



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 25, 2011

No. 112

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC.
July 25, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN CAMPBELL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

A WEEK IN POLITICAL WONDERLAND

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. We begin another week in political wonderland. The Dow falls 100 points at the opening bell. What is it that we should do?

Well, if we had the knowledge and problem-solving skills of average college sophomore economic students, or women in a church study group, before the week is out, we would take some simple steps.

First, we would understand that, in a divided government with real economic challenges, no one group is allowed, especially those representing a minority opinion, to have their way entirely.

Then, we would begin by repealing the silly debt ceiling limitation, a law that was enacted in 1917 when the United States was about to embark upon a borrowing binge in World War I. It was used to look like we were fiscally responsible, a charade that we have done dozens of times since.

The fact is, these are debts we've already incurred, and the United States will honor them. What sort of theatrics are we going to go through until we finally own up?

Next, we would actually deal with the twin challenges of unsustainable spending and tax cuts along with the need to restore our economy and compete in a global business environment.

In an ideal world, my Republican friends would use their opportunity over the next 10 weeks to actually show how they would control spending in a way that is possible within the political process. In fact, they would have two opportunities between now and the election to actually shut down the government, if they didn't get their way, to highlight that effort.

We would also deal with a real consensus on things like military spending. There's broad agreement across party lines. For example, why shouldn't we, more than a half century after the end of World War II, 22 years after the collapse of the Soviet Union, bring those troops home from Europe? Of course we can do that, and it's a start of many things that would help us restore balance to our military spending.

Next, we can deal meaningfully with our health care costs. Many parts of the United States spend far less money for Medicaid, Medicare than the high-spending areas. We know how to do this and, in fact, those low-spending,

high value areas provide better quality health care. Let's use the power of the Health Care Reform Act to accelerate those reforms and spread them around America, saving money and improving the quality of care.

Turn to the Tax Code. The American public would support a modest reasonable tax reform that would actually raise some revenue by closing unjustified tax loopholes and be able to deal with fairness and simplicity. More people would actually pay their taxes. We would have more revenue, and there would be more confidence in the system.

We should deal with our infrastructure deficit, something that doesn't get as much attention around here as it should. We have a serious deficiency in terms of basic infrastructure, transportation, sewer, water, trillions of dollars of a deficit that is building, undermining our competitiveness in a global economy. We would have modest user fees to support needed improvement, together with intelligent use of credit that would put hundreds of thousands of people to work, strengthening not just the economy, but improving our health and our global competitiveness.

We would reform agricultural spending. Those college students could figure out what the experts have told us: that we can actually provide more support for America's farmers and ranchers, improve the environment, put more resources into nutrition for our children in schools, all the time strengthening American agriculture, saving money. This isn't rocket science.

Finally, we would launch a very public American process on how to strengthen Social Security; protect that lifeline for our seniors in a way that brings people together rather than divides them. Any Rotary Club with 10 people, an Internet connection and a sheet of butcher paper could come up with one, two or three alternatives that would solve the problem over the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5401

next 50 years and would be acceptable to the American public.

This doesn't have to be so hard. It doesn't need to risk knocking the economy into another tailspin. Done right, we can meet our real challenges in a way that puts us on a sustainable economic path. We can rebuild and renew America, and unite our country to meet our challenges ahead.

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 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

Please hear our prayers for the Members of this assembly, upon whom the authority of government is given. Help them to understand the tremendous responsibility they have to represent both their constituencies and the people of this great Nation of ours.

This is a great but complex task. Grant them as well the gift of wisdom to sort through what competing interests might exist to work a solution that can serve all of the American people.

Finally, give each Member peace and equanimity and give all Americans generosity of heart to understand that governance is not simple but difficult work, at times requiring sacrifice and forbearance.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. CLAY 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.

ANOTHER AMERICAN MURDERED IN MEXICO

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mexican bandits have killed yet another American. The reason: His family couldn't come up with the \$10,000 ransom.

Jorge Dieppa was a court translator for the Federal court in El Paso, Texas. He also was a lecturer at UTEP. Dieppa had gone to Juarez to get his car fixed, but he was kidnapped on July 6. When his relatives didn't pay the ransom, he was murdered. He was found bound with duct tape after being stabbed repeatedly.

Juarez is the border city of death. Thousands of Mexicans have been murdered there as well as several Americans. Rogue bandits and drug cartels rule the city. They rein terror on people through violence, racketeering, extortion, robbery, kidnapping, and drug deals.

The violence in "death city" is not the only border town with an atmosphere of outlawry. Other border towns such as Nuevo Laredo and Matamoros are dangerous for honest persons. Violence in Mexico affects the U.S. border towns with the cross-border crime, including reports of Americans with Spanish surnames being kidnapped and held for ransom.

Failure to realize that crime in "death city" and other Mexican border towns is real and expanding is to live like Alice in Wonderland.

And that's just the way it is.

AMERICA NEEDS WHITE HOUSE LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. BROOKS. During Barack Obama's 2 years as a freshman Senator, America's debt increased \$400 billion. During Obama's next 2 years in the Senate majority, America's debt increased another \$1.8 trillion. As President, Barack Obama drove up America's debt another \$3 trillion. In Barack Obama's time in Washington, America's debt load has increased by more

than \$5 trillion. That's a 50 percent increase in just 6 years.

Do you see the pattern? The longer Obama is in Washington, the worse America's debt and the weaker America becomes.

What is President Obama's solution? Obama submits record-high budgets to Congress that continue Washington's unsustainable spending binge. Obama demands a debt ceiling increase with no spending cuts.

Mr. President, America needs White House leadership. If you have a written solution to this debt crisis, please submit it. The American people deserve no less.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL). The gentleman is reminded to address his remarks to the Chair.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The 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 July 22, 2011 at 3:28 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. Res. 234.

That the Senate passed S. 300.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

□ 1210

CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE

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

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity this weekend to go home to Louisiana, which I enjoyed doing. I heard from a State senator of mine who is also a banker. He said that he had a gentleman come in his office this weekend, asking for some more money on his loan. He said, Well, in order to do that, you have to give us some more information. We have to see your debt-to-income ratio—your assets versus your liabilities. So, after looking at that, he explained to him that, if the ratio doesn't work, he can't lend him any more money.

If you were to plug in that same ratio of what our Federal regulators are requiring of our financial institutions when they look upon the American people and American businesses, you would find that if we put that same set

of rules on this government that, basically, our Federal regulators would not let us borrow any more money.

The point of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that we have a spending problem here in Washington. We cannot raise this debt ceiling unless we do three things: unless we cut, we cap, and we balance our budget.

THE TRUTH: AMERICA'S DEBT CEILING MUST BE RAISED

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my good friend did what many of us did, my neighbor in Louisiana. I went home to Texas, and interacted with so many constituents, many of them asking the question: Why? I believe it's important to ask the question: Why not?

Let me tell you, my friends, that we don't need to politicize the debt ceiling, which has been raised many, many times, but we do need to tell the truth: for if the debt ceiling is not raised, trillions of dollars will be lost, not of those of us who sit on this floor, but from the portfolios and packages for seniors and 401(k)s.

If you want to talk about \$1 trillion, talk about what will be lost to our seniors and hardworking Americans in collapsing their 401(k)s. There is no option. There is not an option for the short term. That's a joke. That's politics to start us back again in April or March. Let's go forward with the proposed Reid plan. Let's get a deficit reduction; raise the debt ceiling; cut what we can and go into regular order. That is the responsible, adult way to go.

America is watching. America is looking. I am not going to stand by while trillions of dollars are lost. I ask my Republican friends to join us in a reasoned response to America's concerns.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2584, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 363 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 363

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to

the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment printed in section 2 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill, as amended, back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The amendment considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole is as follows: Strike section 427.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which they may revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 2584. It allows any Member of the House to offer amendments which are germane and comply to the House rules. The rule allows priority recognition for the amendments that have been preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am pleased to support this resolution, which continues the record of our Rules Committee in this Congress of providing for as open and fair and orderly a process as possible.

□ 1220

I commend our chairman, Mr. DREIER, for continuing the record of fairness and openness in the formulation of this rule, which is in contrast to some rules that we have had in past years.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2584 provides \$27.5 billion overall for programs within the Department of Interior and the Forest Service, Environmental Protection Agency, the Indian Health Service, and other agencies. But it is a bill that strikes a fiscally responsible balance

between providing funds for ongoing Federal programs while also saving the taxpayers 7 percent over last year's enacted levels. It puts us back roughly to the 2009 levels.

There are some who will claim that there are certain programs that have been hurt heavily. It is true, for example, that the Environmental Protection Agency has an 18 percent reduction in funding in this bill. Please remember, though, that this was made possible simply because of unprecedentedly high record appropriations for EPA in 2009, of which \$3 billion remains unobligated.

In an era when 42 to 44 cents of every dollar that we spend goes for interest, it makes no sense in continuously overappropriating line items where money is not needed, not used, and sits there vacant.

This is a bill that oftentimes for those of us who live in the West has been full of riders year after year after year. It probably makes no difference here, but I realize that some are going to be very sensitive to this issue. I know the gentlelady from New York is very concerned about these potential issues that may be on this bill. And why should she not be? If you include the military, 0.8 percent of New York is owned by the Federal Government. I will contrast that with my State, which has 64 percent owned by the Federal Government. And we're not the highest.

This is an issue and a bill that is very important to those of us. And, Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill; it is an extremely fair rule. It can't get any fairer than this one. I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman from Utah, my colleague, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in these tough times we must make choices that reflect our values and our belief that we solve our toughest problems through shared sacrifice and working together. Unfortunately, today we consider yet another bill that is devoid of these values.

Once again, today's legislation places the burden on the American people while rewarding the special interests and the lobbyists who walk these halls.

One of the many riders inserted into the bill will effectively open up a million acres of national forest and other public land around the Grand Canyon National Park because people want to mine uranium there.

Democrats have great concerns about maintaining the integrity of the Grand Canyon and the effect of uranium mining on water quality, not to mention the spectacle that shows us auctioning off a national treasure with the proceeds going to mostly foreign-owned entities.

Who is it that wants to drill for uranium and mine for uranium? Russia, their state atomic energy corporation, and South Korea's state-owned utility.

In other words, we will give up the Grand Canyon and potable water, likely, to benefit the Russians and South Koreans. And any mining that is included in this bill comes under a bill that was signed by Ulysses S. Grant in 1872. We have not raised royalties on anything that anybody takes from us, including foreign entities as they come here to mine our resources.

At the same time, the majority proposes crippling cuts to the EPA that will cut programs that protect our air and water. There are few more important responsibilities in making sure when we go to the kitchen sink that the water coming out is safe. We know a human being may live as long as he or she may without food—four days without water. If our Nation can't protect these most basic of our life necessities, we have indeed fallen far.

Today's bill would also prohibit the use of government moneys to add animals to the Endangered Species List but allows the use of government money to take species off the same list. This policy change threatens the Endangered Species Act and the environmental protections that come with it.

The misguided priorities in this bill will directly impact my district, and my colleague is right about that, and the citizens I am elected to represent. But not just them.

Twenty percent of the freshwater on this planet resides in the Great Lakes. Most of us who live around the Great Lakes believe it is our responsibility to take care of them and to pass it on to future generations. But in recent years, the Great Lakes have been damaged by pollution and invasive species carried on to our water by foreign vessels. We have allowed that.

New York, of course, being closest to the Atlantic Ocean and the St. Lawrence Seaway, has enacted stronger laws against dumping ballast, and this bill punishes us for doing that.

The invasive species are not damaging just an ecosystem but a way of life for the Great Lakes communities that line the shore, as well as endangering our freshwater. The EPA has come to the aid of these communities by dedicating funding to restore the Great Lakes. But today's bill would bar New York State from receiving any restoration funding from the EPA and leave the Great Lakes to be overrun by private polluters and the invasive species they have delivered from overseas.

Any bill that stands up for foreign shipping magnates but won't provide a cent to help Americans should never see the light of day and will never receive my vote.

Today's legislation also harms the arts. If today's bill takes effect, the National Endowment for the Arts will have lost 20 percent of its funding in 2 years. Now, these cuts target a program that works. In fiscal year 2010, we invested \$167.5 million into the NEA—remember that number, \$167.5—for the purpose of providing funding to non-profit arts organizations.

The funding created \$166.2 billion in total economic activity, supported 5.7 million jobs, and, for the \$167 million, generated back \$12.6 billion in tax revenue to the United States Treasury. And that does not count what happens to help improvements to States' treasuries and local treasuries.

Today's legislation targets a program proven to create jobs and contribute to the economic and the cultural well-being of our Nation. You would think that people who are elected to the Congress of the United States would really want a program like that not only to survive but to grow. But, no, here they are cutting the budget once again.

Our country is blessed with stunning natural beauty and a wealth of natural resources that are unparalleled anywhere in the world. But in one final swipe at our national interest, today's bill cuts the budget for the Land and Water Conservation Fund by a whopping 78 percent. The Land and Water Conservation Fund ensures that our national treasures will be here for our children and our grandchildren, a mission that apparently deserves 78 percent less money than it did the year before. A cut like that says all you need to know about the priorities of the majority and the special interests that are being served.

If getting our fiscal house in order is truly about shared sacrifices, this bill does not reflect it. We could have started by asking oil and gas companies to pay their fair share after profiting so richly from resources found on American soil. Instead, the majority rejected an amendment that would have asked oil and gas companies to pay a little more so the Nation can fund programs to clean up the most polluted lands in our country. The majority will not even allow this amendment to receive a vote on the floor.

Today's bill asks nothing of the companies that are making record profits. Instead, cuts to programs and services and the agencies that serve the American people and protect our environment for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, a bill like this does not reflect our values. It is not up to the standards the American people have come to expect and deserve. It puts special interests over our general welfare, and it fails totally to invest in our future. We can and we must do better.

I am pleased to now yield 3 minutes to my colleague from New York, the ranking Democrat on the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, Mr. BISHOP.

□ 1230

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank my friend from New York for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this rule and to the underlying bill. As every member of the Rules Committee knows, the Interior and Environment appropriations bill that we will debate today simply violates the rules of the House. Unfortunately, the Rules Committee has

waived all points of order against the bill, preventing Members from striking provisions that are clearly in violation of House rules.

In particular, title V of the bill includes the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2011, H.R. 872, a bill that amends the Clean Water Act, which is solely within the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, of which I am the ranking member.

Furthermore, the provision amends the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, better known as FIFRA, that is under the jurisdiction of the House Agriculture Committee.

As we all know, advancing authorizing legislation within an appropriations vehicle is not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations, and it stands in stark contrast to clause 2(b) of rule XXI of the House rules, which states, in part, "A provision changing existing law may not be reported in a general appropriation bill"; and yet that is precisely what title V is: a change in existing law.

Not only is the inclusion of title V in the underlying bill a violation of House rules, but it is also legislatively redundant. The House has already passed H.R. 872 earlier this year under suspension of the rules. The bill is now being considered in the Senate, where it has been reported out of the Senate Agriculture Committee.

In my opinion, including H.R. 872 in the Interior appropriations bill will hamper negotiations between Senators and between the House and the Senate to get a final bill that everyone can be disappointed with—frankly, that's what's at stake here—but that can pass both Chambers and be enacted into law before the court-ordered deadline of October 31, 2011. Let me say that again: There is a court-ordered deadline of October 31, 2011, to resolve this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I will be offering an amendment to strike title V when it comes up during debate this week. However, I am deeply disappointed that the Rules Committee has blatantly ignored the rules of the House by eliminating the ability of Members to raise a point of order against provisions of an appropriations bill that changes existing law.

There are approximately 39 policy riders included in the Interior appropriations bill. And let's be clear: These are policy earmarks, and these earmarks undermine the jurisdiction of authorizing committees and undermine the ability of the House and the Senate to work its will. It is unfortunate that the Rules Committee is protecting these new earmarks from the rules of the House.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule and a "no" vote on the underlying bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We find that this particular bill is a great illustration of one of the problems that we have here in the House of

Representatives and, indeed, with government. Our land policy in the United States is one historically that had no purpose or organization to it. It simply happened. But what happened happened disproportionately throughout this country, which is why 1 out of every 3 acres in America is now owned by the Federal Government.

I defy anyone on that side to find for any a constitutional provision that would allow that ownership; but, nonetheless, it is.

The unfortunate thing is it is disproportionate. One out of every 2 acres in the West is owned by the Federal Government. That means 52 percent of the area west of Denver is owned by the Federal Government. Four percent of the area east of Denver is owned by the Federal Government, much of that in military installations.

As I said, the State of New York has 0.3 percent of its land owned by the Federal Government, 0.8 percent if you include military. The State of Virginia has 8 percent owned by the Federal Government, almost all military. The gentleman from Massachusetts, who will be here as well, 1.1 percent of his State is owned by the Federal Government.

And so it means different issues for my State, which is 65 percent owned by the Federal Government; Alaska; Nevada, which is almost 90 percent owned by the Federal Government; Idaho, which is over 60 percent owned by the Federal Government. Things take place differently.

That's why, for example, things like the Land and Water Conservation Fund is a nice fund if it were used to preserve what we already have. Unfortunately, that fund is used to buy more territory, with an administration decision and mindset that no land should ever be given back or given up; more should be accumulated. That's why it's the ability of this appropriations bill to try to put that money—not simply to cut it, but to move it into preservation as opposed to access to buying more land, which makes sense to us in the West because we recognize this heavy-handed tyranny that takes place.

Let me just give you one simple example that was brought up here that deals with uranium mining in Arizona, one of the so-called "riders" in this particular appropriations bill. It takes place in what is called the Arizona Strip, which has led some people to mistakenly think that we were going to be strip mining around the Grand Canyon.

The Arizona Strip is the size of the State of New Jersey. That is the area between Utah and the Colorado River. In that area in 1984, Morris Udall, who was at the time the chairman of the Resources Committee here in the House, created a wilderness compromise in which a wilderness area was to be created in the State of Arizona. In that, 56 percent of the State of Arizona was put off limits to any kind of

mining endeavors whatsoever. In exchange, certain areas were put specifically for those types of mining areas, including areas in the Arizona Strip, this New Jersey-sized piece of the State of Arizona. The unfortunate thing is it was always intended to be used there for mining purposes because there is a great deal of uranium ore there.

Unlike other kinds of mining, this ore is found in little pipes, strips within the ground that go up and down. And what you need to do is simply bore into the pipe, find the ore in the middle, take it out, and then replace all the stuff back in. So once you are done with that mine, no one ever sees that it was there in the first place. The ore that is taken out is not left in Arizona. It's actually going to be shipped for processing somewhere else. So there will be no tailings. There will be no wind pollution. There will be no dust issues whatsoever.

Certain special interest groups said, well, it could change the water quality that goes through Colorado and then would eventually flow to Las Vegas and do something strange in Las Vegas, as if that were ever possible. Unfortunately, as stated by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, their mines and mining groups, there have been certain interest groups that have inferred, with no substantive supporting data, that groundwater in this particular area of the Colorado River may be contaminated by uranium mining. That simply won't happen, and it won't happen because of where the ore is. The ore is found 100 feet below the surface. There is only 12 inches of rain a year there. There is no particular kind of any runoff that will take place. It is also found 1,000 feet above the aquifer with clay underneath, so there is no way there can be any kind of leaching that goes into the aquifer.

The bottom line is there will never, never be any kind of contamination on this water, which was the excuse used to justify a political reason for taking this land that had been part of the '84 agreement off the table, and it could not be used again.

Unfortunately, the EPA gets involved in this one again because they have determined that if the uranium—or whatever they call the uranium—gets into the water and it's more than 30 parts per billion, that's unsafe. Unfortunately, there are uranium pipes within the Grand Canyon itself which already erode into the water, and it creates a situation where, naturally occurring, there are 4 parts per billion. So they did some testing at existing mines up in the Kanab Creek area to find out what would happen if actually some of this uranium were to leach into the water, and it would increase that 4 number to 6 parts per billion.

In essence, what they are saying is: You could take all of the tailings that could come from these potential mines and dump them into the Colorado

River, and you still would not reach the level set by the EPA for drinking water. In fact, the uranium that naturally occurs in the Colorado River, even if you had a catastrophe, is still lower than uranium levels found in freshwater lakes in the desert area.

Now, why isn't all that considered? Because the decision to withdraw that area from mining was not based on science. If it were based on science, then the Department of Environmental Quality of Arizona would not have testified that there was no scientific basis for it. The State of Arizona would not have passed a piece of legislation decrying the withdrawal of that particular area. The guy who was actually part of the National Parks Conservation Association as well as the Audubon Society and the Save the Redwoods League, who was actually the one that did the scientific study in '84 when the original design by Mo Udall was made, simply said there was no legitimate evidence to say there could be any contamination of that air, which basically means the withdrawal of this land was done for political purposes, not scientific purposes.

So to put a provision back into this bill saying that if you're going to do this kind of stuff, it had darn well better be on a scientific basis and not a political basis makes sense. It's one of the right things to do in here.

□ 1240

I realize we have some other speakers here; so I'm not going to take all the time yet, but I would desperately like to talk about the clean water provisions, the navigable water provisions and what EPA does with those because it has a different impact on those of us in the West, where almost all of our land is controlled by them, versus those in the East, where almost no land is controlled by them and they have a great deal of freedom to develop the resources on their own.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond for a minute before I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I have, from the Las Vegas Sun of July 22, an article saying that the previous allowing of uranium mining has caused great damage. This watershed gives water to 26 million people and provides 90 percent of the water used in southern Nevada.

Let me quote from the paper:

"As it is, the Colorado River is already endangered by the uranium mines"—which the gentleman talked about has not hurt anybody at all—"that sit in the watershed, some perilously close to the water. The moratorium also doesn't prevent existing mining claims from being developed. The Interior Department says there are about 3,500 claims in the area. Adding the potential for more uranium to enter the water doesn't make sense. Republicans in Congress should quit

trying to repeal the moratorium and should instead work to protect the Grand Canyon and the Colorado River. It makes no sense to put millions of people's drinking water at risk."

I will put that in the RECORD, if I may, and a New York Times editorial of June 28, "Mining and the Canyon." Absolute harm is being done.

