUDGET AND SPENDING CONCERNS AT HHS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation held a hearing entitled ''Budget and Spending Concerns at HHS''. Testimony was heard from Norris Cochran, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Budget, Department of Health and Human Services; Carolyn L. Yocom, Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office; and James C. Cosgrove, Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office.

RISING REGULATORY COMPLIANCE COSTS AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE HEALTH OF SMALL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing entitled ''Rising Regulatory Compliance Costs and Their Impact on the Health of Small Financial Institutions''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION'S REVERSE MORTGAGE PROGRAM FOR SENIORS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity held a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Federal Housing Administration's Reverse Mortgage Program for Seniors''. Testimony was heard from Charles Coulter, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Single Family Programs, Office of Housing, Federal Housing Administration; and public witnesses.

ASSESSING U.S. FOREIGN POLICY PRIORITIES AND NEEDS AMIDST ECONOMIC CHALLENGES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia held a hearing entitled ''Assessing U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities and Needs Amidst Economic Challenges in the Middle East''. Testimony was heard from Jeffrey D. Feltman, Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, Department of State; Mara Rudman, Assistant Administrator for the Middle East Bureau, U.S. Agency for International Development; and Mark Ward, Deputy Special Coordinator for Middle East Transitions, Department of State.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a markup of H.R. 3857, the ''Public Transit Security and Local Law Enforcement Support Act''; H.R. 4005, the ''Gauging American Port Security Act''; H.R. 3173, to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to reform the process for the enrollment, activation, issuance, and renewal of a Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) to require, in total, not more than one in-person visit to a designated enrollment center; and H.R. 2356, the ''WMD Prevention and Preparedness Act of 2011''.

The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 3857; H.R. 4005; H.R. 3173; and H.R. 2356.

FIRST RESPONDER TECHNOLOGIES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications; and Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technology held a joint hearing entitled "First Responder Technologies: Ensuring a Prioritized Approach for Homeland Security Research and Development". Testimony was heard from Robert Griffin, Director of First Responder Programs, Science and Technology Directorate, Department of Homeland Security; Mary H. Saunders, Director, Standards Coordination Office, National Institute of Standards and Technology; Edward Kilduff, Chief of Department, New York City Fire Department; Annette Doyin, Director, Office of Emergency Management, Pasco County, Florida; and public witness.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing on the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Testimony was heard from Robert S. Mueller III, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S OFFSHORE DRILLING PLAN

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Evaluating President Obama's Offshore Drilling Plan and Impacts on Our Future". Testimony was heard from Tommy Beaudreau, Director, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.

TSA OVERSIGHT PART IV: IS TSA EFFECTIVELY PROCURING, DEPLOYING, AND STORING AVIATION SECURITY EQUIPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY?

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; and Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Held a joint hearing entitled "TSA Oversight Part IV: Is TSA Effectively Procuring, Deploying, and Storing Aviation Security Equipment and Technology?" Testimony was heard from David R. Nicholson, Assistant Administrator for Finance and Administration and Chief Financial Officer, Transportation Security Administration; Charles K. Edwards, Acting Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security; and Stephen M. Lord, Homeland Security and Justice Issues, Government Accountability Office.

SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2012

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 5652, the "Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012". The Committee granted, by a record vote of 8 to 3, a closed rule providing two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112–21 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representatives Ryan (WI) and Van Hollen.

ENSURING THE BEST STEWARDSHIP OF AMERICAN TAXPAYER DOLLARS AT THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research and Science Education held a hearing entitled "Ensuring the Best Stewardship of American Taxpayer Dollars at the National Science Foundation". Testimony was heard from Allison C. Lerner, Inspector General, National Science Foundation.

EFFECTS OF HIGH GASOLINE PRICES ON SMALL BUSINESSES

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Running on Empty: The Effects of High Gasoline Prices on Small Businesses". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MEDICARE DURABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT COMPETITIVE BIDDING PROGRAM

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled "Medicare Durable Medical Equipment Competitive Bidding Program". Testimony was heard from Laurence Wilson, Director of the Chronic Care Policy Group, Center for Medicare, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services; Kathleen King, Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

SOCIAL SECURITY'S INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security held a hearing entitled "The State of Social Security's Information Technology". Testimony was heard from G. Kelly Croft, Deputy Commissioner of Systems and Chief Information Officer, Social Security Administration, Valerie C. Melvin, Director, Information Management and Technology Resources Issues, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 10, 2012

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense, to receive a closed briefing on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2013 for Pacific Command Programs, 10:30 a.m., SVC–217.

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, to hold hearings to examine current readiness of U.S. forces in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2013 and the Future Years Defense Program, 10 a.m., SR–232A.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Patricia K. Falcone, of California, to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, Executive Office of the President, Marietta S. Robinson, of Michigan, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and William P. Doyle, of Pennsylvania, and Richard A. Lidinsky, Jr., of Maryland, both to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine S. 2374, to amend the Helium Act to ensure the expedient and responsible draw-down of the Federal Helium Reserve in a manner that protects the interests of private industry, the scientific, medical, and industrial communities, commercial users, and Federal agencies, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine Medicare physician payments, focusing on understanding the past so we can envision the future, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), focusing on Chicago and beyond, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine helping the middle class balance work and family, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 2276, to permit Federal officers to remove cases involving crimes of violence to Federal court, S. 2554, to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2017, and the nominations of David Medine, of Maryland, to be Chairman, James Xavier Dempsey, of California, Elisebeth Collins Cook, of Illinois, Rachel L. Brand, of Iowa, and Patricia M. Wald, of the District of Columbia, all to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, 10 a.m., SD–226.

House

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight, and Credit, hearing entitled ''Formulation of the 2012 Farm Bill: Credit Programs'', 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee, continued markup of H.R. 5651, the ''Food and Drug Administration Reform Act of 2012'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade, hearing entitled ''The Costs and Consequences of Dodd-Frank Section 1502: Impacts on America and the Congo'', 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Commercial and Administrative Law, hearing on H.R. 4369, the ''Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency (FACT) Act of 2012'', 9:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Where Are All the Watchdogs? Addressing Inspector General Vacancies'', 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing entitled ''Supporting American Jobs and the Economy through Expanded Energy Production: Challenges and Opportunities of Unconventional Resources Technology'', 9:30 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee, hearing on ongoing intelligence activities, 9 a.m., HVC–304. This is a closed hearing.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

9:30 a.m., Thursday, May 10

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: The Majority Leader will be recognized.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

9 a.m., Thursday, May 10

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Complete consideration of H.R. 5326—Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013. Consideration of H.R. 5652—Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

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.