[From the Las Vegas Sun, June 22, 2011]

REPUBLICANS SHOULD QUIT TRYING TO ROLL BACK URANIUM MINING MORATORIUM

Interior Secretary Ken Salazar in June issued a six-month moratorium on new uranium mining claims on 1 million acres near the Grand Canyon. The ban provides time for the government to complete a study of the effects of uranium mining in the area.

A final report is due this fall, and Salazar said the department is considering banning new mining claims in the area for the next 20 years.

The issue is important. Uranium mining threatens not only the beauty and ecosystem of the Grand Canyon, but it also poses a threat to the Colorado River, which is a key source of water for about 26 million people in Arizona, Nevada and California. The Colorado River, which forms Lake Mead, provides 90 percent of the water used in Southern Nevada.

Salazar cited a concern for water quality in announcing the moratorium extension because the 1 million acres are in the Colorado River watershed. Water officials worry that more uranium mines could result in radioactive material streaming into the river.

The Grand Canyon and the Colorado River need to be protected. The moratorium on new claims was put in place because of an incredible spike in mining interest in the area under the George W. Bush administration. The Grand Canyon doesn't need to see any more mining around it.

Environmental groups and Colorado River water users cheered Salazar's decision, but in Congress, Salazar's announcement was targeted by some Republicans who claimed it was a bad policy.

In a news release issued this month, Rep. Jeff Flake, R-Ariz., boasted about inserting a provision to block the administration from enforcing the moratorium in the spending bill that covers the Interior Department. The bill passed the House Appropriations Committee this month. Flake claimed that mining "can create jobs and stimulate the economy in Northern Arizona."

But Flake's argument is shameless. He is using the nation's poor economy as an excuse to force a dangerous policy on the country.

Flake's argument is part of the larger Republican attempt to roll back any sort of regulation. In passing the interior spending bill from his committee, Appropriations Chairman Hal Rogers complained about what he called the administration's "widespread regulatory overreach" and pledged to cut it.

But when it comes to clean water, Congress shouldn't be cutting back. People need to be confident their water supply is protected, and if the Republican plan moves forward, there will be serious doubt.

As it is, the Colorado River is already endangered by uranium mines and tailing piles that sit in the watershed, some perilously close to the water. The moratorium also doesn't prevent existing mining claims from being developed. The Interior Department says there are about 3,500 hard-rock mining claims in the area. Adding the potential for more uranium to enter the water doesn't make sense.

Republicans in Congress should quit trying to repeal the moratorium and should instead

work to protect the Grand Canyon and the Colorado River. It makes no sense to put millions of people's drinking water at risk.

[From the New York Times, June 28, 2011]

MINING AND THE CANYON

The Obama administration has extended for six months a 2009 moratorium on new uranium mining claims on one million acres around the Grand Canyon. This is good news; even better is the promise from Ken Salazar, the interior secretary, that he will soon recommend a 20-year ban on new claims in the region. That is the maximum allowed under the 1872 mining law.

With uranium prices rising, the number of mining claims have jumped sharply over the last few years. There have been about 3,500 claims in the Grand Canyon-area alone. If developed, they would generate toxic wastes that would threaten the Colorado River—the source of drinking water for roughly 27 million people—the aquifer and the Grand Canyon ecosystem in general.

Mr. Salazar said he could not cancel valid existing claims, but there is likely to be little actual mining. The decision to "with-draw" the land from future claims creates new regulatory hurdles for existing claimants, who must demonstrate, among other things, that they had discovered actual mineral deposits before the 2009 moratorium. Only a handful have been able to do so.

There have been the usual complaints from mining lobbyists and their Congressional allies. Representative Jeff Flake, a Republican from Arizona, has threatened to use the interior appropriations bill to block Mr. Salazar's plan. The moratorium will have little effect on the country's uranium supply, most of which comes from Wyoming and New Mexico.

It will protect a treasured national park and the drinking water for millions of people.

I am now pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the ranking member, the gentlelady from New York, for yielding me the time.

I rise today to oppose this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have two children, ages 13 and 10, and one of our favorite things to do as a family is to go hiking. We have hiked all over this great country. We have a love and a respect for our open spaces and for our environment. Unfortunately, the Republicans' fiscal year 2012 Interior appropriations bill throws that into grave danger.

This Interior appropriations bill represents an unprecedented departure from our Nation's decades-long bipartisan commitment to protecting our shared environment, magnificent natural resources and our cherished cultural treasures. It's a shame that my Republican colleagues prioritize tax breaks and incentives for highly profitable oil companies over the Grand Canyon, the Cape Cod National Seashore, State parks, and even public health.

Mr. Speaker, I could be here all day talking about the harmful cuts and misplaced priorities that are included in this bill: from the more than 25 policy riders that do not belong in an appropriations bill, that do everything from gutting the Endangered Species

Act to allowing uranium drilling by foreign companies alongside the Grand Canyon, to the harsh cuts in EPA funding that will result in millions of Americans being exposed to dirtier air and dirtier water.

I give my Republican colleagues credit. They have left no stone unturned in their environmental assault. Unfortunately, though, that stone will be covered in toxic algae, coal ash, and polluted water if they have their way.

One of the most egregious cuts in this bill is to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has been one of the greatest conservation success stories over the past 50 years, protecting thousands and thousands of acres of land at the Federal and State levels. States rely on this funding and demonstrate their commitment to its value by providing matching funding for State park and recreational purposes. Not only that, but the Land and Water Conservation Fund has a dedicated source of funding derived from oil and gas leasing in the Outer Continental Shelf and is authorized to accumulate \$900 million annually from its dedicated sources. Nonetheless, my Republican friends forget all of this and still slash the Land and Water Conservation Fund funding by 78 percent from the current fiscal year. This represents the lowest level of funding in the 45-year history of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. What's most troubling is that, in the committee report, my Republican colleagues acknowledge the enormous value of the Land and Water Conservation Fund but then go right ahead and decimate its budget.

The bill also cuts clean water and safe drinking water grant programs by nearly 40 percent, threatening Americans' ability to access clean water and adding to the already significant backlog of safe drinking water infrastructure projects.

Look, I know it's politically popular to demonize the EPA right now, and at times I've had my own strong disagreements with the EPA on certain issues, but this Interior appropriations bill is not the way to meaningfully address any of those disagreements. This bill puts the priorities of special interests and scoring cheap political points over public health and our natural resources. It's as simple as that.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that these are tough budgetary times, but what troubles me about the Republicans' approach to this appropriations process is that so many of their cuts are aimed at programs that will lower the standard of living and lessen the quality of life for a majority of Americans. This appropriations process should be about lifting people up, not putting people down, and it should be about a decent respect for our environment, and certainly a respect for our environment over corporate special interests.

When we talk about protecting our environment, we're talking about quality of life issues that impact every single person in this country. This bill undermines our historic bipartisan commitment to our environment.

I would urge my colleagues to reject this rule and reject the underlying bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am once again appreciative that data from newspaper articles were put into the RECORD, because the newspapers have a tendency of quoting one another and also quoting environmental groups. Unfortunately, the data still says the same thing from those who know, the scientific community, that actually knows what they're talking about, who said:

"A few environmental groups claim, without providing any scientific supporting data, that the groundwater in the Colorado would be contaminated with uranium mining. We conclude that even the most implausible accident would increase the amount of uranium in the Colorado River by an amount that is undetectable over those that occur there normally."

Another said: "I continue to view such activities as posing no credible threat of environmental harm to either the Grand Canyon National Park or the Colorado River that flows through it. I can see no credible justification for a 1.1 million-acre withdrawal from mineral entry of lands to the north and south of the park."

Another said: "It is important to note that the research conducted by the United States Geological Survey and the preliminary findings by the University of Arizona confirm uranium exploration and mining pose no threat to the Grand Canyon watershed or the park."

This is the study. This is the scientific data. It would be nice if, for once, we used this data instead of quoting one another and quoting things that have no basis in science.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. BENISHEK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and final passage of the bill. In a time when government is borrowing over 40 cents for every dollar it spends, this bill makes needed cuts and puts forward a responsible and sensible framework for managing our Nation's natural resources.

I represent a vast district in northern Michigan that includes Federal forests, national parks, and three Great Lakes. I am particularly pleased that the committee included language to boost and streamline timber harvests in Federal forests, similar to legislation that I introduced earlier this year.

Right now on the Federal forests, for them to plan a timber harvest takes nearly 8 years to complete a harvest, from the beginning of the attempt to sell a parcel of land for timber and the

actual harvesting; whereas, certified sustainable State forests take less than 2 years and certified sustainable county forests take a year.

Basically it comes down to jobs in my district. We have a lot of Federal land in northern Michigan, and people in my district depend on the timber industry for jobs. Every little town has a mill, a flooring mill. Jobs, high-paying jobs, and the frustration that comes from having a forest full of timber and being unable to harvest it because of onerous regulations and rules result in a less healthy forest and less jobs for northern Michigan.

We have a long way to go to responsibly harvest timber in northern Michigan and elsewhere in this country, but I believe this is a good start, and I am certainly looking forward to working with this committee in the future to continue to promote jobs in northern Michigan.

□ 1250

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds before yielding to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

We're always being told what's junk science in here, but I will tell you right now, I really think that the science is very strong, and thank goodness there's a moratorium on this mining around the Grand Canyon.

I am now pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), who will make it very clear.

Mr. MARKEY. This spending bill represents one of the most egregious assaults on our Nation's environment in the history of our country. If this bill were to pass, our air will be smoggier. Our climate will be hotter. Our water will be more polluted. Our public lands will become more despoiled.

Simply put, this legislation is so toxic, H.R. 2584 is so toxic, that you'd better handle it wearing a hazmat suit because there are so many future environmental crimes committed against the environment in our country that you have to handle this bill with extreme care.

The actual title of this bill is Interior Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations for 2012. But it could be called the Have the Republicans Been Outside Act.

It's hot, ladies and gentlemen. It is hot. The world is warming. All of the evidence has been pointing in this direction for decades, and people are living it on a daily basis.

It's appropriate that this bill starts with the word "interior," because only the House Republicans who have been cooped up inside for weeks debating whether to crater our economy could possibly ignore what's going on outside in our natural environment.

The weather forecasters said we were trapped under a heat dome last week. Well, the Republican majority, under this Capitol dome, would commit us to even more dangerous heat if this bill passes.

And believe it or not, this bill bans the Environmental Protection Agency from increasing the fuel economy standards of the vehicles which we drive in our country, which will basically put the brakes on the all-electric vehicle, plug-in hybrid revolution.

Now, I know that's what the auto industry wants. I know that's what the oil industry wants. They don't want to see cars become more and more efficient so we don't have to consume all that oil so that we can tell OPEC we don't need their oil any more than we need their sand.

But in this bill, they actually ban the EPA from improving the fuel economy standards of the vehicles that we drive, and they ban all 50 States from improving the efficiency of the vehicles that we drive.

And how else could you explain that this bill would increase smog and dirty air days if you didn't have the House Republicans living in their own world?

When families are planning their summer trips to explore our national parks, how else could you explain a bill that allows for mining of nuclear fuel uranium near Grand Canyon National Park?

Under this bill, when families go to enjoy the sunset across the canyon, it won't just be the sun that's causing the glow, but the radiation as well from the uranium mining.

And when Americans are canceling vacations because they can't pay for gas, how else can you explain a bill that would tell auto companies to stop making more fuel-efficient cars and trucks?

If you live in an air conditioned mansion with an indoor pool and you have your bottled water delivered, then this bill makes perfect sense to you, especially if you also work for the oil, coal mining, or chemical industries. For those industries, this bill represents their summer vacation from regulation. For the rest of us, it is a one-way ticket to a dirtier environment for the United States of America.

House Republicans have a tough time raising the debt ceiling, but with this bill they are proving to have no reservations when it comes to raising the death ceiling with more pollution in our air, in our water, making us less healthy, making us more likely to be able to contract diseases that we would not otherwise.

It is bad enough that the House Republicans want to take Medicare away from grandma, but now they want to make the air she and her grandkids breathe and the water they drink more polluted. This bill would cause more premature deaths, more asthma, more harm to children from toxins like mercury.

Yes, they don't want to lift the debt ceiling, but they will be lifting the death ceiling because of the exposure to all of these chemicals, all of these pollutants.

Vote "no" on the Republican appropriations bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I know that what we do here on the floor is often riveting drama for those who are watching on television. Let me, in some respects, not try to add to that drama and go back to facts, something we don't necessarily like around here.

We've already talked about this so-called uranium issue showing facts. The chart that we just saw from the gentleman from Massachusetts was an interesting chart. The area of the United States that was colored on that chart is the area that there are those in this administration, indeed, on this floor, want to be owned by the Federal Government here.

Let me talk to you just a moment—and I'll even grant some time to the gentlelady from New York if she could actually answer this one—and talk about what some of these issues do to those of us who live under what Nelson Rockefeller called the "deadening hand of bureaucracy" because, once again, in the East you don't have to deal with these situations; in the West we do.

Let me talk about simply the Environmental Protection Agency and some of the brilliant things they do in the name of trying to clean up our water and our air and make life more livable for us. One of the suburbs of my community—and I call it a suburb simply because my community only has, what, 18,000 people in it; so I like calling it a suburb—has no rivers, no creeks, no streams, no anything. It does have irrigation ditches. Starting at the top of the mountain, the irrigation water flows down so it covers all the fields, as normally you would want to do.

We passed legislation for the Clean Water Act allowing the Federal Government, especially the EPA, to come in and monitor water that is navigable water systems on interstate commerce. The Great Salt Lake in Utah is all confined in the State of Utah. There are no outlets. That's why it's salty. There is nothing more intra-navigable than the Great Salt Lake.

But because in the 1880s some of the pioneers used to ship sheep over there for summer grazing on the islands in the Great Salt Lake, it is now part of the interstate commerce system and part of the navigable water system of the United States, therefore controllable by the Environmental Protection Agency.

Now, let's see what they did in my particular community. In this community where there were irrigation ditches, the overflow from the irrigation ditches ran down, and the Environmental Protection Agency said the runoff from those irrigation ditches would eventually go into the Great Salt Lake; therefore, that runoff from a ditch was part of the navigable water systems of the United States and controllable as wetlands by the Environmental Protection Agency, even though that irrigation runoff to get to the Great Salt Lake would actually have to run down the mountain,

through a culvert for the city road, through one for the train tracks, through one that was the side road of the freeway, through the northbound freeway, through the barrel pit, through the southbound freeway, through another one of the adjacent roads to the southbound freeway, up a 3 percent grade to an area that had been previously determined to be not wetlands area, and eventually into the Bear River system which was stopped from going to the Great Salt Lake by the Bear River Bird Refuge.

□ 1300

They claim that could happen. And because of that, the water from the irrigation system was navigable waters of the United States and the Environmental Protection Agency claimed jurisdiction over it, which meant that the citizens of that community could not expand their sewer system. Instead, they had to take money out of their pockets to ship their sewage either to Brigham City or Willard because the Environmental Protection Agency now controlled the navigable waters because we gave them the power to do that under the Clean Water Act.

One of the things I am talking about here and one of the frustrations we have illustrated by this bill is, unfortunately, time after time these agencies funded in this bill do not consider what they do to real people. Real people in my community are being harmed time after time by decisions made from bureaucrats sitting here in Washington, and then we wonder why we rail against these environmental groups, why we rail against these agencies, and why we don't want to have some kind of control over this process. And the only vehicle we seem to have is the appropriation bill.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund is used to buy more land to get more control; if it were not, we would not complain about it. The EPA is used to get more control over people's lives, and they hurt people in the process. If it were not so, we would not complain about it. The withdrawing of uranium mining on the Arizona strip was done, despite all the scientific testimony, for political reasons. Were it not done so, we would not complain about it.

This is a decent bill, which moves us a step forward to try to control our spending habit, dealing with what is really the core issue and core responsibility of our agencies and trying not to harm people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. May I inquire of my colleague if he has further speakers.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. May I inquire how much time actually remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah has 11 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. To the gentlelady from New York, I have a brilliant

11-minute speech welling within my bosom; but if you are willing to close, I will be willing to close as well.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank you for that, and I am willing to close.

Mr. Speaker, let me just close with this: I think we have demonstrated that this bill contains an astonishing array of devastating cuts and special interest riders that jeopardize the water we drink, the air we breathe, and our country's national heritage.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I think we've also proven in this bill that we are moving in the right direction to try to control the excesses that continuously take place here and still maintain the core responsibilities that have to be there, and we have done it in a rule that is adamantly fair. It is an open rule that will allow anyone to bring anything down here to the floor until we do a UC agreement that stops it. It is a good rule, and I urge adoption of that particular rule.

In closing, I will once again reiterate the fairness of this open rule. I urge its adoption, and I urge the adoption of the underlying legislation.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. 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.

REQUESTING RETURN OF OFFICIAL PAPERS ON H.R. 1309

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 368

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives request the Senate to return to the House the bill (H.R. 1309) entitled "An Act to extend the authorization of the national flood insurance program, to achieve reforms to improve the financial integrity and stability of the program, and to increase the role of private markets in the management of flood insurance risk, and for other purposes".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the House that on July 24, 1998, at 3:40 p.m., Officer Jacob

J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson of the United States Capitol Police were killed in the line of duty defending the Capitol against an intruder armed with a gun.

At 3:40 p.m. today, the Chair will recognize the anniversary of this tragedy by observing a moment of silence in their memory.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed, as follows:

Adopting House Resolution 363 and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2584, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 363) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 205, nays 131, not voting 96, as follows:

[Roll No. 630]

YEAS—205

Adams	Chaffetz	Gibson
Aderholt	Coble	Gingrey (GA)
Akin	Coffman (CO)	Gohmert
Alexander	Conaway	Goodlatte
Amash	Cravaack	Gowdy
Austria	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Bachus	Culberson	Griffin (AR)
Barletta	Denham	Griffith (VA)
Bartlett	Dent	Grimm
Bass (NH)	DesJarlais	Guinta
Benishek	Diaz-Balart	Guthrie
Biggert	Dreier	Hall
Bilbray	Duffy	Hanna
Bilirakis	Duncan (SC)	Harper
Bishop (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Harris
Bishop (UT)	Ellmers	Hastings (WA)
Black	Emerson	Hayworth
Blackburn	Farenthold	Heck
Bonner	Fincher	Hensarling
Bono Mack	Fitzpatrick	Heger
Boustany	Flake	Herrera Beutler
Brooks	Fleischmann	Huelskamp
Broun (GA)	Fleming	Huizenga (MI)
Bucshon	Flores	Hultgren
Buerkle	Forbes	Hunter
Burgess	Fortenberry	Hurt
Calvert	Fox	Issa
Camp	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins
Campbell	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (IL)
Canseco	Gallegly	Johnson (OH)
Cantor	Gardner	Johnson, Sam
Capito	Garrett	Jones
Carter	Gerlach	Jordan
Chabot	Gibbs	Kelly

King (NY)	Nunes	Schmidt	Labrador	Olver	Sánchez, Linda T.
Kingston	Nunnelee	Schock	Lamborn	Owens	T.
Kinzinger (IL)	Olson	Schweikert	Larson (CT)	Paul	Schakowsky
Kline	Palazzo	Scott (SC)	Lipinski	Payne	Scott, David
Lance	Paulsen	Scott, Austin	Loebach	Pelosi	Sensenbrenner
Landry	Pearce	Sessions	Lofgren, Zoe	Perlmutter	Shuler
Lankford	Pence	Shimkus	Lungren, Daniel E.	Posey	Smith (WA)
Latham	Petri	Shuster	Mack	Price (NC)	Stearns
LaTourette	Pitts	Simpson	Maloney	Quigley	Sullivan
Latta	Platts	Smith (NE)	Marchant	Richardson	Tiberi
Lewis (CA)	Poe (TX)	Smith (NJ)	McCarthy (CA)	Rohrabacher	Velázquez
LoBiondo	Pompeo	Smith (TX)	McDermott	Roskam	Walsh (IL)
Long	Price (GA)	Southerland	McNerney	Ross (AR)	Waters
Lucas	Quayle	Stivers	Miller, Gary	Rothman (NJ)	Watt
Luetkemeyer	Reed	Stutzman	Myrick	Roybal-Allard	Welch
Lummis	Rehberg	Terry	Nadler	Rush	Wilson (FL)
Manzullo	Reichert	Thompson (PA)	Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Wolf
Marino	Renacci	Thornberry			Young (FL)
McCaul	Ribble	Tipton			
McClintock	Rigell	Turner			
McCotter	Rivera	Upton			
McHenry	Roby	Walberg			
McKeon	Roe (TN)	Walden			
McKinley	Rogers (AL)	Webster			
McMorris	Rogers (KY)	West			
Rodgers	Rogers (MI)	Westmoreland			
Meehan	Rokita	Whitfield			
Mica	Rooney	Wilson (SC)			
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman			
Miller (MI)	Ross (FL)	Womack			
Mulvaney	Royce	Woodall			
Murphy (PA)	Runyan	Yoder			
Neugebauer	Ryan (WI)	Young (AK)			
Noem	Scalise	Young (IN)			
Nugent	Schilling				

NAYS—131

Ackerman	Hahn	Murphy (CT)
Altmire	Hanabusa	Neal
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Barrow	Heinrich	Pascarella
Bass (CA)	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Peters
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Peterson
Boswell	Hochul	Pingree (ME)
Brady (PA)	Holden	Polis
Butterfield	Holt	Rahall
Capps	Honda	Rangel
Capuano	Hoyer	Reyes
Cardoza	Inslee	Richmond
Carnahan	Israel	Ruppersberger
Carney	Jackson (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Sarbanes
Castor (FL)	(TX)	Schiff
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Schrader
Ciциlline	Johnson, E. B.	Schwartz
Clarke (MI)	Kaptur	Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Serrano
Clay	Kildee	Sewell
Cleaver	Kind	Sherman
Clyburn	Kucinich	Sires
Connolly (VA)	Langevin	Slaughter
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Speier
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Stark
Costa	Levin	Sutton
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Thompson (CA)
Critz	Lowey	Thompson (MS)
Crowley	Lujan	Tierney
Cuellar	Lynch	Tonko
Cummings	Markey	Towns
Davis (CA)	Matheson	Tsongas
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Van Hollen
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky
Deutch	McCollum	Walz (MN)
Dicks	McGovern	Wasserman
Doggett	McIntyre	Schultz
Donnelly (IN)	Meeks	Waxman
Edwards	Michaud	Woolsey
Edwards	Miller (NC)	Wu
Filner	Miller, George	Yarmuth
Frank (MA)	Moore	
Fudge	Moran	
Grijalva		

NOT VOTING—96

Baca	Chandler	Fattah
Bachmann	Cohen	Garamendi
Baldwin	Cole	Giffords
Barton (TX)	Costello	Gonzalez
Becerra	Crenshaw	Gosar
Berg	Davis (KY)	Granger
Berkley	DeFazio	Graves (MO)
Berman	DeGette	Green, Al
Boren	Dingell	Green, Gene
Brady (TX)	Dold	Gutierrez
Braley (IA)	Doyle	Hartzler
Brown (FL)	Ellison	Hinches
Buchanan	Engel	Hirono
Burton (IN)	Eshoo	King (IA)
Cassidy	Farr	Kissell

□ 1337

Ms. WOOLSEY and Messrs. MORAN and CARNEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WEBSTER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 630, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to participate in the following vote. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows: Rollcall vote 630, on agreeing to the resolution—H. Res. 363, providing for consideration of H.R. 2584, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes—I would have voted "yea."

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 25, 2011, I was unavoidably detained and missed the first vote in a series of two votes. I missed rollcall vote No. 630. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted as follows: Rollcall vote No. 630: "yea" (On agreeing to H. Res. 363).

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 25, 2011, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 630. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on H. Res. 363—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2584—Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 because it waives all points of order against the bill. H.R. 2584 includes many harmful policy riders that violate the House rules by legislating on an appropriations bill.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably detained and missed the following vote: H. Res. 363—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2584—Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this resolution.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote 630. If present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote 630.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 108, answered “present” 2, not voting 89, as follows:

[Roll No. 631]

YEAS—233

Aderholt	Gallegly	Paulsen
Akin	Gingrey (GA)	Pence
Alexander	Goodlatte	Petri
Austria	Gowdy	Pingree (ME)
Bachus	Graves (GA)	Pitts
Barletta	Green, Al	Platts
Barrow	Griffin (AR)	Polis
Bartlett	Griffith (VA)	Pompeo
Bass (NH)	Grimm	Price (GA)
Becerra	Guinta	Quayle
Benishek	Guthrie	Rangel
Biggart	Hall	Rehberg
Bilirakis	Hanabusa	Reichert
Bishop (GA)	Harper	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Rigell
Black	Hayworth	Rivera
Blackburn	Heinrich	Roby
Blumenauer	Hensarling	Roe (TN)
Bonner	Herger	Rogers (AL)
Bono Mack	Higgins	Rogers (KY)
Boustany	Hinojosa	Rogers (MI)
Brooks	Hochul	Rokita
Broun (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Rooney
Bucshon	Hultgren	Ros-Lehtinen
Buerkle	Hunter	Ross (FL)
Butterfield	Hurt	Royce
Calvert	Insee	Runyan
Camp	Issa	Ruppersberger
Campbell	Jenkins	Ryan (WI)
Canseco	Johnson (GA)	Scalise
Capito	Johnson (IL)	Schiff
Capps	Johnson, Sam	Schmidt
Carnahan	Jones	Schock
Carney	Jordan	Schrader
Carter	Kaptur	Schwartz
Cassidy	Kelly	Schweikert
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Scott (SC)
Chabot	King (NY)	Scott (VA)
Chaffetz	Kingston	Scott, Austin
Ciциlline	Kline	Scott, David
Clarke (MI)	Lance	Serrano
Clay	Langevin	Sessions
Cleaver	Lankford	Sewell
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Coble	LaTourette	Shimkus
Coffman (CO)	Latta	Shuster
Cole	Levin	Simpson
Connolly (VA)	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Conyers	Long	Smith (NJ)
Cooper	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Crawford	Luetkemeyer	Southerland
Critz	Lujan	Speier
Cueellar	Manzullo	Stutzman
Culberson	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Cummings	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Davis (CA)	McCarthy (NY)	Tsongas
Davis (LL)	McCaul	Turner
DeLauro	McClintock	Upton
Denham	McCollum	Van Hollen
DesJarlais	McHenry	Walberg
Diaz-Balart	McIntyre	Walden
Doggett	McKeon	Walsh (IL)
Dreier	McKinley	Walz (MN)
Duncan (SC)	Meehan	Wasserman
Duncan (TN)	Mica	Schultz
Edwards	Michaud	Waxman
Ellmers	Miller (MI)	Webster
Emerson	Moore	West
Farenthold	Moran	Westmoreland
Fincher	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Flake	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (SC)
Fleischmann	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Fleming	Myrick	Wolf
Flores	Neugebauer	Womack
Fortenberry	Nunes	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Nunnelee	Yarmuth
Franks (AZ)	Olson	Yoder
Frelinghuysen	Palazzo	Young (IN)

NAYS—108

Ackerman	Boswell	Clarke (NY)
Adams	Brady (PA)	Conaway
Altire	Burgess	Costa
Andrews	Capuano	Courtney
Bass (CA)	Cardoza	Cravaack
Bilbray	Carson (IN)	Crowley
Bishop (NY)	Chu	Dent

Deutch	Jackson Lee	Pallone
Dicks	(TX)	Pascrell
Donnelly (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Pastor (AZ)
Duffy	Johnson, E. B.	Pearce
Filner	Keating	Peters
Fitzpatrick	Kind	Peterson
Forbes	Kinzinger (IL)	Poe (TX)
Fox	Kucinich	Rahall
Fudge	Landry	Reed
Gardner	Larsen (WA)	Renacci
Garrett	Latham	Reyes
Gerlach	Lee (CA)	Richmond
Gibbs	Lewis (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Gibbs	LoBiondo	Sarbanes
Gibson	Lowe	Schilling
Grijalva	Lummis	Slaughter
Hahn	Lynch	Stark
Hanna	Maloney	Stivers
Harris	Markey	Sutton
Hastings (FL)	Matheson	Terry
Heck	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Herrera Beutler	McCotter	Thompson (MS)
Himes	McGovern	Tierney
Holden	Meeks	Tipton
Holt	Miller (FL)	Towns
Honda	Miller (NC)	Visclosky
Hoyer	Miller, George	Woodall
Huelskamp	Neal	Wu
Israel	Noem	Young (AK)
Jackson (IL)	Nugent	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Amash	Gohmert
	NOT VOTING—89

Baca	Gonzalez	Pelosi
Bachmann	Gosar	Perlmutter
Baldwin	Granger	Posey
Bartoe (TX)	Graves (MO)	Price (NC)
Berg	Green, Gene	Quigley
Berkley	Gutierrez	Richardson
Berman	Hartzler	Rohrabacher
Boren	Hinche	Roskam
Brady (TX)	Hirono	Ross (AR)
Braley (IA)	King (IA)	Rothman (NJ)
Brown (FL)	Kissell	Roybal-Allard
Buchanan	Labrador	Rush
Burton (IN)	Lamborn	Ryan (OH)
Cantor	Lipinski	Sanchez, Linda
Chandler	Loebsack	T.
Cohen	Lofgren, Zoe	Schakowsky
Costello	Lungren, Daniel	Sensenbrenner
Crenshaw	E.	Shuler
Davis (KY)	Mack	Sires
DeFazio	Marchant	Smith (WA)
DeGette	McDermott	Stearns
Dingell	McMorris	Sullivan
Dold	Rodgers	Tiberi
Doyle	McNerney	Tonko
Ellison	Miller, Gary	Velázquez
Engel	Nadler	Waters
Eshoo	Napolitano	Watt
Farr	Oliver	Welch
Fattah	Owens	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Paul	Young (FL)
Giffords	Payne	

□ 1347

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, my flight was delayed on July 25, 2011 and I was unable to cast my vote on rollcall vote Nos. 630 and 631. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on both.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROSS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 25, 2011, I was not present for votes 630 and 631. Had I been present for rollcall 630, I would have voted no. Had I been present for rollcall 631, I would have voted yea.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for votes in the House

Chamber today. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall votes 630 and 631.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 2011, I was not present for two recorded votes because my flight from Iowa to Washington, DC was significantly delayed. I had returned to Iowa to meet with constituents and regret that I was not present to cast my vote on rollcall Nos. 630 and 631.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2584 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER). Pursuant to House Resolution 363 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2584.

□ 1348

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. CAMPBELL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring to the floor H.R. 2584, the fiscal year 2012 Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies appropriations bill.

As we begin, I want to personally thank Mr. MORAN, Mr. DICKS, and each of the members of our subcommittee for their active participation in the bipartisan spirit that has been part of our deliberations this year. Regardless of our positions on this bill, I do sincerely appreciate their constructive contributions.

Mr. Chairman, we're living at a time when the Federal Government borrows more than 40 cents on each dollar that it spends. We are also living in a time of record deficits and debt. While reductions in discretionary spending alone will not totally erase the deficit, we all know that reducing Federal spending is a necessary first step.

The fiscal year 2012 Interior and Environment bill is funded at \$27.5 billion, which is \$2.1 billion, or 7 percent below the fiscal year enacted level, and \$3.8 billion, or 12 percent below the budget request.

Overall, funding within this bill is essentially level within fiscal year 2009 spending. The subcommittee has made some very difficult choices in preparing this budget proposal. In total, 235 Members of the House submitted over 1,700 programmatic requests to the subcommittee for consideration.

While the bill makes significant spending reductions across many agencies and programs, it also provides ample funding to address the needs of key accounts supported by a bipartisan cross-section of Members. For instance, fire suppression at the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service is fully funded at the 10-year average.

The bill includes a \$37 million increase over fiscal year 2011 for the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to hire new inspectors and move forward with offshore oil and gas permitting and leasing while also improving safety. And Members will be pleased to know that the operations of our national parks are sustained at levels only slightly below last year, which means every park unit in the country will be operational and fully staffed without the threat of furloughs or layoffs.

Finally, this bill also makes critical investments in Indian Country. Building upon efforts initiated by Mr. DICKS and Mr. MORAN, this bill continues to make investments in human health and wellness programs in Indian Country, affecting health care, education, and self-determination. Overall, the Department of the Interior is funded at \$9.9 billion, which is a \$715 million, or 7 percent, reduction below last year's enacted level.

As I mentioned, we've done some things that Secretary Salazar will support. The Secretary and I have had many discussions about these issues as well as some areas where funding isn't what he would like to see. One of those areas relates to the funding of the Endangered Species Act.

Since the ESA was enacted, there have been 2,018 species listed and only 21 species recovered. By any calculation, that's a pretty poor track record. Any other program with such a poor rate of success would have long since been terminated. There isn't one member of this subcommittee opposed to recovering endangered species; but the ESA has become so contentious, so political, and so litigious that it has become a policy failure. The authoriza-

tion for the ESA appropriation expired 20 years ago, and the assumption has been that the Appropriations Committee would continue to fund it year in and year out, as it has in the past.

In fact, Members might be interested to know that 26 percent of the funding in this bill is for programs in which the authorizations have expired. That's not how the process is supposed to work, Mr. Chairman. And just as we are going back to regular order and passing appropriation bills, we need to return to regular order when it comes to working with the authorizers to update and fix laws that no longer work or have expired.

It's time to fix the ESA. The best way to do that is for the authorizers and stakeholders in the conservation community to come to the table to fix what is broken so we can actually begin recovering species. We are sending that message today.

Climate change is another item of interest to members of this committee. Most of the Members know that I am not a climate change naysayer. The fact is that climate change funding has been increasing over the past few years, and no one has any idea how or whether its funding is being coordinated between various agencies. The GAO came to the same conclusion in a report released in May of this year. The GAO said: "Without further improvement in how Federal climate change funding is defined and reported, strategic priorities are set, and funding is aligned with priorities, it will be difficult for the public and Congress to fully understand how climate change funds are accounted for and how they are spent." As a result of this ongoing concern, climate change funding in this bill is reduced by \$83 million, or 22 percent.

The bill also makes significant reductions in funding for land acquisition. Land acquisition was funded at \$301 million in the current fiscal year. The President had requested \$900 million for next year. We funded it at \$66 million in this bill to complete land acquisitions currently under consideration. I would personally like to see more funding in the LWCF. The problem is, we just don't have the money.

It's also worth noting that while we increase funding for oil and gas rig inspections, we don't pay for them by including the President's proposed \$38 million increase for additional onshore gas and oil fees or the \$55 million increase for additional offshore oil and gas fees. These issues are best left to the authorizing committees of jurisdiction. And I hope that by next year, the authorizing committees will address this issue.

There are a few other items that may be of interest to Members that I'll mention briefly: The U.S. Geological Survey is funded at \$1.1 billion, which is \$30 million, or 3 percent, below the FY11-enacted level. The next-generation LandSat satellite imaging program, which has been a cooperative

venture with NASA, was proposed to be transferred entirely to USGS without any corresponding funding from NASA. Because projected costs are estimated to increase tenfold over the next 2 years and because LandSat is a widely used governmental and private sector resource, this bill sends the proposal back to the administration with instructions to start over.

Within the EPA, the bill includes \$15 million for a new competitive grant program to fund rural water technical assistance, which is widely supported on both sides of the aisle. The NEA and the NEH are both funded at \$135 million, which is a level too low for some Members and too high for others. It's worth noting that both sides worked together in an effort to maintain several longstanding proven programs that the administration had slated for termination.

The bill provides funding for the Smithsonian at levels just below the FY11-enacted level and includes \$50 million to begin construction of the National Museum of African American History and Culture and \$75 million for revitalization of existing Smithsonian buildings. The bill also provides a \$30 million down payment to begin construction next year of a memorial to honor the memory of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I suspect that most of the headlines from House consideration of this bill will focus on the committee's attention to the EPA. We need to continue funding the EPA in order for business to obtain the necessary permits to operate in accord with the environmental laws.

Through EPA funding, we also continue to address our Nation's critical water and wastewater infrastructure needs. However, one of the major underlying themes to this year's work is the sheer volume of regulatory actions being pursued by agencies in the absence of legislation and without clear congressional direction.

My intense opposition to the EPA's efforts to control nearly every industry in this country is no secret. The EPA's unrestrained effort to regulate greenhouse gases and the pursuit of an overly aggressive regulatory agenda are signs of an agency that has lost its bearings.

Wherever I go, the biggest complaint I hear about the Federal Government is about how the EPA is creating economic uncertainty and killing jobs. This isn't a partisan issue. Members of both parties have said that the EPA's regulatory actions vastly exceed its authority and congressional intent. The responsibility to determine whether or not to expand that authority rests solely with Congress, not with the EPA. We have included a number of provisions in the base bill to address some of these issues and more were added in full committee. We saw during consideration of H.R. 1 earlier this year and we will see again on the House floor even more efforts to rein in the EPA.

I know some of my Democrat friends will be especially critical of the spending reductions in EPA accounts. While we all recognize the importance of the clean drinking water and safe drinking water State revolving funds, we also know funding them, as we have in the past, is not possible. We need to find a better long-term funding source for water infrastructure projects, something that a number of Members have been working on.

It's also worth pointing out that these accounts received \$6 billion in Recovery Act funds in 2009 and still have nearly \$3 billion in previously appropriated funding that they have yet to spend. In calendar year 2009, the EPA received over \$25 billion in combined stimulus funding and regular appropriation. So it should come as no surprise that the funding for the EPA was reduced by \$1.5 billion, or 18 percent, from current levels.

Much will be said today about the subcommittee's allocation of the policy provisions in this bill; but just remember, at the end of the day, what this committee is attempting to do is all about reducing spending, creating more certainty in the marketplace, and promoting an economic environment conducive to job growth. If there's one

thing that we should have learned in the last couple of years, it's that we can't spend our way to an economic recovery. That didn't work. All it did was make the hole we're in much deeper.

I know Mr. MORAN and Mr. DICKS may not agree, but the legislative provisions in this bill and those that will be added today and on the House floor, they are not special interests. They're about jobs. They're about protecting businesses and hardworking Americans from frivolous lawsuits. They're about creating certainty in the marketplace, and they're about assuring businesses that employ people that it's safe to begin hiring people again without the threat of the EPA, under the guise of protecting our environment, imposing millions of dollars of penalties through regulations that are unreasonable or simply defy common sense.

Is this a perfect bill? No. But I've never seen a perfect bill. This is a bill that makes some very tough choices on spending. It's a bill that attempts to rein in the excesses of the EPA, and it's a bill that sends a clear message to stakeholders in Congress that it's time to get busy on renewing expiring authorizations. I wish we had more money to spend on a variety of programs that I, and other Members, be-

lieve are important. I also wish we didn't have a \$1.6 trillion deficit. I wish we weren't \$14.5 trillion in debt. I wish the economy was booming and that unemployment was something we only read about in history books. Unfortunately, wishing doesn't make it so. These are the economic and political realities that we have to face.

□ 1400

In closing, I'd like to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle for their hard work in producing this bill. Most Members don't realize how much time and effort staff members put into this. On the minority side, I'd like to thank Rick Healy and Shalanda Young, as well as Tim Aiken and Pete Modaff. They have played an integral role in the process, and their efforts are very much appreciated.

On the majority side, I'd like to thank the subcommittee staff: Colin Vickery, Grace Stephens, who, by the way, just had a baby last week—she held off until she was sure we had this bill through the full committee—Erica Rhoad, Jason Gray, Darren Benjamin, and Dave LesStrang. I'd also like to thank Missy Small, Kaylyn Bessey and Lindsay Slater on my personal staff for their great work.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT					
Management of Lands and Resources					
Land Resources:					
Soil, water and air management.....	62,989	46,303	46,303	-16,686	---
Range management.....	76,915	71,603	87,532	+10,617	+15,929
Forestry management.....	9,945	9,730	9,945	---	+215
Riparian management.....	22,805	23,052	22,718	-87	-334
Cultural resources management.....	16,816	25,614	16,131	-685	-9,483
Wild horse and burro management.....	75,753	75,008	63,986	-11,767	-11,022
Subtotal.....	265,223	251,310	246,615	-18,608	-4,695
Wildlife and Fisheries:					
Wildlife management.....	37,430	36,973	37,430	---	+457
Fisheries management.....	13,599	13,354	13,354	-245	---
Subtotal.....	51,029	50,327	50,784	-245	+457
Threatened and endangered species.....	22,159	21,668	21,668	-491	---
Recreation Management:					
Wilderness management.....	19,664	19,587	18,421	-1,243	-1,166
Recreation resources management.....	49,153	57,170	49,153	---	-8,017
Subtotal.....	68,817	76,757	67,574	-1,243	-9,183
Energy and Minerals:					
Oil and gas.....	70,130	39,632	74,582	+4,452	+34,950
Oil and gas permit processing fund.....	45,500	32,500	32,500	-13,000	---
(Pilot offices, Sec. 365, permit processing fund)...	(21,000)	(20,973)	(20,973)	(-27)	---
Subtotal, Oil and gas/permit processing fund....	115,630	72,132	107,082	-8,548	+34,950
Oil and gas offsetting permit processing fees.....	-45,500	-32,500	-32,500	+13,000	---
Inspection fees.....	---	37,950	---	---	-37,950
Offsetting collections, inspection fees.....	---	-37,950	---	---	+37,950
Coal management.....	9,724	7,054	7,054	-2,670	---
Other mineral resources.....	10,597	8,415	10,415	-182	+2,000
Renewable energy.....	---	19,735	19,735	+19,735	---
Subtotal, Energy and minerals.....	90,451	74,836	111,786	+21,335	+36,950
Realty and Ownership Management:					
Alaska conveyance.....	29,108	16,622	16,622	-12,486	---
Cadastral survey.....	12,392	12,015	12,015	-377	---
Land and realty management.....	56,400	32,657	32,657	-23,743	---
Subtotal.....	97,900	61,294	61,294	-36,606	---
Resource Protection and Maintenance:					
Resource management planning.....	42,426	40,621	35,621	-6,805	-5,000
Abandoned mine lands.....	---	19,851	19,851	+19,851	---
Resource protection and law enforcement.....	27,685	27,067	27,067	-618	---
Hazardous materials management.....	17,028	16,668	16,668	-360	---
Subtotal.....	87,139	104,207	99,207	+12,068	-5,000
Transportation and Facilities Maintenance:					
Operations.....	6,047	---	---	-6,047	---
Annual maintenance.....	31,879	41,226	38,226	+6,347	-3,000
Deferred maintenance.....	34,429	30,008	30,008	-4,421	---
Subtotal.....	72,355	71,234	68,234	-4,121	-3,000

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Land and resources information systems.....	16,697	15,852	15,852	-845	---
Workforce and Organizational Support:					
Information systems operations.....	15,343	14,697	14,697	-646	---
Administrative support.....	50,287	49,209	49,209	-1,078	---
Bureauwide fixed costs.....	91,307	93,576	91,307	---	-2,269
Subtotal.....	156,937	157,482	155,213	-1,724	-2,269
Challenge cost share.....	1,202	9,467	---	-1,202	-9,467
National landscape conservation system, base program..	31,870	39,345	20,000	-11,870	-19,345
(National landscape conservation system, total program)	(74,635)	---	---	(-74,635)	---
Subtotal, Management of lands and resources.....	961,779	933,779	918,227	-43,552	-15,552
Mining Law Administration:					
Administration.....	36,696	39,696	39,696	+3,000	---
Offsetting collections.....	-47,696	-54,000	-54,000	-6,304	---
Subtotal, Mining Law Administration.....	-11,000	-14,304	-14,304	-3,304	---
Total, Management of lands and resources.....	950,779	919,475	903,923	-46,856	-15,552
Construction					
Appropriation.....	4,617	3,576	3,576	-1,041	---
Land Acquisition					
Land Acquisition.....	18,584	46,620	---	-18,584	-46,620
Inholding, emergency, and hardship.....	1,497	1,500	3,000	+1,503	+1,500
Acquisition management.....	1,875	1,880	1,880	+5	---
Total, Land acquisition.....	21,956	50,000	4,880	-17,076	-45,120
Oregon and California Grant Lands					
Western Oregon resources management.....	96,929	98,056	98,056	+1,127	---
Western Oregon information and resource data systems..	2,124	1,926	1,926	-198	---
Western Oregon transportation & facilities maintenance	11,136	11,002	11,002	-134	---
Western Oregon construction and acquisition.....	314	310	310	-4	---
Western Oregon national monument.....	831	749	749	-82	---
Total, Oregon and California grant lands.....	111,334	112,043	112,043	+709	---
Range Improvements					
Improvements to public lands.....	7,873	7,873	7,873	---	---
Farm Tenant Act lands.....	1,527	1,527	1,527	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	600	600	600	---	---
Total, Range improvements.....	10,000	10,000	10,000	---	---
Service Charges, Deposits, and Forfeitures					
Rights-of-way processing.....	16,400	16,400	16,400	---	---
Energy and minerals cost recovery.....	2,600	7,300	7,300	+4,700	---
Recreation cost recovery.....	1,000	1,500	1,500	+500	---
Adopt-a-horse program.....	500	450	450	-50	---
Repair of damaged lands.....	5,600	3,100	3,100	-2,500	---
Cost recoverable realty cases.....	900	900	900	---	---
Timber purchaser expenses.....	100	50	50	-50	---
Commercial film and photography fees.....	200	200	200	---	---
Copy fees.....	2,000	1,100	1,100	-900	---
Trans Alaska pipeline.....	4,000	1,125	1,125	-2,875	---
Subtotal (gross).....	33,300	32,125	32,125	-1,175	---
Offsetting fees.....	-33,300	-32,125	-32,125	+1,175	---
Total, Service Charges, Deposits & Forfeitures..	---	---	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

Miscellaneous Trust Funds and Permanent Operating Funds					
Current appropriations.....	15,200	19,700	19,700	+4,500	---
=====					
TOTAL, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT.....	1,113,886	1,114,794	1,054,122	-59,764	-60,672
(Mandatory).....	(25,200)	(29,700)	(29,700)	(+4,500)	---
(Discretionary).....	(1,088,686)	(1,085,094)	(1,024,422)	(-64,264)	(-60,672)
=====					
UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE					
Resource Management					
Ecological Services:					
Endangered species:					
Candidate conservation.....	11,448	11,426	10,670	-778	-756
Listing and critical habitat:					
Critical habitat.....	9,472	10,431	---	-9,472	-10,431
Listing.....	11,430	8,847	---	-11,430	-8,847
International listing.....	---	1,500	---	---	-1,500
Petitions.....	---	3,866	---	---	-3,866
Subtotal.....	20,902	24,644	---	-20,902	-24,644
Consultation and HCPs.....	61,877	62,888	53,462	-8,415	-9,426
Recovery.....	81,219	83,692	74,575	-6,644	-9,117
Subtotal, Endangered species.....	175,446	182,650	138,707	-36,739	-43,943
Habitat conservation:					
Partners for fish and wildlife.....	55,304	59,400	39,400	-15,904	-20,000
Conservation planning assistance.....	36,791	38,368	21,368	-15,423	-17,000
Coastal programs.....	15,137	15,436	13,436	-1,701	-2,000
National wetlands inventory.....	5,292	5,238	4,238	-1,054	-1,000
Subtotal, Habitat conservation.....	112,524	118,442	78,442	-34,082	-40,000
Environmental contaminants.....	13,316	13,825	11,825	-1,491	-2,000
Subtotal, Ecological services.....	301,286	314,917	228,974	-72,312	-85,943
National Wildlife Refuge System:					
Wildlife and habitat management.....	226,963	240,241	199,859	-27,104	-40,382
Visitor services.....	75,631	77,621	72,906	-2,725	-4,715
Refuge law enforcement.....	38,071	37,558	31,637	-6,434	-5,921
Conservation planning.....	11,862	8,283	11,723	-139	+3,440
Refuge maintenance.....	139,532	139,172	139,172	-360	---
Subtotal.....	492,059	502,875	455,297	-36,762	-47,578
Migratory Birds, Law Enforcement & International Conservation:					
Migratory bird management.....	52,175	54,423	50,423	-1,752	-4,000
Law enforcement.....	62,930	62,634	58,634	-4,296	-4,000
International affairs.....	13,119	12,991	12,991	-128	---
Subtotal.....	128,224	130,048	122,048	-6,176	-8,000
Fisheries and Aquatic Resource Conservation:					
National fish hatchery system operations.....	48,856	42,761	46,149	-2,707	+3,388
Maintenance and equipment.....	18,180	18,060	18,060	-120	---
Aquatic habitat and species conservation.....	71,903	75,191	64,134	-7,769	-11,057
Subtotal.....	138,939	136,012	128,343	-10,596	-7,669

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Cooperative landscape conservation & adaptive science:					
Cooperative landscape conservation.....	14,727	20,247	10,000	-4,727	-10,247
Adaptive science.....	16,243	17,236	10,000	-6,243	-7,236
Subtotal.....	30,970	37,483	20,000	-10,970	-17,483
General Operations:					
Central office operations.....	42,720	39,941	38,777	-3,943	-1,164
Regional office operations.....	42,836	42,299	41,480	-1,356	-819
Service-wide bill paying.....	36,360	36,097	32,941	-3,419	-3,156
National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.....	7,537	8,537	7,537	---	-1,000
National Conservation Training Center.....	23,930	23,658	23,658	-272	---
Subtotal.....	153,383	150,532	144,393	-8,990	-6,139
Total, Resource Management.....	1,244,861	1,271,867	1,099,055	-145,806	-172,812
Construction					
Construction and rehabilitation:					
Line item construction projects.....	9,810	12,149	2,365	-7,445	-9,784
Bridge and dam safety programs.....	1,851	1,855	1,855	+4	---
Nationwide engineering service.....	9,143	9,084	7,584	-1,559	-1,500
Total, Construction.....	20,804	23,088	11,804	-9,000	-11,284
Land Acquisition					
Acquisitions.....	35,374	108,990	---	-35,374	-108,990
Highlands Conservation Act.....	---	5,000	4,000	+4,000	-1,000
Inholdings/emergencies and hardships.....	4,990	5,000	3,000	-1,990	-2,000
Exchanges.....	1,996	2,000	---	-1,996	-2,000
Acquisition management.....	10,534	13,570	6,570	-3,964	-7,000
User pay cost share.....	1,996	2,000	1,477	-519	-523
Refuge land protection planning.....	---	3,440	---	---	-3,440
Total, Land acquisition.....	54,890	140,000	15,047	-39,843	-124,953
Landowner Incentive Program					
Rescission of prior year balances.....	-4,941	---	---	+4,941	---
Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund					
Grants and administration:					
Conservation grants.....	11,101	17,000	---	-11,101	-17,000
HCP assistance grants.....	10,000	13,500	---	-10,000	-13,500
Snake River Water Rights Act of 2004.....	4,987	---	---	-4,987	---
Administration.....	2,854	3,354	2,854	---	-500
Subtotal, Grants and administration.....	28,942	33,854	2,854	-26,088	-31,000
Land acquisition:					
Species recovery land acquisition.....	11,000	19,646	---	-11,000	-19,646
HCP land acquisition grants to states.....	19,938	46,500	---	-19,938	-46,500
Subtotal, Land acquisition.....	30,938	66,146	---	-30,938	-66,146
Total, Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund.....	59,880	100,000	2,854	-57,026	-97,146
National Wildlife Refuge Fund					
Payments in lieu of taxes.....	14,471	---	13,980	-491	+13,980

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
North American Wetlands Conservation Fund					
North American Wetlands Conservation Fund.....	37,425	50,000	20,000	-17,425	-30,000
Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Fund					
Migratory bird grants.....	3,992	5,000	---	-3,992	-5,000
Multinational Species Conservation Fund					
African elephant conservation fund.....	1,735	1,950	1,477	-258	-473
Rhinoceros and tiger conservation fund.....	2,604	2,450	1,969	-635	-481
Asian elephant conservation fund.....	1,735	1,950	1,477	-258	-473
Great ape conservation fund.....	2,170	1,950	1,969	-201	+19
Marine turtle conservation fund.....	1,736	1,450	983	-753	-467
Total, Multinational Species Conservation Fund..	9,980	9,750	7,875	-2,105	-1,875
State and Tribal Wildlife Grants					
State wildlife grants (formula).....	49,900	67,000	20,000	-29,900	-47,000
State wildlife grants (competitive).....	4,990	20,000	---	-4,990	-20,000
Tribal wildlife grants.....	6,986	8,000	2,000	-4,986	-6,000
Total, State and tribal wildlife grants.....	61,876	95,000	22,000	-39,876	-73,000
TOTAL, U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE.....	1,503,238	1,694,705	1,192,615	-310,623	-502,090
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE					
Operation of the National Park System					
Park Management:					
Resource stewardship.....	343,640	356,276	336,742	-6,898	-19,534
Visitor services.....	239,817	251,299	240,817	+1,000	-10,482
Park protection.....	362,143	364,895	362,143	---	-2,752
Facility operations and maintenance.....	695,020	706,538	691,020	-4,000	-15,518
Park support.....	442,967	448,679	442,967	---	-5,712
Subtotal.....	2,083,587	2,127,687	2,073,689	-9,898	-53,998
External administrative costs.....	166,463	169,190	166,463	---	-2,727
Total, Operation of the National Park System....	2,250,050	2,296,877	2,240,152	-9,898	-56,725
National Recreation and Preservation					
Recreation programs.....	587	585	585	-2	---
Natural programs.....	11,172	13,376	11,172	---	-2,204
Cultural programs.....	24,882	24,804	24,804	-78	---
International park affairs.....	1,646	1,638	1,638	-8	---
Environmental and compliance review.....	433	431	431	-2	---
Grant administration.....	1,749	1,740	1,740	-9	---
Heritage Partnership Programs.....	17,401	8,993	8,993	-8,408	---
Total, National Recreation and Preservation.....	57,870	51,567	49,363	-8,507	-2,204
Historic Preservation Fund					
State historic preservation offices.....	46,407	50,000	42,500	-3,907	-7,500
Tribal grants.....	7,984	11,000	7,000	-984	-4,000
Total, Historic Preservation Fund.....	54,391	61,000	49,500	-4,891	-11,500

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Construction					
General Program:					
Line item construction and maintenance.....	121,159	70,347	70,347	-50,812	---
Emergency and unscheduled.....	3,853	3,861	3,861	+8	---
Housing.....	4,955	2,965	2,965	-1,990	---
Dam safety.....	2,495	1,250	1,250	-1,245	---
Equipment replacement.....	13,723	13,750	13,750	+27	---
Planning, construction.....	10,104	7,712	7,712	-2,392	---
Construction program management.....	38,527	37,590	37,590	-937	---
General management plans.....	14,830	14,646	14,646	-184	---
Rescission of prior year balances.....	-25,000	---	---	+25,000	---
Total, Construction.....	184,646	152,121	152,121	-32,525	---
Land and Water Conservation Fund (rescission of contract authority).....	-30,000	-30,000	-30,000	---	---
Land Acquisition and State Assistance					
Assistance to States:					
State conservation grants (formula).....	37,126	78,000	---	-37,126	-78,000
State conservation grants (competitive).....	---	117,000	---	---	-117,000
Administrative expenses.....	2,794	5,000	2,794	---	-2,206
Subtotal.....	39,920	200,000	2,794	-37,126	-197,206
National Park Service:					
Acquisitions.....	32,767	109,000	---	-32,767	-109,000
American Battlefield Protection Program.....	8,982	10,000	2,000	-6,982	-8,000
Emergencies and hardships.....	1,007	12,000	1,250	+243	-10,750
Acquisition management.....	7,134	12,000	7,250	+116	-4,750
Inholdings, donations, and exchanges.....	5,000	17,000	5,000	---	-12,000
Subtotal.....	54,890	160,000	15,500	-39,390	-144,500
Total, Land Acquisition and State Assistance....	94,810	360,000	18,294	-76,516	-341,706
Rescission.....	-625	---	---	+625	---
TOTAL, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE.....	2,611,142	2,891,565	2,479,430	-131,712	-412,135

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Surveys, Investigations, and Research

Ecosystems:					
Status and trends.....	22,403	22,079	20,985	-1,418	-1,094
Fisheries: Aquatic and endangered resources.....	23,694	22,660	22,660	-1,034	---
Wildlife: Terrestrial and endangered resources.....	49,078	48,544	44,230	-4,848	-4,314
Terrestrial, Freshwater and marine environments.....	35,763	40,230	37,227	+1,464	-3,003
Invasive species.....	10,795	14,086	10,580	-215	-3,506
Cooperative research units.....	19,104	18,824	14,438	-4,666	-4,386
Total, Ecosystems.....	160,837	166,423	150,120	-10,717	-16,303
Climate and Land Use Change:					
Climate variability:					
Climate science centers.....	20,921	25,573	25,573	+4,652	---
Research and development.....	28,468	24,141	15,055	-13,413	-9,086
Carbon sequestration.....	9,955	14,345	---	-9,955	-14,345
Science support for DOI bureaus.....	4,990	8,860	---	-4,990	-8,860
Subtotal.....	64,334	72,919	40,628	-23,706	-32,291

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Land Use Change:					
Land remote sensing.....	62,387	21,975	73,792	+11,405	+51,817
Geographic analysis and monitoring.....	11,420	11,511	11,511	+91	---
Subtotal.....	73,807	33,486	85,303	+11,496	+51,817
Total, Climate and Land Use Change.....	138,141	106,405	125,931	-12,210	+19,526
Energy, Minerals, and Environmental Health:					
Minerals resources.....	52,168	44,164	52,168	---	+8,004
Energy resources.....	27,750	27,392	27,750	---	+358
Contaminant biology.....	9,216	8,695	9,216	---	+521
Toxic substances hydrology.....	10,778	8,267	10,778	---	+2,511
Total, Energy, Minerals, and Env Health.....	99,912	88,518	99,912	---	+11,394
Natural Hazards:					
Earthquake hazards.....	55,979	52,326	55,979	---	+3,653
Volcano hazards.....	24,464	23,359	24,464	---	+1,105
Landslide hazards.....	3,318	3,278	3,318	---	+40
Global seismographic network.....	5,379	5,332	5,379	---	+47
Geomagnetism.....	2,097	2,073	2,097	---	+24
Coastal and marine geology.....	44,728	47,501	44,728	---	-2,773
Total, Natural Hazards.....	135,965	133,869	135,965	---	+2,096
Water Resources:					
Groundwater resources.....	8,481	6,947	8,481	---	+1,534
National water quality assessment.....	64,234	57,540	64,234	---	+6,694
National streamflow information program.....	27,100	26,913	30,000	+2,900	+3,087
Hydrologic research and development.....	11,932	12,008	12,008	+76	---
Hydrologic networks and analysis.....	30,719	33,940	30,719	---	-3,221
Cooperative Water Program.....	63,471	62,252	65,561	+2,090	+3,309
Water Resources Research Act Program.....	6,486	---	6,500	+14	+6,500
Total, Water Resources.....	212,423	199,600	217,503	+5,080	+17,903
Core Science Systems:					
Biological information management and delivery.....	18,563	15,113	15,113	-3,450	---
Nat'l Geological & Geophysical Data Pres Program....	998	---	600	-398	+600
National cooperative geological mapping.....	27,712	25,397	27,712	---	+2,315
National Geospatial Program.....	65,755	65,365	65,755	---	+390
Total, Core Science Systems.....	113,028	105,875	109,180	-3,848	+3,305
Administration and Enterprise Information:					
Science support.....	77,229	79,620	77,229	---	-2,391
Security and technology.....	23,430	21,072	21,072	-2,358	---
Information resources.....	17,988	15,863	15,863	-2,125	---
Total, Admin and Enterprise Information.....	118,647	116,555	114,164	-4,483	-2,391
Facilities:					
Rental payments and operations & maintenance.....	97,427	93,485	93,485	-3,942	---
Deferred maintenance and capital improvement.....	7,292	4,807	7,292	---	+2,485
Construction.....	---	2,500	---	---	-2,500
Total, Facilities.....	104,719	100,792	100,777	-3,942	-15
Total, Surveys, Investigations, and Research....	1,083,672	1,018,037	1,053,552	-30,120	+35,515
National Land Imaging					
National land imaging.....	---	99,817	---	---	-99,817
TOTAL, UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.....	1,083,672	1,117,854	1,053,552	-30,120	-64,302

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT, REGULATION, AND ENFORCEMENT					
(Formerly the Minerals Management Service)					
Ocean Energy Management					
Offshore Energy and Minerals Management:					
Renewable energy.....	23,192	23,073	21,413	-1,779	-1,660
Leasing and environmental program.....	65,352	75,410	75,410	+10,058	---
Resource evaluation.....	35,057	34,733	34,733	-324	---
Regulatory program.....	88,368	143,319	110,319	+21,951	-33,000
Information management program.....	20,484	20,468	20,468	-16	---
Subtotal.....	232,453	297,003	262,343	+29,890	-34,660
Royalty Management:*					
Compliance and asset management.....	67,559	---	---	-67,559	---
Revenue and operations.....	41,805	---	---	-41,805	---
Subtotal.....	109,364	---	---	-109,364	---
*now ONRR under Office of the Secretary					
General Administration:					
Executive direction.....	5,751	3,040	3,040	-2,711	---
Policy and management improvement.....	5,441	10,039	10,039	+4,598	---
Administrative operations.....	21,215	12,324	12,324	-8,891	---
General support services.....	29,665	21,022	21,022	-8,643	---
Subtotal.....	62,072	46,425	46,425	-15,647	---
Total (gross).....	403,889	343,428	308,768	-95,121	-34,660
Use of receipts and cost recovery fees.....	-154,890	-160,163	-160,163	-5,273	---
Inspection fees.....	-10,000	-62,000	-10,000	---	+52,000
Total, Ocean Energy Management.....	238,999	121,265	138,605	-100,394	+17,340
Oil Spill Research					
Oil spill research.....	11,744	14,923	14,923	+3,179	---
Subtotal, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation, and Enforcement.....	250,743	136,188	153,528	-97,215	+17,340
OCS Connect (rescission)(Sec. 128, P.L. 111-242).....	-25,000	---	---	+25,000	---
TOTAL, BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT, REGULATION, AND ENFORCEMENT.....	225,743	136,188	153,528	-72,215	+17,340
OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT					
Regulation and Technology					
Environmental restoration.....	161	---	---	-161	---
Environmental protection.....	94,578	87,438	92,019	-2,559	+4,581
Technology development and transfer.....	15,455	14,478	14,478	-977	---
Financial management.....	513	506	506	-7	---
Executive direction.....	16,219	15,947	15,947	-272	---
Civil penalties.....	100	100	100	---	---
Total, Regulation and Technology.....	127,026	118,469	123,050	-3,976	+4,581

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund					
Environmental restoration.....	15,015	9,495	9,495	-5,520	---
Technology development and transfer.....	5,751	3,550	3,550	-2,201	---
Financial management.....	6,443	6,406	6,406	-37	---
Executive direction.....	8,308	7,992	7,992	-316	---
Total, Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund.....	35,517	27,443	27,443	-8,074	---
TOTAL, OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT.....					
	162,543	145,912	150,493	-12,050	+4,581
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS					
Operation of Indian Programs					
Tribal Government:					
Aid to tribal government.....	31,886	30,541	30,541	-1,345	---
Consolidated tribal government program.....	71,710	76,520	71,710	---	-4,810
Self governance compacts.....	148,951	155,084	148,951	---	-6,133
Contract support.....	219,560	195,490	228,000	+8,440	+32,510
Indian self determination fund.....	1,996	2,000	2,000	+4	---
New tribes.....	310	315	315	+5	---
Small and needy tribes.....	---	2,950	2,950	+2,950	---
Road maintenance.....	26,390	25,431	25,431	-959	---
Tribal government program oversight.....	8,786	8,762	8,762	-24	---
Subtotal.....	509,589	497,093	518,660	+9,071	+21,567
Human Services:					
Social services.....	33,879	35,627	33,879	---	-1,748
Welfare assistance.....	74,761	74,911	74,911	+150	---
Indian child welfare act.....	11,053	10,867	10,867	-186	---
Housing improvement program.....	12,598	12,619	12,619	+21	---
Human services tribal design.....	430	430	430	---	---
Human services program oversight.....	3,900	3,373	3,373	-527	---
Subtotal.....	136,621	137,827	136,079	-542	-1,748
Trust - Natural Resources Management:					
Natural resources, general.....	4,547	5,124	5,124	+577	---
Irrigation operations and maintenance.....	11,910	11,939	11,939	+29	---
Rights protection implementation.....	28,442	29,602	29,602	+1,160	---
Tribal management/development program.....	6,782	8,651	6,782	---	-1,869
Endangered species.....	1,248	1,247	1,247	-1	---
Integrated resource information program.....	2,105	2,109	2,109	+4	---
Cooperative landscape conservation.....	419	200	419	---	+219
Agriculture and range.....	28,863	28,883	28,883	+20	---
Forestry.....	43,644	44,195	43,644	---	-551
Water resources.....	10,150	10,839	10,150	---	-689
Fish, wildlife and parks.....	11,340	13,342	11,341	+1	-2,001
Resource management program oversight.....	6,632	6,121	6,121	-511	---
Subtotal.....	156,082	162,252	157,361	+1,279	-4,891
Trust - Real Estate Services.....	145,821	125,457	122,596	-23,225	-2,861
Education:					
Elementary and secondary programs (forward funded)..	520,048	526,117	520,048	---	-6,069
(Tribal grant support costs)	(46,280)	(46,373)	(46,373)	(+93)	---
Post secondary programs (forward funded).....	64,192	64,321	64,321	+129	---
Subtotal, forward funded education.....	584,240	590,438	584,369	+129	-6,069
Elementary and secondary programs.....	76,939	122,730	102,730	+25,791	-20,000
Post secondary programs.....	61,603	60,380	60,380	-1,223	---
Education management.....	29,916	22,006	22,006	-7,910	---
Subtotal, Education.....	752,698	795,554	769,485	+16,787	-26,069

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Public Safety and Justice:					
Law enforcement.....	305,893	330,391	318,391	+12,498	-12,000
Tribal courts.....	27,088	23,445	23,445	-3,643	---
Fire protection.....	1,109	873	873	-236	---
Subtotal.....	334,090	354,709	342,709	+8,619	-12,000
Community and economic development.....	36,856	34,865	34,865	-1,991	---
Executive direction and administrative services..... (housing improvement, road maint, etc. in bill lang)..	258,089 (59,545)	251,935 (48,049)	251,935 (48,049)	-6,154 (-11,496)	---
Total, Operation of Indian Programs.....	2,329,846	2,359,692	2,333,690	+3,844	-26,002
Construction					
Education.....	140,509	52,104	102,104	-38,405	+50,000
Public safety and justice.....	17,864	11,329	11,329	-6,535	---
Resources management.....	42,075	33,012	33,012	-9,063	---
General administration.....	2,039	2,035	2,035	-4	---
Construction management.....	7,093	6,512	6,512	-581	---
Total, Construction.....	209,580	104,992	154,992	-54,588	+50,000
Indian Land and Water Claim Settlements and Miscellaneous Payments to Indians					
White Earth Land Settlement Act (Admin).....	624	625	625	+1	---
Hoopa-Yurok settlement fund.....	250	250	250	---	---
Pyramid Lake water rights settlement.....	142	142	142	---	---
Nez Perce/Snake River.....	15,432	9,450	9,450	-5,982	---
Navajo Water Resources Development Trust Fund.....	5,988	6,000	6,000	+12	---
Navajo Gallup Water Settlement.....	---	4,388	4,388	+4,388	---
Duck Valley Water Rights Settlement.....	11,976	12,000	12,000	+24	---
Puget Sound regional shellfish settlement.....	6,487	---	---	-6,487	---
Soboba Band/Luiseno Indian Settlement.....	5,488	---	---	-5,488	---
Total, Indian Land and Water Claim Settlements and Miscellaneous Payments to Indians.....	46,387	32,855	32,855	-13,532	---
Indian Guaranteed Loan Program Account					
Indian guaranteed loan program account.....	8,199	3,114	8,114	-85	+5,000
TOTAL, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.....	2,594,012	2,500,653	2,529,651	-64,361	+28,998
DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES					
Office of the Secretary, Salaries and Expenses					
Executive direction.....	18,210	---	---	-18,210	---
Policy, management and budget.....	36,663	---	---	-36,663	---
Hearings and appeals.....	7,151	---	---	-7,151	---
Central administrative services.....	41,586	---	---	-41,586	---
Bureau of Mines workers compensation.....	570	---	---	-570	---
Indian Arts and Crafts Board.....	1,308	---	---	-1,308	---
Consolidated Appraisal services.....	12,112	---	---	-12,112	---
National Museum of American Latino Commission.....	998	---	---	-998	---
Leadership and administration.....	---	129,418	119,032	+119,032	-10,386
Management services.....	---	34,643	21,755	+21,755	-12,888
Office of Natural Resources Revenue.....	---	119,609	109,364	+109,364	-10,245
Total, Office of the Secretary, Salaries and expenses.....	118,598	283,670	250,151	+131,553	-33,519

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Insular Affairs					
Assistance to Territories					
Territorial Assistance					
Office of Insular Affairs.....	9,262	9,480	9,262	---	-218
Technical assistance.....	15,271	13,804	13,804	-1,467	---
Maintenance assistance fund.....	2,443	2,241	2,241	-202	---
Brown tree snake.....	2,994	3,000	2,994	---	-6
Coral reef initiative.....	998	1,000	998	---	-2
Water and wastewater projects.....	791	---	791	---	+791
Empowering Insular Communities.....	1,996	4,120	1,996	---	-2,124
Subtotal, Territorial Assistance.....	33,755	33,645	32,086	-1,669	-1,559
American Samoa operations grants.....	22,707	22,752	22,752	+45	---
Northern Marianas covenant grants.....	27,720	27,720	27,720	---	---
Total, Assistance to Territories.....	84,182	84,117	82,558	-1,624	-1,559
Compact of Free Association					
Compact of Free Association - Federal services.....	2,808	2,818	2,808	---	-10
Discretionary payments - program grant assistance.....	2,000	---	---	-2,000	---
Enewetak support.....	499	236	499	---	+263
Compact payments, Palau (section 122).....	12,000	---	---	-12,000	---
Total, Compact of Free Association.....	17,307	3,054	3,307	-14,000	+253
Total, Insular Affairs.....	101,489	87,171	85,865	-15,624	-1,306
Office of the Solicitor					
Legal services.....	47,510	49,481	47,510	---	-1,971
General administration.....	16,244	16,385	16,244	---	-141
Ethics.....	1,192	2,610	1,192	---	-1,418
Total, Office of the Solicitor.....	64,946	68,476	64,946	---	-3,530
Office of Inspector General					
Audit and investigations.....	38,800	39,203	38,800	---	-403
Administrative services and information management....	9,693	10,268	9,693	---	-575
Total, Office of Inspector General.....	48,493	49,471	48,493	---	-978
Office of Special Trustee for American Indians					
Federal Trust Programs					
Program operations, support, and improvements.....	157,942	150,103	150,103	-7,839	---
(Office of Historical Accounting).....	(31,534)	(31,171)	(31,171)	(-363)	---
Executive direction.....	2,736	2,216	2,216	-520	---
Total, Office of Special Trustee for American Indians.....	160,678	152,319	152,319	-8,359	---
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES.....	494,204	641,107	601,774	+107,570	-39,333
(Mandatory).....	(27,720)	(27,720)	(27,720)	---	---
(Discretionary).....	(466,484)	(613,387)	(574,054)	(+107,570)	(-39,333)

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
DEPARTMENT-WIDE PROGRAMS					
Wildland Fire Management					
Fire Operations:					
Preparedness.....	290,452	276,964	276,964	-13,488	---
Fire suppression operations.....	398,951	270,611	270,611	-128,340	---
Subtotal, Fire operations.....	689,403	547,575	547,575	-141,828	---
Other Operations:					
Hazardous fuels reduction.....	183,314	156,763	183,314	---	+26,551
Burned area rehabilitation.....	33,203	13,046	13,046	-20,157	---
Fire facilities.....	6,137	6,137	6,137	---	---
Joint fire science.....	6,000	6,000	6,000	---	---
Rural fire assistance.....	---	---	7,000	+7,000	+7,000
Subtotal, Other operations.....	228,654	181,946	215,497	-13,157	+33,551
Subtotal, Wildland fire management.....	918,057	729,521	763,072	-154,985	+33,551
Rescission of unobligated balances.....	-200,000	---	---	+200,000	---
Use of emergency suppression funds.....	---	---	-189,000	-189,000	-189,000
Total, Wildland fire management.....	718,057	729,521	574,072	-143,985	-155,449
FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Account					
FLAME wildfire suppression reserve account.....	60,878	92,000	92,000	+31,122	---
Total, all wildland fire accounts.....	778,935	821,521	666,072	-112,863	-155,449
Central Hazardous Materials Fund					
Central hazardous materials fund.....	10,155	10,149	10,149	-6	---
Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund					
Damage assessments.....	3,896	3,743	3,743	-153	---
Program management.....	1,937	1,906	1,406	-531	-500
Restoration support.....	616	614	614	-2	---
Total, Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund..	6,449	6,263	5,763	-686	-500
Working Capital Fund.....	85,651	73,119	57,019	-28,632	-16,100
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT-WIDE PROGRAMS.....	881,190	911,052	739,003	-142,187	-172,049
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
State royalty administrative cost deduction (BOEMRE).. (net receipt sharing - both on and offshore)	-42,000	-42,000	-42,000	---	---
Geothermal Energy Receipts (Sec. 423).....	-8,000	---	---	+8,000	---
Geothermal receipts amendment (P.L. 111-212).....	8,000	---	---	-8,000	---
TOTAL, GENERAL PROVISIONS.....	-42,000	-42,000	-42,000	---	---
TOTAL, TITLE I, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR....	10,627,630	11,111,830	9,912,168	-715,462	-1,199,662
Appropriations.....	(10,913,196)	(11,141,830)	(9,942,168)	(-971,028)	(-1,199,662)
Rescissions.....	(-285,566)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(+255,566)	---
(Mandatory).....	(52,920)	(57,420)	(57,420)	(+4,500)	---
(Discretionary).....	(10,574,710)	(11,054,410)	(9,854,748)	(-719,962)	(-1,199,662)

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE II - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY					
Science and Technology					
Air toxics and quality.....	120,517	---	---	-120,517	---
Clean Air and Climate.....	---	134,370	120,082	+120,082	-14,288
(Climate protection program).....	---	(16,345)	(16,345)	(+16,345)	---
Climate protection program.....	16,828	---	---	-16,828	---
Enforcement.....	15,293	15,326	15,293	---	-33
Homeland security.....	46,176	42,036	42,036	-4,140	---
Indoor air and Radiation.....	1,264	6,758	6,758	+5,494	---
IT / Data management / Security.....	3,657	4,108	3,657	---	-451
Operations and administration.....	69,660	76,521	70,050	+390	-6,471
(Rent).....	(30,237)	(35,661)	(35,661)	(+5,424)	---
(Utility).....	(19,851)	(20,195)	(20,195)	(+344)	---
(Security).....	(10,327)	(10,714)	(10,714)	(+387)	---
Pesticide licensing.....	6,578	6,831	6,578	---	-253
Research: Air, climate and energy.....	---	108,000	93,000	+93,000	-15,000
Research: Chemical safety and sustainability.....	---	138,057	125,514	+125,514	-12,543
(Research: Computational toxicology).....	(21,054)	(21,211)	(21,054)	---	(-157)
(Research: Endocrine disruptor).....	(15,950)	(16,888)	(15,950)	---	(-938)
Research: Clean air.....	102,404	---	---	-102,404	---
Research: Human health and ecosystems.....	243,894	---	---	-243,894	---
Research: Land protection.....	13,372	---	---	-13,372	---
Research: National priorities.....	---	---	5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Research: Pesticides and toxics.....	27,285	---	---	-27,285	---
Research: Safe and sustainable water resources.....	117,297	118,776	108,532	-8,765	-10,244
Research: Sustainable and healthy communities.....	---	171,026	154,324	+154,324	-16,702
Research: Sustainability.....	25,486	---	---	-25,486	---
Water: Human health protection.....	3,769	3,787	3,787	+18	---
Total, Science and Technology.....	813,480	825,596	754,611	-58,869	-70,985
(transfer from Superfund).....	(26,780)	(23,016)	(23,016)	(-3,764)	---
Environmental Programs and Management					
Air toxics and quality.....	207,272	---	---	-207,272	---
Brownfields.....	23,680	26,397	23,680	---	-2,717
Clean air and climate.....	---	315,286	263,741	+263,741	-51,545
(Climate protection program).....	---	(111,419)	(91,997)	(+91,997)	(-19,422)
Climate protection program.....	107,530	---	---	-107,530	---
Compliance.....	106,874	119,648	106,874	---	-12,774
Enforcement.....	255,850	268,218	226,656	-29,194	-41,562
(Environmental justice).....	(6,856)	(7,397)	(6,856)	---	(-541)
Environmental protection: National priorities.....	---	---	15,000	+15,000	+15,000
Geographic programs:					
Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.....	299,400	350,000	250,000	-49,400	-100,000
Chesapeake Bay.....	54,391	67,350	50,000	-4,391	-17,350
San Francisco Bay.....	5,333	4,847	4,847	-486	---
Puget Sound.....	38,095	19,289	30,000	-8,095	+10,711
Long Island Sound.....	5,333	2,962	2,962	-2,371	---
Gulf of Mexico.....	4,572	4,464	4,464	-108	---
South Florida.....	1,653	2,061	1,653	---	-408
Upper Mississippi River Basin.....	---	6,000	---	---	-6,000
Lake Champlain.....	3,048	1,399	1,399	-1,649	---
Lake Pontchartrain.....	1,143	955	955	-188	---
CARE(Community Action for a Renewed Environment)....	1,865	2,384	---	-1,865	-2,384
Other geographic activities.....	1,209	1,296	---	-1,209	-1,296
Subtotal.....	416,042	463,007	346,280	-69,762	-116,727

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Homeland security.....	12,856	11,300	11,300	-1,556	---
Indoor air and radiation.....	25,887	33,770	33,770	+7,883	---
Information exchange / Outreach.....	133,979	145,210	120,936	-13,043	-24,274
(Children and other sensitive populations: Agency coordination).....	(7,491)	(10,795)	(6,515)	(-976)	(-4,280)
(Environmental education).....	(9,713)	(9,885)	---	(-9,713)	(-9,885)
International programs.....	19,068	19,447	16,195	-2,873	-3,252
IT / Data management / Security.....	99,549	95,413	93,372	-6,177	-2,041
Legal/science/regulatory/economic review.....	122,657	128,610	89,234	-33,423	-39,376
Operations and administration.....	496,017	507,535	476,419	-19,598	-31,116
(Rent).....	(162,578)	(170,807)	(170,807)	(+8,229)	---
(Utilities).....	(13,182)	(11,221)	(11,221)	(-1,961)	---
(Security).....	(30,836)	(29,266)	(29,266)	(-1,570)	---
Pesticide licensing.....	116,889	110,523	110,523	-6,366	---
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).....	118,043	116,871	112,643	-5,400	-4,228
Toxics risk review and prevention.....	100,123	115,297	100,123	---	-15,174
(Endocrine disruptors).....	(8,554)	(8,268)	(8,268)	(-286)	---
Underground storage tanks (LUST / UST).....	12,966	12,866	12,866	-100	---
Water: Ecosystems					
National estuary program / Coastal waterways.....	26,748	27,058	26,748	---	-310
Wetlands.....	26,505	27,368	21,199	-5,306	-6,169
Subtotal.....	53,253	54,426	47,947	-5,306	-6,479
Water: Human health protection.....	104,188	107,324	98,324	-5,864	-9,000
Water quality protection.....	223,747	225,486	192,550	-31,197	-32,936
Total, Environmental Programs and Management.....	2,756,470	2,876,634	2,498,433	-258,037	-378,201
Office of Inspector General					
Audits, evaluations, and investigations.....	44,701	45,997	41,099	-3,602	-4,898
(transfer from Superfund).....	(9,955)	(10,009)	(9,955)	---	(-54)
Buildings and Facilities					
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure.....	7,055	8,038	7,055	---	-983
Operations and administration.....	29,373	33,931	29,373	---	-4,558
Total, Buildings and Facilities.....	36,428	41,969	36,428	---	-5,541
Hazardous Substance Superfund					
Audits, evaluations, and investigations.....	9,955	10,009	9,955	---	-54
Compliance.....	1,234	1,222	1,222	-12	---
Enforcement.....	191,621	191,615	181,615	-10,006	-10,000
Homeland security.....	41,707	41,834	41,834	+127	---
Indoor air and radiation.....	2,454	2,487	2,454	---	-33
Information exchange / Outreach.....	1,431	1,433	1,433	+2	---
IT /data management/security.....	17,408	16,080	16,080	-1,328	---
Legal/science/regulatory/economic review.....	1,528	1,677	1,528	---	-149
Operations and administration.....	136,648	138,069	136,369	-279	-1,700
(Rent).....	(43,798)	(47,112)	(47,112)	(+3,314)	---
(Utilities).....	(3,741)	(3,765)	(3,765)	(+24)	---
(Security).....	(8,396)	(8,282)	(8,282)	(-114)	---
Research: Chemical safety and sustainability*.....	4,027	3,342	3,342	-685	---
Research: Sustainable communities**.....	20,546	17,706	17,706	-2,840	---
Research: Sustainability.....	95	---	---	-95	---

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Superfund cleanup:					
Superfund: Emergency response and removal.....	200,498	194,895	194,895	-5,603	---
Superfund: Emergency preparedness.....	9,345	9,263	9,263	-82	---
Superfund: Federal facilities.....	31,135	26,242	26,242	-4,893	---
Superfund: Remedial.....	605,368	574,499	574,499	-30,869	---
Superfund: Support to other Federal agencies.....	5,908	5,858	5,858	-50	---
Subtotal.....	852,254	810,757	810,757	-41,497	---
Total, Hazardous Substance Superfund.....	1,280,908	1,236,231	1,224,295	-56,613	-11,936
(transfer to Inspector General).....	(-9,955)	(-10,009)	(-9,955)	---	(+54)
(transfer to Science and Technology).....	(-26,780)	(-23,016)	(-23,016)	(+3,764)	---
* Formerly Research: Human health and ecosystems					
** Formerly Research: Land protection					
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund (LUST)					
Enforcement.....	789	832	789	---	-43
Operations and administration.....	1,854	1,591	1,591	-263	---
Research: Sustainable communities*.....	397	454	454	+57	---
Underground storage tanks (LUST / UST).....	109,835	109,604	102,835	-7,000	-6,769
(LUST/UST).....	(12,410)	(11,982)	(11,982)	(-428)	---
(LUST cooperative agreements).....	(63,066)	(63,192)	(56,423)	(-6,643)	(-6,769)
(Energy Policy Act grants).....	(34,359)	(34,430)	(34,430)	(+71)	---
Total, Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund.....	112,875	112,481	105,669	-7,206	-6,812
* Formerly Research: Land protection					
Inland Oil Spill Program (formerly Oil Spill Response)					
Compliance.....	135	138	138	+3	---
Enforcement.....	2,288	2,902	2,288	---	-614
Oil.....	14,698	19,472	14,698	---	-4,774
Operations and administration.....	537	536	536	-1	---
Research: Sustainable communities*.....	684	614	614	-70	---
Total, Inland Oil Spill Program.....	18,342	23,662	18,274	-68	-5,388
* Formerly Research: Land protection					
State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG)					
Alaska Native villages.....	9,980	10,000	---	-9,980	-10,000
Brownfields projects.....	99,800	99,041	60,000	-39,800	-39,041
Clean water state revolving fund (SRF).....	1,521,950	1,550,000	689,000	-832,950	-861,000
Diesel emissions grants.....	49,900	---	30,000	-19,900	+30,000
Drinking water state revolving fund (SRF).....	963,070	990,000	829,000	-134,070	-161,000
Mexico border.....	9,980	10,000	---	-9,980	-10,000
Subtotal, Infrastructure assistance grants.....	2,654,680	2,659,041	1,608,000	-1,046,680	-1,051,041
Categorical grants:					
Beaches protection.....	9,880	9,900	9,880	---	-20
Brownfields.....	49,396	49,495	49,396	---	-99
Environmental information.....	9,980	10,200	9,980	---	-220
Hazardous waste financial assistance.....	103,139	103,412	103,139	---	-273
Lead.....	14,535	14,855	14,535	---	-320
Multi-media tribal implementation.....	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
Nonpoint source (Sec. 319).....	175,505	164,757	150,505	-25,000	-14,252
Pesticides enforcement.....	18,674	19,085	18,674	---	-411
Pesticides program implementation.....	13,493	13,140	13,140	-353	---
Pollution control (Sec. 106).....	238,786	250,264	204,264	-34,522	-46,000
(Water quality monitoring).....	(18,463)	(11,300)	(11,300)	(-7,163)	---
Pollution prevention.....	4,930	5,039	4,930	---	-109
Public water system supervision.....	105,489	109,700	105,489	---	-4,211
Radon.....	8,058	8,074	8,058	---	-16
State and local air quality management.....	236,107	305,500	201,580	-34,527	-103,920

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Toxics substances compliance.....	5,089	5,201	5,089	---	-112
Tribal air quality management.....	13,273	13,566	13,273	---	-293
Tribal general assistance program.....	67,739	71,375	62,875	-4,864	-8,500
Underground injection control (UIC).....	10,869	11,109	10,869	---	-240
Underground storage tanks.....	2,495	1,550	1,550	-945	---
Wetlands program development.....	16,796	15,167	15,167	-1,629	---
Subtotal, Categorical grants.....	1,104,233	1,201,389	1,002,393	-101,840	-198,996
Total, State and Tribal Assistance Grants.....	3,758,913	3,860,430	2,610,393	-1,148,520	-1,250,037
Subtotal, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.....	8,822,117	9,023,000	7,289,202	-1,532,915	-1,733,798
Rescission.....	-140,000	-50,000	-140,000	---	-90,000
TOTAL, TITLE II, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY	8,682,117	8,973,000	7,149,202	-1,532,915	-1,823,798
Appropriations.....	(8,822,117)	(9,023,000)	(7,289,202)	(-1,532,915)	(-1,733,798)
Rescissions.....	(-140,000)	(-50,000)	(-140,000)	---	(-90,000)

TITLE III - RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

Forest and Rangeland Research

Forest inventory and analysis.....	66,805	61,939	66,805	---	+4,866
Research and development programs.....	239,832	233,834	210,477	-29,355	-23,357
(Global Climate Change Science).....	(31,793)	(28,357)	---	(-31,793)	(-28,357)
Total, Forest and rangeland research.....	306,637	295,773	277,282	-29,355	-18,491

State and Private Forestry

Forest Health Management:					
Federal lands forest health management.....	56,737	55,613	54,501	-2,236	-1,112
Cooperative lands forest health management.....	48,821	43,942	43,063	-5,758	-879
Subtotal.....	105,558	99,555	97,564	-7,994	-1,991
Cooperative Fire Protection:					
State fire assistance.....	32,358	33,201	32,537	+179	-664
Volunteer fire assistance.....	6,680	7,000	6,680	---	-320
Subtotal.....	39,038	40,201	39,217	+179	-984
Cooperative Forestry:					
Forest stewardship.....	32,548	29,449	28,860	-3,688	-589
Forest legacy.....	52,894	135,000	3,000	-49,894	-132,000
Subtotal.....	52,894	135,000	3,000	-49,894	-132,000
Community forest and open space conservation.....	1,000	5,000	1,000	---	-4,000
Urban and community forestry.....	32,040	32,377	29,042	-2,998	-3,335
Forest resource information and analysis.....	5,026	---	4,925	-101	+4,925
Subtotal, Cooperative Forestry.....	123,508	201,826	66,827	-56,681	-134,999
International forestry.....	9,492	---	5,000	-4,492	+5,000
Total, State and Private Forestry.....	277,596	341,582	208,608	-68,988	-132,974

National Forest System

Land management planning.....	45,033	205,602	30,033	-15,000	-175,569
Inventory and monitoring.....	167,219	---	165,219	-2,000	+165,219
Recreation, heritage and wilderness.....	281,627	290,498	281,627	---	-8,871

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
Grazing management.....	49,738	45,445	55,445	+5,707	+10,000
Forest products.....	336,049	---	336,722	+673	+336,722
Vegetation and watershed management.....	184,341	---	184,341	---	+184,341
Wildlife and fish habitat management.....	140,260	---	140,260	---	+140,260
(Integrated resource restoration).....	---	(854,242)	---	---	(-854,242)
Restoration of Management and Resources.....	---	659,242	---	---	-659,242
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Fund.....	14,970	40,000	30,000	+15,030	-10,000
Priority watersheds and jobs stabilization.....	---	80,000	---	---	-80,000
Legacy roads and trails.....	---	75,000	---	---	-75,000
Minerals and geology management.....	83,560	78,805	83,560	---	+4,755
Landownership management.....	91,765	85,875	91,765	---	+5,890
Law enforcement operations.....	144,254	144,059	144,059	-195	---
Valles Caldera National Preserve.....	3,432	---	3,432	---	+3,432
<hr/>					
Total, National Forest System.....	1,542,248	1,704,526	1,546,463	+4,215	-158,063
<hr/>					
Capital Improvement and Maintenance					
Facilities:					
Maintenance.....	90,450	82,661	42,661	-47,789	-40,000
Construction.....	44,550	18,124	7,000	-37,550	-11,124
<hr/>					
Subtotal.....	135,000	100,785	49,661	-85,339	-51,124
Roads:					
Maintenance.....	167,868	148,944	166,885	-983	+17,941
Construction.....	27,327	8,874	35,000	+7,673	+26,126
<hr/>					
Subtotal.....	195,195	157,818	201,885	+6,690	+44,067
Trails:					
Maintenance.....	69,821	63,422	63,846	-5,975	+424
Construction.....	18,560	18,766	18,560	---	-206
<hr/>					
Subtotal.....	88,381	82,188	82,406	-5,975	+218
Deferred maintenance.....	9,158	9,136	9,136	-22	---
Legacy road and trail remediation.....	44,910	---	35,000	-9,910	+35,000
<hr/>					
Subtotal, Capital improvement and maintenance....	472,644	349,927	378,088	-94,556	+28,161
Deferral of road and trail fund payment.....	-13,000	-12,000	-12,000	+1,000	---
<hr/>					
Total, Capital improvement and maintenance.....	459,644	337,927	366,088	-93,556	+28,161
<hr/>					
Land Acquisition					
Acquisitions.....	19,235	72,500	---	-19,235	-72,500
Acquisition management.....	9,000	12,000	7,000	-2,000	-5,000
Cash equalization.....	400	1,000	1,000	+600	---
Critical inholdings/wilderness protection.....	4,299	4,500	4,500	+201	---
<hr/>					
Total, Land Acquisition.....	32,934	90,000	12,500	-20,434	-77,500
Acquisition of land for national forests, special acts	1,048	955	955	-93	---
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges.....	250	227	227	-23	---
Range betterment fund.....	3,600	3,262	3,262	-338	---
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research.....	50	45	45	-5	---
Management of national forest lands for subsistence uses.....	2,577	---	2,000	-577	+2,000
<hr/>					
Wildland Fire Management					
Fire operations:					
Wildland fire preparedness.....	673,650	1,006,052	1,006,052	+332,402	---
Wildland fire suppression operations.....	995,511	538,720	538,720	-456,791	---
<hr/>					
Subtotal, Fire operations.....	1,669,161	1,544,772	1,544,772	-124,389	---

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

Table with 6 columns: Description, FY 2011 Enacted, FY 2012 Request, Bill, Bill vs. Enacted, Bill vs. Request. Rows include: Other operations (Hazardous fuels, Fire plan research, etc.), Subtotal, Wildland fire management, Rescission, Use of emergency suppression funds, Total, Wildland fire management, FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Account, FLAME wildfire suppression reserve account, Rescission, Total, all wildland fire accounts, Forest Service payments to communities, Total, Forest Service without Wildland fire, TOTAL, FOREST SERVICE.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Indian Health Services

Clinical Services:

IHS and tribal health delivery

Table with 6 columns: Description, FY 2011 Enacted, FY 2012 Request, Bill, Bill vs. Enacted, Bill vs. Request. Rows include: Hospital and health clinic programs, Dental health program, Mental health program, Alcohol and substance abuse program, Contract health services, (Catastrophic health emergency fund), Subtotal.

Preventive Health:

Table with 6 columns: Description, FY 2011 Enacted, FY 2012 Request, Bill, Bill vs. Enacted, Bill vs. Request. Rows include: Public health nursing, Health education, Community health representatives program, Immunization (Alaska), Subtotal, Urban health program, Indian health professions, Tribal management, Direct operations.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Self-governance.....	6,054	6,329	6,317	+263	-12
Contract support costs.....	397,693	461,837	573,761	+176,068	+111,924
Total, Indian Health Services.....	3,665,273	4,166,139	4,034,322	+369,049	-131,817
Indian Health Facilities					
Maintenance and improvement.....	53,807	57,078	55,439	+1,632	-1,639
Sanitation facilities construction.....	95,665	79,710	77,002	-18,663	-2,708
Health care facilities construction.....	39,156	85,184	85,724	+46,568	+540
Facilities and environmental health support.....	192,701	210,992	205,083	+12,382	-5,909
Equipment.....	22,618	24,705	24,011	+1,393	-694
Subtotal, Indian Health Facilities.....	403,947	457,669	447,259	+43,312	-10,410
Use of prior year unobligated balances.....	---	---	-20,000	-20,000	-20,000
Total, Indian Health Facilities.....	403,947	457,669	427,259	+23,312	-30,410
TOTAL, INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE.....	4,069,220	4,623,808	4,461,581	+392,361	-162,227
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH					
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences...	79,054	81,085	79,054	---	-2,031
AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY					
Toxic substances and environmental public health.....	76,638	76,337	74,039	-2,599	-2,298
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES..	4,224,912	4,781,230	4,614,674	+389,762	-166,556
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES					
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT					
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality.....	3,153	3,444	2,661	-492	-783
CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD					
Salaries and expenses.....	10,777	11,147	10,000	-777	-1,147
OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION					
Salaries and expenses.....	7,984	9,570	7,530	-454	-2,040
INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT					
Payment to the Institute.....	8,283	9,225	7,900	-383	-1,325
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION					
Salaries and Expenses					
Museum and Research Institutes:					
National Air and Space Museum.....	18,359	18,246	18,246	-113	---
Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory.....	24,336	24,035	24,035	-301	---
Major scientific instrumentation.....	3,814	3,822	3,814	---	-8
Universe Center.....	200	300	200	---	-100
National Museum of Natural History.....	48,318	48,163	48,163	-155	---
National Zoological Park.....	23,306	23,352	23,306	---	-46
Smithsonian Environmental Research Center.....	3,765	3,773	3,756	-9	-17
Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute.....	14,867	12,239	12,239	-2,628	---
Biodiversity Center.....	500	2,100	500	---	-1,600

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Arthur M. Sackler Gallery/Freer Gallery of Art.....	6,123	6,135	6,113	-10	-22
Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage.....	2,295	2,300	2,282	-13	-18
Cooper-Hewitt, National Design Museum.....	4,051	4,244	4,051	---	-193
Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.....	4,347	4,356	4,347	---	-9
National Museum of African Art.....	4,452	4,461	4,452	---	-9
World Cultures Center.....	300	300	300	---	---
Anacostia Community Museum.....	2,059	2,063	2,048	-11	-15
Archives of American Art.....	1,876	1,880	1,858	-18	-22
National Museum of African American History and Culture.....	13,298	13,437	12,894	-404	-543
National Museum of American History.....	22,392	22,637	22,349	-43	-288
National Museum of the American Indian.....	32,335	31,900	31,900	-435	---
National Portrait Gallery.....	5,987	5,999	5,967	-20	-32
Smithsonian American Art Museum.....	9,325	9,343	9,245	-80	-98
American Experience Center.....	300	800	300	---	-500
Subtotal, Museums and Research Institutes.....	246,605	245,885	242,365	-4,240	-3,520
Mission enabling:					
Program support and outreach:					
Outreach.....	9,592	9,291	9,291	-301	---
Communications.....	2,490	2,594	2,342	-148	-252
Institution-wide programs.....	11,607	10,928	10,839	-768	-89
Office of Exhibits Central.....	3,006	3,012	2,982	-24	-30
Museum Support Center.....	1,870	1,874	1,858	-12	-16
Museum Conservation Institute.....	3,230	3,236	3,119	-111	-117
Smithsonian Institution Archives.....	2,189	2,193	2,054	-135	-139
Smithsonian Institution Libraries.....	9,963	9,983	9,963	---	-20
Subtotal, Program support and outreach.....	43,947	43,111	42,448	-1,499	-663
Office of Chief Information Officer.....	45,526	46,144	43,536	-1,990	-2,608
Administration.....	33,293	33,949	33,293	---	-656
Inspector General.....	2,602	2,607	2,602	---	-5
Facilities services:					
Facilities maintenance.....	70,000	72,107	70,000	---	-2,107
Facilities operations, security and support.....	192,916	192,727	192,727	-189	---
Subtotal, Facilities services.....	262,916	264,834	262,727	-189	-2,107
Subtotal, Mission enabling.....	388,284	390,645	384,606	-3,678	-6,039
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	634,889	636,530	626,971	-7,918	-9,559
Facilities Capital					
Revitalization.....	91,940	84,830	59,580	-32,360	-25,250
Facilities planning and design.....	32,810	140,170	65,170	+32,360	-75,000
Total, Facilities Capital.....	124,750	225,000	124,750	---	-100,250
TOTAL, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.....	759,639	861,530	751,721	-7,918	-109,809
NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART					
Salaries and Expenses					
Care and utilization of art collections.....	36,828	36,708	36,708	-120	---
Operation and maintenance of buildings and grounds....	29,209	35,499	31,209	+2,000	-4,290
Protection of buildings, grounds and contents.....	23,729	23,509	23,509	-220	---
General administration.....	20,759	23,065	20,759	---	-2,306
Total, Salaries and Expenses.....	110,525	118,781	112,185	+1,660	-6,596

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Repair, Restoration and Renovation of Buildings					
Base program.....	48,125	19,219	13,938	-34,187	-5,281
TOTAL, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART.....	158,650	138,000	126,123	-32,527	-11,877
JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS					
Operations and maintenance.....	22,455	23,200	22,455	---	-745
Capital repair and restoration.....	13,892	13,650	13,650	-242	---
TOTAL, JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS.....	36,347	36,850	36,105	-242	-745
WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS					
Salaries and expenses.....	11,203	11,005	10,000	-1,203	-1,005
NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES					
National Endowment for the Arts					
Grants and Administration					
Grants:					
Direct grants.....	67,243	58,208	54,200	-13,043	-4,008
Challenge America grants.....	7,984	8,000	6,000	-1,984	-2,000
New Our Town.....	---	5,000	2,000	+2,000	-3,000
Subtotal.....	75,227	71,208	62,200	-13,027	-9,008
State partnerships:					
State and regional.....	39,469	34,737	37,000	-2,469	+2,263
Underserved set-aside.....	10,683	9,402	9,000	-1,683	-402
Subtotal.....	50,152	44,139	46,000	-4,152	+1,861
Subtotal, Grants.....	125,379	115,347	108,200	-17,179	-7,147
Program support.....	1,876	2,845	1,750	-126	-1,095
Administration.....	27,435	28,063	25,050	-2,385	-3,013
Total, Arts.....	154,690	146,255	135,000	-19,690	-11,255
National Endowment for the Humanities					
Grants and Administration					
Grants:					
Bridging cultures.....	1,500	4,000	2,000	+500	-2,000
Federal/State partnership.....	42,450	40,100	38,000	-4,450	-2,100
Preservation and access.....	16,500	15,600	12,750	-3,750	-2,850
Public programs.....	15,000	13,800	12,000	-3,000	-1,800
Research programs.....	16,250	14,900	12,250	-4,000	-2,650
Education programs.....	13,750	13,550	12,000	-1,750	-1,550
Program development.....	500	500	500	---	---
We The People Initiative grants.....	3,219	---	4,750	+1,531	+4,750
Digital humanities initiatives.....	4,000	4,250	3,500	-500	-750
Subtotal, Grants.....	113,169	106,700	97,750	-15,419	-8,950

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Matching Grants:					
Treasury funds.....	4,800	2,750	2,000	-2,800	-750
Challenge grants.....	9,471	8,750	8,000	-1,471	-750
Subtotal, Matching grants.....	14,271	11,500	10,000	-4,271	-1,500
Administration.....	27,250	28,055	27,250	---	-805
Total, Humanities.....	154,690	146,255	135,000	-19,690	-11,255
=====					
TOTAL, NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES.....	309,380	292,510	270,000	-39,380	-22,510
=====					
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,289	2,400	2,234	-55	-166
NATIONAL CAPITAL ARTS AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS					
Grants.....	2,994	---	---	-2,994	---
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION					
Salaries and expenses.....	5,896	6,108	5,498	-398	-610
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	8,490	8,154	8,133	-357	-21
UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM					
Holocaust Memorial Museum.....	49,024	52,694	50,524	+1,500	-2,170
PRESIDIO TRUST					
Operations.....	14,970	12,000	12,000	-2,970	---
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	---	6,000	2,000	+2,000	-4,000
Capital construction.....	---	83,768	28,000	+28,000	-55,768
Total, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION.....	---	89,768	30,000	+30,000	-59,768
=====					
TOTAL, TITLE III, RELATED AGENCIES.....	10,299,035	11,258,880	10,458,050	+159,015	-800,830
Appropriations.....	(10,699,035)	(11,450,880)	(10,458,050)	(-240,985)	(-992,830)
Rescissions.....	(-400,000)	(-192,000)	---	(+400,000)	(+192,000)
=====					
TITLE IV - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Cabin user fee (Sec. 417).....	2,000	---	---	-2,000	---
=====					
GRAND TOTAL.....	29,610,782	31,343,710	27,519,420	-2,091,362	-3,824,290
Appropriations.....	(30,436,348)	(31,615,710)	(27,689,420)	(-2,746,928)	(-3,926,290)
Rescissions.....	(-825,566)	(-272,000)	(-170,000)	(+655,566)	(+102,000)
Discretionary total.....	29,559,000	31,289,290	27,465,000	-2,094,000	-3,824,290

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a sad day, a sad day for the environment and for America's great natural and cultural heritage. H.R. 2584, with its deep cuts in important environmental and natural resource programs and shocking array of special interest riders and funding limitations, falls far short of meeting our responsibilities to protect and wisely use our Nation's natural resources.

The bill before the House today is more than \$2 billion below the current spending level, and it's almost \$4 billion below the President's request. It's even \$324 million below the CR level of H.R. 1 that was passed by the House just in February.

Given the subcommittee's punishingly low 302(b) allocation, I do recognize the difficulties that Chairman SIMPSON of the subcommittee and Chairman ROGERS of the full committee faced in crafting the bill. I do appreciate their efforts, Mr. SIMPSON's efforts particularly and Mr. COLE's, to protect funding for American Indian programs. I only wish that that protection could have extended to other important portions of this bill.

But as bad as the funding cuts are in this bill, what is most important is the extent to which the majority has filled this bill with extremist legislative riders and funding limitations. The bill is short on needed funds and long on antienvironmental riders.

H.R. 2584 is not so much a spending bill as the fulfillment of a wish list for special interests. Oil companies, cattle grazers, industrial agribusiness, miners, and those who wish to pollute our air and water for greater profit all have their special provisions tucked away into this bill. It is a dump truck of provisions for special interests.

In addition, this bill picks up where H.R. 1 left off and includes dozens of deep cuts in conservation and environmental protection programs, while the extractive or consumptive uses of our public lands are shielded from cuts and given a pass from complying with our Nation's landmark environmental laws. We continually hear from the majority that the pain of budget cuts has to be shared by all, but in this bill they have chosen winners and losers—the extractors and the exploiters and the despoilers of the forests are the winners and the animals and the people who depend upon clean air and water are the losers. The animals, the environment, the forests, the waterways, and humans who depend on clean air and water all lose.

This bill continues the majority's assault on the Environmental Protection Agency with deep cuts. After the EPA budget was cut by 16 percent in the current fiscal year, the majority is now proposing a further reduction of 18 percent for next year. In other words, a 34 percent cut in environmental protection. Cuts of nearly 40 percent are made to the clean water and safe

drinking water grant programs, just at the time when the States and localities have run out of money to try to provide for clean water and to deal with storm water overflow and all of the plumbing infrastructure that is necessary throughout our country. When the majority says it wants to rein in the EPA, what they're really reining in is the ability to protect clean air and clean water. It also cuts more than 600 positions in EPA's regulatory workforce.

I am extremely disappointed at the majority's decision to prohibit funds for the Endangered Species Act listings and critical habitat designations. These are the vital first steps needed to begin the recovery process for 260 species currently at risk of extinction. Under the guise of sending a signal to the authorizing committee, this bill attacks the very heart of the Endangered Species Act. There are a great many unauthorized programs in this bill.

Wildlife programs overall are hard hit by this bill. State and tribal wildlife grants are cut by two-thirds, multinational species conservation by a fifth, and cooperative endangered species conservation by 95 percent. Even funding for the National Wildlife Refuge System will be cut by 7½ percent.

Our national parks and forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness areas, and other conservation units deserve better than what this bill provides. As stewards of these magnificent resources that were passed down to us, we have a responsibility to defend and preserve them for future generations. Spending reductions like the 78 percent cut to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a nearly 80 percent cut to the Land and Water Conservation Fund to the lowest level it has ever been, and a 33 percent cut to the National Landscape Conservation System will place at risk some of our most precious resources.

I would also like to note that this bill is about more than our natural resources and the environment, and while the cultural activities and institutions are a small portion of the bill, they are a vital part of our communities and they do enhance our economy and our way of life. Yet these programs and activities would receive substantial cuts under this bill as well.

I am also struck by the contradictions contained in H.R. 2584. Here are just two examples:

On the one hand, the bill allocates millions of dollars to restore the Everglades in Florida, yet the majority includes a funding limitation that will permit the pollution of the Everglades. The bill also includes funding to deal with the continuing fallout from uranium mining on the Navajo Indian Reservation, yet it includes language that will expose Grand Canyon National Park and the millions of Americans who depend upon the Colorado River for their drinking water to the well-known dangers of uranium mining, and they give away the publicly owned uranium to a foreign-owned Asian mining

company. Imagine, giving away publicly owned uranium to a foreign firm.

The list of legislative riders and funding limitations in the bill is long: National Environmental Policy Act waivers, limitations on judicial review, and the blocking of air and water pollution controls. Whole legislative texts have been dumped into this bill. These riders and limitations have nothing to do with deficit reduction and everything to do with carrying out an extreme ideological agenda.

Repealing environmental regulations doesn't save money; it costs money. Keeping toxins out of our air and water is a great deal cheaper than cleaning up the damage or dealing with the adverse health effects. Preventing the Deepwater Horizon disaster would have been far cheaper than having to clean it up after the fact.

Each rider or funding limitation seems designed to benefit one industry or another. These provisions have become the new earmarks, with 39 such provisions already in the bill, and more are going to be proposed to be added.

While this bill rewards businesses and industries that seek to delay or undermine environmental protections, it penalizes others who try to do the right thing. As just one example, American Electric Power recently announced it's going to stop work on a low-carbon, coal-fired power plant, carbon sequestration, showing it can work, but they're going to stop work on it in light of the pullback in regulating emissions related to climate change. They see what the Congress is doing, they see what their competitors are doing, so they've decided not to do the right thing because we're making it too expensive to do the right thing.

With the funding cuts and special interest provisions, it's no wonder that the Statement of Administration Policy on H.R. 2584 runs five pages with its veto threat. I concur with the administration's views on the bill and under general leave will submit the administration's statement.

We owe it to our constituents and our communities to protect the air we breathe and the water we drink, to protect public health from the dangers of mercury and arsenic and lead. Imagine, we have more than 500 coal-fired power plants in this country and they emit more than 78,000 pounds of mercury, and yet one drop of mercury will poison an entire lake.

□ 1410

That's what we should be looking to, and not tying EPA's hands. We ought to be good stewards of the abundant natural and cultural heritage passed down to us. President Johnson noted in 1964, and I'm going to quote, "If future generations are to remember us with gratitude rather than contempt, we must leave them something more than the miracles of technology. We should be leaving them a glimpse of the world as it was in the beginning, not just after we got through with it."

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2584 falls far short of our responsibility to present and future generations. And so I obviously oppose the bill.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2584—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012
(Rep. Rogers, R-KY)

The Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 2584, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012. The Administration is committed to ensuring the Nation lives within its means and reducing the deficit so that the Nation can compete in the global economy and win the future. That is why the President put forth a comprehensive fiscal framework that reduces the deficit by \$4 trillion, supports economic growth and long-term job creation, protects critical investments, meets the commitments made to provide dignity and security to Americans no matter their circumstances, and provides for our national security.

The Administration strongly opposes a number of provisions in this bill, including ideological and political provisions that are beyond the scope of funding legislation. If the President is presented with a bill that undermines ongoing conservation, public health, and environmental protection efforts through funding limits or restrictions, his senior advisors would recommend he veto the bill.

While overall funding limits and subsequent allocations remain unclear pending the outcome of ongoing bipartisan, bicameral discussions between the Administration and congressional leadership on the Nation's long-term fiscal picture, the Administration has concerns regarding the level of resources the bill would provide for a number of programs in a way that undermines core government functions, investments key to economic growth and job creation, as well as protection of public health and the environment and preservation of our Nation's natural resource heritage, including, but not limited to:

Department of the Interior (DOI)

Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) Conservation Grants. The level of funding provided to the North American Wetlands Conservation Act and State and Tribal Wildlife grants, as well as the termination of Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act grants, would threaten the ability of States and private organizations to conserve and provide access to habitat, undermining the conservation of game and non-game species.

Safety Inspection Fees. The bill does not include user fees to cover inspections of oil and gas production facilities offshore and onshore. Without these fees, taxpayers, rather than industry, would have to shoulder the cost of these operations, which are critical to ensuring safe and responsible energy development.

FWS Operations. The funding provided for operations would seriously degrade the ability of FWS to maintain the network of National Wildlife Refuges and fulfill other statutory responsibilities. This would result in delays in environmental compliance reviews, which could impede major infrastructure projects, including road construction, water delivery, and other federally funded projects that directly benefit State and local governments.

Landsat. The bill does not provide funding to begin the acquisition of the next Landsat satellite, ending a 40-year stream of data that is used by Federal, State, local and Tribal governments and the private sector to make informed land and resource manage-

ment decisions and to assess the impacts of those decisions over time.

DOI and Department of Agriculture (USDA), Forest Service

Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). The funding in the bill for LWCF programs would deny willing sellers the opportunity to sell land holdings, and severely impair the ability of Federal, State, and local officials, as well as private landowners, to preserve and manage areas important to wildlife, recreationalists, and sportsmen and women.

Wildland Fire Suppression. The bill's funding for suppression is substantially below the 10-year average, which is the accepted method for calculating suppression requirements. While the bill directs DOI and the Forest Service to use emergency fire suppression balances to make up the shortfall, this strategy carries high risk given the high fire activity to date and the cancellation of balances in FY 2011 appropriations.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

EPA Operating Budget. At the funding level provided, EPA will be unable to implement its core mission of protecting human health and the environment. Research necessary to support this mission will be curtailed, and restoration of key ecosystems such as the Great Lakes and the Chesapeake Bay will be delayed.

State Revolving Funds (SRFs). The level of funding provided in the bill would result in approximately 400 fewer wastewater and drinking water projects, and impede EPA's ability to reach the long-term goal of providing approximately 5 percent of total water infrastructure funding annually.

State Categorical Grants. The funding provided in the bill for grants to States would impede States' ability to carry out critical public health and environmental activities such as air quality monitoring and water quality permitting. This would greatly reduce core high-priority State environmental programs at a time of declining State budgets.

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Programs. The reductions in funding for GHG programs and regulations severely limit actions the Administration could take under current law to permit, control, and monitor greenhouse gases and would block EPA's efforts to reduce GHG emissions from vehicles and large stationary sources.

Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI). The level of resources for the GLRI would reduce the ability of Federal agencies and their partners to clean up contaminated sediments, fight invasive species, restore habitat, and improve water quality in this critical ecosystem.

High Priority Ecosystems Funding. The level of funding provided for the Chesapeake Bay would jeopardize the successful clean-up of the Nation's largest estuary.

Responsible Energy Development and Oil Spill Response. The level of resources in the bill would eliminate efforts to increase the frequency of environmental compliance inspections at oil facilities. In addition, the bill does not include emergency transfer authority necessary to improve the Government's ability to prevent and respond to oil spills.

Smart Growth. The bill terminates funding for EPA's Smart Growth program, which contributes to efforts to assist communities in coordinating infrastructure investments and minimizing environmental impact of development.

National Endowment for the Arts (NEA)

The funding in the bill for the NEA, which is the largest national funder of the arts in the United States, would cut support for arts

organizations across the country during a time when private and State arts funding is also highly constrained.

Council on Environmental Quality

The Administration's ability to guide the Executive Branch's environmental policies and programs will be substantially reduced at the funding level in the bill.

The Administration strongly opposes problematic policy and language issues that are beyond the scope of funding legislation, including, but not limited to, the following provisions in this bill:

Restrictions on Implementing the Endangered Species Act. Preventing FWS from implementing key provisions of the Endangered Species Act will only result in increased costs and delays in the future.

Mountain Top Mining Reform. Preventing the Office of Surface Mining from developing or implementing the stream buffer zone rule could increase the risk of litigation and potentially delay sustainable coal mining.

Mineral Withdrawal Prohibition. Prohibiting DOI from restricting new mining claims on approximately 1 million acres of Federal lands near the Grand Canyon will reverse a temporary moratorium on new uranium and other mining claims. The Secretary of the Interior is currently assessing the impact to water quality in Grand Canyon National Park to ensure that any future uranium or other mining activity in the area does not lead to the human health and environmental impacts seen from previous mining-caused contamination of ground water and drinking water supplies.

Gray Wolves. The Endangered Species Act expressly gives the public the right to challenge listing decisions. Restricting judicial review of any published final rule to delist gray wolves in Wyoming or the Great Lakes region from the Endangered Species Act would deny the public an opportunity to make sure that a future listing decision on gray wolves is based on science.

Protecting Wilderness Characteristics Secretarial Order. Prohibiting the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) from implementing Secretarial Order 3310, which directs BLM to use the public resource management planning process to designate certain lands with wilderness characteristics as "Wild Lands" is unnecessary given the Department's policy that includes collaboration with stakeholders to identify public lands that may be appropriate candidates for congressional designation under the Wilderness Act.

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions from Stationary Sources. Preventing EPA from regulating GHG emissions from stationary sources would prevent the Agency from proposing or finalizing new regulations to control GHG emissions from power plants and petroleum refineries, increasing the risk of long-term environmental consequences from GHG emissions. EPA is under two settlement agreements to complete these rules in 2012.

Clean Air Act Permitting. Section 431(a)(2-4) of the bill effectively overrides Federal and State-issued permits for emissions from industrial facilities that are very large emitters of greenhouse gases by stating that the Clean Air Act's requirement to obtain a permit has no legal effect and that no lawsuits may be brought against a facility due to uncontrolled greenhouse gas emissions.

Light-Duty Greenhouse Gas Standards. Section 453 of the bill undermines Executive Branch efforts to set standards that will save consumers money at the pump and reduce GHG emissions through increased vehicle fuel efficiency on Model Year 2017-2025 Light-Duty Vehicles.

Utility Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT)/Transport Rule. Section

462 of the bill blocks EPA from implementing its utility MACT rule to control air toxics emissions, as well as the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule controlling interstate transport of nitrogen oxides and particulate matter emissions from power plants. This provision interferes with the long-delayed implementation of major air pollution rules covering pollution from power plants.

Mountaintop Mining Coordination and Guidance. Section 433 of the bill prohibits implementing or enforcing an EPA/Army Corps of Engineers (Corps)/Office of Surface Mining coordination Memorandum of Understanding and EPA guidance on the Clean Water Act/National Environmental Policy Act and mountaintop mining. This issue is currently undergoing judicial review and should be allowed to conclude without congressional intervention.

Clean Water Act. Section 435 of the bill would stop an important Administration effort to provide clarity around which water bodies are covered by the Clean Water Act. The Administration's work in this area will help to protect the public health and economic benefits provided to the American public by clean water, while also bringing greater certainty to business planning and investment and reducing an ongoing loss of wetlands and other sensitive aquatic resources. The existing regulations were the subject of two recent Supreme Court cases, in which the Court itself indicated the need for greater regulatory clarity regarding the appropriate scope of the Clean Water Act jurisdiction.

Outer Continental Shelf Drilling. Section 443 of the bill limits EPA's Clean Air Act permitting authority for Outer Continental Shelf drilling and would eliminate the Agency's discretion in considering human health and environmental protections when issuing these permits.

Integrated Risk Information System. Section 444 of the bill withholds funding for EPA to take administrative action following its assessment of risk for certain chemicals. This provision would delay scientific assessment of environmental contaminants and could delay regulatory or other Agency actions designed to protect public health.

Limiting Compliance of the Endangered Species Act. Section 447 of the bill would prevent EPA from implementing a biological opinion related to pesticides if the opinion identifies modifying, canceling, or suspending registration of a pesticide registered under FIFRA. This could undermine efforts to protect species from being put into jeopardy from a Federal project and could stop development and delay issuance of permits.

Lead Renovation and Repair Rule. Section 450 of the bill prohibits funding for EPA to implement the 2008 Lead Renovation, Repair and Painting (RRP) rule, as amended, until after industry develops and EPA approves different lead paint test kits. This would undermine efforts to protect sensitive populations from exposure to lead, a known toxin to children and developing fetuses, during home renovation projects. The currently available test kits allow renovators to comply with the 2008 rule.

Reducing Emissions from Cement Facilities. The language would prevent common sense deployment of technology that has been around for decades that will improve public health by reducing emissions of pollutants, including known carcinogens such as dioxin, from cement facilities.

Fighting Fraud, Waste, and Abuse. Sections 449 and 451 of the bill fall short of their intended purposes of protecting the interest of the Nation's taxpayers. The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress to achieve the common goal of fighting fraud, waste, and abuse in Federal contracts, grants, and other Federal assistance.

The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress as the fiscal year 2012 appropriations process moves forward to ensure the Administration can support enactment of the legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

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

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the esteemed chairman of the full committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I rise today to commend this bill to our colleagues and urge that it be passed. It includes \$27.5 billion in Federal spending. That's a reduction of \$2.1 billion below last year, \$3.8 billion below the President's request.

Some have complained that these cuts are too much, too fast. But it's important to remember that these agencies and programs have seen unprecedented massive increases in spending in recent years. This sort of excess has contributed to our astronomical debt and is threatening our recovery. We simply can't fund unnecessary and ineffective programs when we are borrowing 42 cents on every dollar we spend. We just simply can't afford it.

This legislation makes smart, significant cuts across each and every agency funded by this bill. The bill still adequately funds the agencies that are important to the health of our citizens, the stability of our economy, and the preservation of our environment, but we've made some priority adjustments in areas that can and should withstand lower budgets.

Some areas that will see bigger reductions include climate change programs, which are trimmed 22 percent from last year, and land acquisition funding, which is at a level nearly 79 percent lower than last year.

Frankly, many of the cuts in this bill are just plain common sense, particularly when it comes to the Environmental Protection Agency. The reductions and provisions in this bill were made with very good reason—to rein in unparalleled, out-of-control spending and job-killing overregulation by the EPA.

Though we all appreciate the core mission of the EPA, this agency has

lost grips with economic reality and has become the epitome of the continued and damaging regulatory overreach of this administration. We can't allow an agency to circumvent the authority of Congress, especially when it has such destructive effects on our Nation's economic recovery.

I'd like to say that we've heard from Americans all across the country and across every sector of the economy who attribute harsh regulatory burdens to their economic uncertainty, uncertainty that's crushing job growth.

It's my hope that this legislation sends the message loud and clear: Legislation by regulation must stop. We've restricted funding for EPA personnel, as well as addressed EPA's flawed greenhouse gas regulations and de facto moratorium on mining permits in Appalachia. It's my hope that provisions like these will return the EPA to a better working order, facilitating a more effective government, sending money where it really needs to go, and removing burdensome barriers to job creation to clear the way for economic recovery.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member MORAN, the subcommittee, and all of the staff for all their hard work on this very tough bill. Chairman SIMPSON has led the way on an excellent bill, I think, that makes good on our promise to reduce government spending with real significant spending reforms.

His subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, held 22 oversight hearings, more than any other of the 12 subcommittees on Appropriations. I'm confident that they've gone above and beyond their duty to ensure that these cuts come from wasteful and redundant programs. I know these decisions were not made lightly, were not made easy, but they are responsible, and will help us move in the right direction.

Although it's been difficult at times, the House should be proud to be moving this year's appropriations process in regular order, the first time in years. With this bill we will have finished more than half of the fiscal 12 appropriation bills before the recess. And nearly all of the bills have been moved through subcommittee or full committee, and therefore are on cue to come to the full body. This return to regular order has contributed to thoughtful, collaborative appropriations bills that reflect the will of the American people and will help get our Nation's finances in order.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the very distinguished ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise to state my opposition to H.R. 2584, the FY 2012 Interior and Environment appropriations bill.

But before I state the reasons for my strong opposition, I want to, again recognize Chairman SIMPSON, Ranking Member MORAN and their staffs for all the hard work that was necessary to put together the FY 2012 Interior and Environment appropriations bill. I also want to repeat my gratitude to the majority for being inclusive when developing this bill.

That being said, however, the low allocation foisted on the Interior Subcommittee made it impossible to develop a bill that is responsible and reasonable, so it is no surprise that the resulting bill will harm the environment and our ongoing efforts to preserve America's natural heritage. Two key examples of this potential damage are that the bill includes the lowest level of spending in the Land and Water Conservation Fund in more than 40 years, and funding levels for EPA not seen in more than a decade.

Overall, the allocation for the bill is 7 percent below the amount enacted in the current year, a level that will have a negative impact on our natural resource agencies and on the Environmental Protection Agency. After the EPA took a substantial cut of 16 percent in the current fiscal year, 2011, the Republican majority is now proposing a further reduction in the agency's budget of 18 percent. You add that together, it's a 34-percent reduction in just this year.

This bill would substantially diminish the capacity of EPA to carry out its responsibilities, which may actually be the goal of some of my colleagues on the other side. But the repercussions will be felt across the Nation, including an ever-growing backlog of water treatment infrastructure projects and a decline in air and water quality.

As was pointed out in a recent Washington Post article, the vast majority of the EPA's funds pass through to States and localities that are already squeezed by budget cuts.

□ 1420

These infrastructure projects create jobs in communities all across the country and provide one of the most basic services taxpayers expect—clean water. The Bush administration's EPA administrator estimated that there was a \$688 billion nationwide backlog of clean water infrastructure projects, and that total is even larger today. That backlog will not disappear if we just ignore it, but as we have seen in so many cases this year, the majority has decided to push this problem further down the road.

In addition to the clearly insufficient levels of funding across the board in this legislation, we were surprised that the majority also included a wish list of special interest riders to the bill that will handcuff the EPA and the Department of the Interior. These types of riders are largely ideological, have no impact on deficit reduction, and will be rejected by the Senate and the President, hopefully.

It seems that special interest riders have become the new earmarks—and I support earmarks. This bill was made even worse when the majority adopted more special interest riders with amendments that were approved at full committee, and I fear that there will be more policy amendments offered on the floor as we consider this bill.

One of the riders is language that would effectively block any funding to the Fish and Wildlife Service for new listings under the Endangered Species Act. As Mr. MORAN said, there are 260 candidate species waiting to be listed, and they will not receive the protection of the Endangered Species Act.

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

Mr. MORAN. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. Here is the situation that the Fish and Wildlife Service faces in the administration of the ESA. Speaking of that 260, of that total, there are just under 30 species that are poised for listing in the near future. The spending provisions in this bill would block further activity to protect these declining species. And remember, if you delay listing too long, a species will go extinct, thus making recovery impossible.

I also will be strongly supporting the amendments that aim to remove these riders. These amendments include an attempt to protect Grand Canyon National Park and the folks who depend on the Colorado River for drinking water from the potential danger from new uranium mines. Another amendment that I strongly support will increase funding for sanitation facilities for Native American communities.

In closing, I do want to reiterate my praise expressed at subcommittee mark for Chairman SIMPSON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COLE and other subcommittee members for the funding levels for programs serving American Indians. It is gratifying that this subcommittee's bipartisan commitment to tribal programs forged over the last few years has been continued by the new majority.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for the purpose of colloquy.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, 2 months ago, the Secretary of the Interior announced that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would remove gray wolves from the Endangered Species Act list in areas covering the northern Rocky Mountain States and roughly the easternmost one-third of the State of Washington, the eastern quarter of the State of Oregon, and a small piece of Utah. I understand that H.R. 2584 also would exempt from judicial review any final rule issued by the Secretary that delists wolves in the State of Wyoming and the western Great Lakes. So I commend the chairman for your leadership to see that these States are

given a chance to succeed in their management of species.

As with other decisions, the Secretary of the Interior's May announcement does not resolve the problem for many agricultural areas in States that don't fit neatly within the Fish and Wildlife Service's arbitrarily set geographical boundaries, and it reverses a policy that the Fish and Wildlife Service itself implemented by regulation in 2003 in which wolves were delisted in all of the State of Washington and other areas with appropriate State recovery measures in place.

Under the current administration's policy, in my own district in central Washington, wolves will be delisted on the eastern side up to a highway that cuts through a heavy agriculture area. Wolves on one side of the highway will be listed, the other side not. The same is true in Oregon and Utah.

I appreciate the steps the gentleman has included in this bill to create a more rational approach toward delisting these recovered wolves by allowing the States to manage the populations using sound wildlife management principles. I want to confirm my understanding that the bill and accompanying report language on page 10 is intended to include all States in their entirety within the northern Rocky Mountain area, including Washington, Oregon, and Utah.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes. Our intent is to make it clear that States with approved management plans should be given authority to manage delisted wolf populations in their States. The language in the bill ensures that delisting decisions are made by scientists on the ground, not judges in courtrooms.

The report language clarifies that similar bill language should apply to areas where wolves have expanded beyond their original population boundaries once State management plans are in place and the Fish and Wildlife Service determines that the population should be delisted. That language is intended to address States that currently face mixed management challenges, like Washington, Oregon, and Utah.

I know your concern about this issue, and Representative WALDEN from Oregon has shared with me similar concerns as well.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for that clarification.

As we both know, the problem goes far beyond wolves. The ESA has nearly 1,400 listed species in the U.S. and hundreds of millions of dollars being spent by local, State, Federal, and private entities on ESA activities; yet Federal agencies are being regularly sued for poor science and poorly drafted regulations, and only 20 species have been recovered.

Do you agree with me that the Endangered Species Act is broken and needs to be modernized and updated?

I yield to the chairman.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, today's ESA is so highly contentious, political, and litigious that it has become a failure of public policy. Funding authorization for ESA programs expired nearly two decades ago, but because we have continued to fund them, ESA reform continues to stay on the back burner.

This bill calls for a "timeout" for unauthorized funding of new critical habitat or ESA listing decisions in order to encourage authorizers and stakeholders to come to the table to bring the ESA into the 21st century, which it is not now.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, a couple of weeks ago Secretary Salazar acknowledged, "There are changes and improvements that can be made to how we deal with endangered species" and that "we need to have an endangered species program that does, in fact, work." I couldn't agree more with the Secretary's statement.

The Natural Resources Committee that I chair has jurisdiction over ESA, as well as NOAA and the Fish and Wildlife Service, and we will be working in coming months to conduct robust oversight and look at much needed proposals to update this law. I appreciate your leadership and look forward to working with you on this very important issue.

I yield to the chairman.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman.

It is important that authorizing committees like yours be able to modernize landmark laws like the ESA—laws that were widely supported when they were passed but no longer work as Congress originally intended. No less than 56 agencies or programs in this bill have expired authorizations, and stakeholders and interested Members of Congress should know that these programs are also at risk of defunding if they are not reauthorized. Our bill, hopefully, will provide incentive for stakeholders who have been unwilling to participate in the reform process to finally entertain serious reform of the ESA, which I am sure your committee will actively pursue.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, that certainly is the intent that we tend to pursue.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, the minority would respectfully request of the majority that such colloquies, including the one that just transpired, as well as future ones, be shared with the minority. They are meant to be a clarification of language and funding in the bill. And they may very well prompt actions on our part to strike language if we don't fully understand what the intent was, and that may very well apply to the delisting of wolves. So we would appreciate, when the majority

engages in colloquies, sharing that language with the minority.

Would the gentleman like to respond? I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have no problem sharing with you the colloquies that we engage in.

Mr. MORAN. Good. So we would like a copy of the colloquy that just transpired.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the ranking member of the Financial Services Appropriations Committee.

□ 1430

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 2584, the Interior Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2012. First, however, I would like to acknowledge both Chairman SIMPSON and Congressman MORAN, who have worked in a bipartisan and collaborative way throughout the lengthy hearing and markup process. It has been a pleasure for me to serve as a member of this subcommittee.

Unfortunately, this subcommittee's insufficient spending allocation has resulted in deep cuts in funding for important agencies and programs. In addition, numerous anti-environmental riders have been attached to this legislation.

Although there are many to choose from, I would like to mention a few of these cutbacks and what their impact will be on specific agencies and programs. For example, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which is crucial in helping to fund land acquisition and in protecting threatened and endangered species, was funded at \$66 million, which is \$834 million below the budget request.

State and Tribal Wildlife Grants, which play an important role in making sure that we have strategic and effective wildlife conservation programs, were funded at \$22 million, or \$73 million below the request.

The Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, is funded at \$7.1 billion, which is \$1.8 billion below the request. At this funding level, the EPA will be prevented from accomplishing many of its missions to protect our environment.

There are so many destructive riders attached to this legislation that it is difficult to figure out which ones to highlight during my brief remarks. One that specifically harms my State of New York was added during full committee markup. This rider prevents the Great Lakes States from receiving any EPA funding if they have implemented ballast water rules that have stronger timeliness or standards than the Federal or international requirements that are currently in effect. Because New York has been at the forefront of efforts to require ships to treat their ballast water before discharging it into New York's waterways, our State will be immediately affected. States should

have the right to protect their own waters from dangerous aquatic invasive species.

Another particularly harmful rider would stop the EPA from limiting greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources for a 1-year period. Overall, 69 percent of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States come from stationary sources, such as our electric utilities and petroleum refineries. This rider, which prevents the EPA from acting, will have far reaching and devastating consequences on our Nation's air quality. In particular, my Bronx congressional district, which has one of the highest asthma rates in the Nation, will continue to suffer from poor air quality.

Because of the sharp reductions included in this bill to the programs and agencies that protect our environment, enrich our lives through the arts, and increase recreational opportunities; and because of the riders that harm our wildlife, our land, our water, and our air quality, I will be voting against this bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), a valued member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Fiscal Year 2012 Interior, Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations bill. I would like to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member MORAN for being excellent leaders on the subcommittee. It has been a pleasure to work with both of them. I especially commend the 22 oversight hearings that our subcommittee held this year. The subcommittee works hard, and we have done our due diligence in putting this bill together.

The FY 2012 Interior and Environment Appropriations bill recognizes the current economic environment and the past 4 years of out-of-control spending. It is \$2.1 billion below last year's level, and \$3.8 billion below the President's 2012 request. It is a focused and lean bill which supports funding for duties which are clearly the responsibility of the Federal Government and makes tough decisions about how we allocate taxpayers' dollars.

The bill fully funds Federal firefighters and Forest Service Wildland Fire Management. It ensures our national parks, which belong to the American people, remain fully operational in 2012. And it includes \$30 million for diesel emissions reduction grants to retrofit old diesel engines with cleaner burning ones, a program that has been successfully implemented across the United States and is contributing to cleaner air.

The bill also reduces the EPA inflated budget back down to the 2006 level and cuts \$46 million in requested funding for burdensome regulation of greenhouse gases, which means control of carbon dioxide, a regulation unilaterally adopted by the administration

that is making the U.S. less competitive in the world and sending American jobs overseas.

Finally, yes, Mr. Chairman, there are many spending reductions in this bill, including programs I support. However, we have to start somewhere to bring economic sanity back to the budgeting process, and this is one of the first of many steps to come.

In conclusion, I am pleased to support this bill. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Interior Environment Appropriations Subcommittee, I have great respect for Chairman SIMPSON, Ranking Member MORAN, and the staffers on both sides of the aisle.

One important aspect of this bill is Chairman SIMPSON and Representative COLE have worked together with Democrats to protect critical education and health care investments in Indian Country as part of our trust relationship with the 565 tribes in this country. Native American children, families and elders will all benefit as a result of our efforts.

However, on virtually every other aspect of this bill, particularly on the environment, this appropriations bill is a radical attempt to take America backwards from 40 years of bipartisan progress in protecting human health and our environment.

There are nearly 40 special interest policy riders in this bill. It is outrageous that these riders protect corporate polluters while attacking clean water, clean air, our public lands, and wildlife conservation. Representatives WAXMAN, MARKEY and RUSH, as ranking members of the House Energy and Commerce Committee and Natural Resources Committee have sent letters expressing their grave concern about these extreme, destructive policy riders that have no business being on an appropriations spending bill.

This abuse of the legislative process to further Republicans' radical agenda on behalf of polluters and special interests should not be tolerated. These policy riders put the public health of Americans at risk and will imperil America's natural heritage for future generations. In particular, Republicans have chosen to mount an unprecedented assault on the Environmental Protection Agency, an agency created by President Richard Nixon.

Clearly, Republicans have now come full circle and this bill makes House Republicans the most polluter-friendly Congress in nearly two generations. In addition to gutting EPA's budget, Republicans have added 10 policy riders that will make the air we breathe dirtier and eight policy riders that will make the water we drink more polluted and toxic. The Republican riders halt the EPA's work under the Clean Air Act to protect the public health from impacts of carbon dioxide pollution,

mercury emissions, sulfur dioxide, soot and smog. This will jeopardize the health of millions of children suffering from asthma and put more Americans at risk for strokes, heart disease, and other respiratory and cardiovascular diseases.

In 2010, the EPA found the Clean Air Act saved 160,000 lives nationwide. That's equivalent to the entire population of Tempe, Arizona. By 2020, that number is expected to grow to 230,000 lives saved, leading to \$2 trillion in economic benefits.

Republican riders also stop EPA's work under the Clean Water Act to clean our rivers, streams, lakes, and to protect our drinking water from the impacts of coal mining, storm water discharge, and toxic nutrient pollution and pesticides.

Essentially, House Republicans are telling the American people that protecting public health and the environment from corporate polluters is no longer important. And despite the Tea Party Republicans' supposed ban on earmarks, this bill is loaded with earmarks for a few privileged polluters and special interests.

□ 1440

Here are just four out of a dozen Republican earmarks contained in this bill:

An earmark for foreign companies to allow for uranium mining adjacent to the Grand Canyon, one of America's most treasured places;

An earmark for Shell Oil to ignore environmental regulations to drill offshore in the Arctic Ocean;

An earmark for a few sheep farmers subsidized by U.S. taxpayers on U.S. land so they can evade environmental laws that protect bighorn sheep;

A special earmark for the State of Texas to continue its illegal air permitting program in violation of the Clean Air Act.

These dirty, toxic, and dangerous earmarks to a few special interests come at the expense of cleaner water, healthier air, our cherished national parks, and endangered wildlife. Minnesotans are deeply troubled by this reckless bill that endangers the health of our communities while destroying our natural resources that are our children's inheritance. This is one of the most extreme pieces of anti-environmental legislation to ever come to the floor of the House. As far as the American people are concerned, H.R. 2584 should be declared a toxic Superfund site that is so dangerous to human health and the environment that it needs to be remediated rather than passed into law.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and its abandonment of 40 years of progress we have made in protecting the American people's health and the American national heritage.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to an esteemed colleague and member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the Chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation, and I want to praise the process by which we arrived at this. This is probably the hardest-working subcommittee on a very hard-working Appropriations Committee; 22 separate hearings, a very open process. I think even the minority that disagreed with some of the decisions that were made would agree that they were made fairly, openly, transparently, and by votes. And the American people can look at what we did.

Usually, when you come to this floor, you come to debate and to disagree. We're certainly going to have a great deal of that over the course of the next several days as we work through the main legislation and the many amendments which undoubtedly will be offered. But I want to focus today on an area of bipartisan agreement, and that's the decisions that were made regarding funding in Indian Country and Native American programs.

Mr. Chairman, our chairman generously mentioned, and appropriately mentioned, the hard work that Mr. MORAN and Mr. DICKS did in setting the foundation for the progress that's being built upon this year. What he was too modest about was his own role, first as a ranking member and then as the chairman, and also seeing that an appropriate focus was placed on Indian Country. Frankly, while I disagree with the administration in many places, I want to thank them as well because in many cases, they had great suggestions, they certainly put forward serious proposals, and they've been very easy to work with in Native American issues. So there's a lot of praise here to go around.

Most importantly, I think from an appropriations standpoint, the numbers speak for themselves. The Bureau of Indian Affairs funding was cut, but actually cut less than the President requested. The Indian Health Service got a 9 percent increase—almost \$400 million. You can run through the program. IHS staffing for new facilities, \$63 million. Fully funded at the President's request. Road maintenance, \$25 million. Funded at the President's request. Indian guaranteed loan program, something to help tribes as they move into private industries, actually funded above the President's request. Contract support costs, fully funded, \$228 million. Indian Health Service, fully funded, \$574 million.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman.

Contract support, again, fully funded or funded at very near what the President requested. Most importantly, language put in to make sure that those contracts are actually fully funded by the BIA, something that has not always happened in the past. Again, important language on joint ventures

whereby we encourage tribes to take some of their revenue, work with the Federal Government, reinvest in health care facilities, other needed infrastructure improvements in Indian Country.

I say all this just to point out that while we have serious disagreements and serious debates, and while we made very hard decisions, overall funding is, as Chairman SIMPSON suggested, down 7 percent from last year and certainly well below the request that the President made. In this area, defending one of the most challenged populations in the country, Republicans and Democrats alike can be exceptionally proud of what was done and the priorities when we put, again, the most challenged people that we deal with on that committee in the most favored position. That hasn't always happened. I want to thank my friend Chairman SIMPSON for making sure it happened and my friends Mr. MORAN and Mr. DICKS for doing the same.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

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

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the FY 2012 Interior appropriations bill in its current form. Not only am I deeply troubled by the bill's lack of infrastructure investment that would create jobs, grow the economy, and protect public health, but it is unfortunate that the Appropriations Committee has included several dozen egregious special interest policy earmarks in the bill that will undermine our Nation's commitment to clean water, clean air, and the environment, which are fundamental to local economies like the one I represent.

We've heard from our friends on the Appropriations Committee that we must make difficult decisions in these trying economic times. I couldn't agree more. Furthermore, we've heard from the chairman of the subcommittee that he believes that many of the programs that are cut are good programs, but that we must be willing to make cuts to reduce our growing debt.

Consider this: The bill cuts \$2.1 billion from 2011 levels for the Department of the Interior, EPA, and other agencies. However, if we were to eliminate the Bush tax cuts only for those households earning more than a million dollars per year, we could save the revenues necessary to preserve these critical agencies in less than 18 days. The bill provides \$1.4 billion less for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, a fund that is critical to both environmental protection and economic development. If we were to eliminate the Bush tax cuts, we could reestablish our commitment to clean water within 12 days, affecting only those tax cuts from people who make a million dollars a year or more. That's a reasonable price to pay for the economic development that would result.

Over the past several months we have heard repeatedly that we must do all

that we can to prevent taxing our Nation's job creators, a sentiment with which I agree in principle. However, in my district and districts all across this country, it is the environment that is the job creator. The economy of my district depends on clean water, clean air, and safe, swimmable beaches. The cuts in this bill place all of these in jeopardy. If the Republican priorities in this bill prevail, we could put an effective tax rate of zero on the small businesses in my district and it wouldn't help at all because they would have no income—and no income means no jobs.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield 2 minutes to the esteemed former chairman of the full committee, the member emeritus of several subcommittees, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to express my deep appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee as well as the ranking member, especially for the number of public hearings they had reviewing all of the programs of this subcommittee, taking us back to regular order in almost unprecedented form, making sure the public had a chance to talk to us about their view as to how these programs were working.

As we meet today, the country is faced with a crisis regarding our debt. Should we raise the national debt ceiling or not? That debate is swirling around whether we should reduce spending or we should increase taxes to fund additional spending desired by the administration and the former majority. It's very, very important to know that we are at a crisis point in terms of spending. With that backdrop, we can hear the same debate taking place in this very committee discussion. People complaining about not enough money for EPA, for example.

The fact is that most of these programs are over-funded relative to just a few years ago, and the debate and the concern is an expression about a desire for more spending or a lack of increased funding above and beyond the wish list of many around here. The fundamental issue ought to be discussed in terms of how programs have worked and not worked.

I've heard many complaints about air quality questions today by the other side. It was, Mr. Chairman, my privilege to write the toughest environmental laws in the country relative to improving air quality. Years ago, as we discussed implementing those policies in my State of California, the center of the discussion was to make sure we focus upon the real problems.

□ 1450

We can solve the problems of stationary sources, we said then, very quickly, very easily—up to 97 percent-plus of their pollution. The real problem lies with the automobile, doing something serious about that. What people do driving their cars is the key to the question.

The EPA has failed us in many, many a way in dealing with these major challenges, and I would suggest that any number of issues that might be raised is illustrated by the one endangered species I'd mentioned. That endangered species is the desert tortoise.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. We could have solved that problem years ago by planting endless numbers of eggs in the East Mojave. Instead, the EPA decided to ignore and the environmentalists decided to ignore that potential, saying it took too long to plant those and have them grow to adulthood. The fact is, over the last 15 years, had we done that, we would not have that endangered species any longer. Recently, we learned the only healthy population of the desert tortoise was on the National Training Center Army base where they took care of the animals versus what we did in the environment. Indeed, the EPA deserves some serious review as well as reauthorization.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), an extraordinary champion of the environment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

I am uncomfortable coming to the floor and having to speak against this bill. There is nobody in Congress I have more respect and affection for than the subcommittee chairman; but this bill is an example of why the Republican budget gimmick last week was a fool's errand. If ever enacted, the public would be outraged.

These critical programs of EPA are not overfunded. Just talk to anybody in your home community who is dealing with things like the revolving fund for sewer and water.

This bill is not balanced. There are opportunities where there could have been fees and charges from people who profit from the activities of this bill. But no. Instead, we are shifting costs to the public and damage to the environment. We are actually giving more money to some of the special interests that profit from these activities.

We are slashing things that matter to most Americans—the ability of the EPA to protect our families and their environment and land acquisition to protect American treasures. It's going to cost hundreds of thousands of jobs in rural and small town America where people rely on our open spaces, our public lands, our parks and recreational activities.

It shortchanges America's future.

The jihad against climate change continues from my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, and it's ironic. When people can barely walk outside in Washington, D.C. and when we're dealing with drought, flood, wildfires, the extreme weather events across the country, the scientists tell

us that it's related to human activity, and this budget reduces our ability to deal with climate change and extreme weather events.

I agree that the subcommittee has a very difficult job, in part, because of the unrealistic numbers that were given to them; but sadly, if you look at the bill in its entirety, I must take gentle exception to Chairman ROGERS saying we all support the core mission of EPA. Sadly, anybody who reads this bill understands that that's not the case and that it's being brought to us in a way that simply undermines that core mission that means so much to Americans, to our environment, and to our future.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 30 seconds remaining.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, the reality is that this is a bad bill. There may be some good people who have been involved in putting it together. I like the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, but the fact is that this would severely restrict our government's ability to improve the quality of our air and water. It would substantially cut programs that, I think, many of the American people take for granted. Our environment will be despoiled by this bill if it becomes enacted, so I would strongly urge that this body vote against it.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. In closing, I thank the Members for the debate that has gone on with regard to this bill.

I notice that Members on the other side of the aisle continually refer to some of the policy provisions that are in this bill as policy rider/special interest legislation. In fact, they were called "earmark legislation" in this bill, but they are special interest.

Let me tell you that the only special interest that I care about right now are the unemployed people in this country who are looking for a job. If you talk to any business in this country, the one thing they will tell you is the uncertainty created by the potential regulation and proposed regulation by the EPA is stopping them from expanding their businesses because they have no idea—no idea—what it's going to cost to hire a new employee.

They are the biggest wet blanket on our economy that we have today, so we need to do something about it. We need to rein them back in because they are totally out of control. That's what this bill does.

This is under an open rule. That means Members will have the opportunity, if they have different ideas and if they can get a majority of the votes, to remove some of these things. If so, they can remove them, but I'd suspect more are going to be added rather than removed as this bill moves through its full consideration.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this Rule and this incredibly short-sighted legislation before us today. The underlying bill is a direct attack on the environment and as a result an assault on public health and our economy.

The programs included in the Interior and Environment Appropriations bill affect so many aspects of our lives including clean air, clean water, public health and support for the arts.

Unfortunately, at the funding level provided, the Environmental Protection Agency will be fundamentally dismantled, making the agency unable to implement its core mission of protecting the environment and promoting public health.

The bill also removes funding for programs that help modernize buildings and other infrastructure and funding for innovative projects that are helping communities implement smarter water management solutions that protect clean water and save consumers money.

In my district, the Sacramento and American Rivers provide 85 percent of drinking water to those that live in the City of Sacramento that is over 400,000 of my constituents. Mr. Speaker, we rely on federal support to ensure the water we drink is safe. Without the proper level of funding I am very worried that we are going down a path of unknown consequences.

This bill also hurts Sacramento by slashing funds for the EPA's Office of Smart Growth which has worked closely with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments to ensure sustainable, positive growth in our region. In a time when local governments are suffering massive cuts, the investment in the Office of Smart Growth offers our communities assistance that will help them grow and revitalize their local economies.

Mr. Chair, the Sacramento area is on a path to become a national leader in the green economy, with over 230 companies, and 14,000 jobs. It is critical that we support policies that foster new innovation, and job growth in the green economy. Unfortunately, this bill does not do that!

What's more, this bill would cut the National Endowment of the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities by 13 percent. Both NEA and NEH grants are essential for our local economies. This funding is fundamental to supporting a thriving arts scene in my district, creating jobs and inspiring local students. As a former docent of the Crocker Art Museum in Sacramento, I can tell you firsthand the effect that an individual piece of art or a trip to a museum can have on a child. These are cuts we cannot afford to make.

In previous years, the Interior and Environment Appropriations bill has provided an opportunity to move our nation forward and make progress in areas as diverse as climate change to water use efficiency. But in this Congress, this Majority is forcing us to take a huge step backwards.

As a whole, this legislation has an unprecedented number of special-interest policy riders that endanger public health and go beyond the scope of the legislation.

In an austere budget environment, we can all agree that cuts need to be made but cuts to public health, cannot and should not be made just to give subsidies to Big Oil and Wall Street Executives.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to consider the dangerous and unprecedented ramifications this bill would have

on our constituents. I strongly reject this egregious proposal.

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

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendment printed in section 2 of House Resolution 363 is adopted. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment who has caused it to be printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2584

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SIMPSON

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a manager's amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider the amendment en bloc and at this point in the reading.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. 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 Idaho?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 48, line 3, insert "all" before "funds".
Page 48, line 5, strike "exhausted" and insert "obligated".

Page 67, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$6,812,000)".

Page 81, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$40,000,000)".

Page 105, line 19, insert "to the National Endowment for the Humanities" after "available".

Page 125, lines 14 and 15, strike "may establish" and "programs".

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

Mr. SIMPSON. The manager's amendment before us makes several technical and conforming changes to the bill. These are all noncontroversial changes, and they have been shared with the minority. I believe the minority is supportive of the amendment, and I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. CLAY. I rise for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee.

I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member MORAN, for your leadership and for this opportunity to discuss an important and urgent matter.

As the chairman knows, there are two acts that seek to conserve marine mammals—the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act. I am not here to debate the merits of those acts but to discuss an inadvertent and unexpected consequence of them.

□ 1500

There is what seems to be a contradiction when it comes to the protection of polar bears. Exactly the opposite may be happening.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding.

I am aware of this issue. This is one of those times when a law whose intent is to protect may be unintentionally causing harm.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, you are correct. This is an urgent issue, as we know, of polar bears, specific bears today that are in danger of being lost and which could be saved by importation into the United States. While it was the intent of Congress to protect these animals, the acts were never intended to be bureaucratic obstacles to common sense and to saving their lives.

Some brief background is in order. Mr. Chairman, section 101 of the Marine Mammals Protection Act established a moratorium on the importation of marine mammals. However, section 102 and 104 of the act allow for the issuance of permits for the importation of marine mammals under certain circumstances.

Now, the act generally prohibits permits from public display of marine mammals from a species of stock designated as depleted, which is defined as one that is listed as an endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act.

On May 15, 2008, the Secretary of the Interior listed the polar bear as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act; and since then, no permits for the importation of polar bears for the health and welfare of the animals or for the purposes of public display have been issued by the Secretary. The act does require that conservation plans for taking animals include proposals to enhance their habitat which, in this case, is impossible.

One of the main reasons the polar bear was listed as threatened is the loss of their habitat. It is not possible

to comply with this requirement, and we urge the Secretary to take this into consideration when making a final determination on these permits.

There is also a requirement that such takings be for scientific purposes. Mr. Chairman, I think you would agree that establishing successful captive breeding programs for a threatened species fits into the Congress's intent for scientific purposes. Declining habitat conditions for the polar bear and an increasing number of human-bear interaction have resulted in an increase in the number of polar bears brought into temporary or permanent captivity in Canada in recent years, including an increase in the number of non-releasable animals and orphaned cubs.

Canadian institutions cannot house all of these bears and any animals not placed in suitable facilities could be used, euthanized or left to die in the wild.

The Government of Manitoba, Canada, has passed legislation allowing such bears to be exported from Canada for purposes of captive maintenance and public display at accredited zoological institutions in the United States. These are institutions that have undergone a thorough and rigorous review and inspection process by zoological professionals to examine all aspects of an institution's operation.

Prior to issuing those permits, the Secretary of the Interior should determine the institution is accredited by the Association of Zoos and Aquariums and meets specific public display criteria as determined by the Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify that it is your understanding that under these acts, the Secretary of the Interior may issue permits for the importation into the U.S. of live polar bears for the purpose of public display at appropriate accredited zoological institutions. Upon a finding that such importation of such will benefit the health and welfare of the animal or is otherwise consistent with the conservation of the polar bears, in addition with the other areas, the Secretary's authority is granted under the Marine Mammals Protection Act, section 102(b) and 104(c)(4)(A).

Again, I want to thank the chairman for this opportunity.

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

(On request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CLAY was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. CLAY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri, and I want to be clear. I hope the Secretary of the Interior and the Fish and Wildlife Service hear us clearly when we say that it is the sense of the committee that under these acts the Secretary of the Interior may issue permits for the importation into the United States of live polar bears for the purposes of public display

at appropriate accredited zoological institutions upon a finding that such importation will benefit the health and welfare of the animal or is otherwise consistent with the conservation of the polar bear.

I thank the gentleman for raising the matter and for working with me on this important issue.

Mr. CLAY. I thank the chairman, as well as Ranking Member DICKS for requesting additional time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For necessary expenses for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, acquisition of easements and other interests in lands, and performance of other functions, including maintenance of facilities, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, including the general administration of the Bureau and the assessment of mineral potential of public lands pursuant to Public Law 96-487 (16 U.S.C. 3150(a)), \$918,227,000, to remain available until expended; of which \$3,000,000 shall be available in fiscal year 2012 subject to a match by at least an equal amount by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation for cost-shared projects supporting conservation of Bureau lands; and such funds shall be advanced to the Foundation as a lump sum grant without regard to when expenses are incurred.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 20, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$18,663,000)".

Page 92, line 1, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$18,663,000)".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, as I noted previously, there are a lot of winners and losers in H.R. 2584.

Two of the winners are the oil and gas companies and the cattle grazers who use our publicly owned land. One of the losers is Indians who need Sanitation Facilities.

My amendment would do two things. First, it decreases funding from the increase in the bill for the BLM's oil and gas and grazing management programs. Second, the amendment would restore the Indian Sanitation Facilities Program by what it was cut below the current spending level. I find it ironic that the majority refused to allow the administration to collect an inspection

fee from the oil and gas industry but had no problem in providing more taxpayer subsidies for the oil and gas industry.

The oil and gas industry gets about \$4 billion in subsidies per year. Likewise cattle ranchers get about \$400 million in subsidies per year by paying their ridiculously low fee of \$1.35 per month per cow while States charge so much more. Texas, for example, charges \$65 to \$150 per cow per month to graze on State-owned lands, but the Federal Government charges only \$1.35. Well, in this bill, they would see an increase in taxpayer resources devoted to grazing management from \$75 million to \$90 million, a 20 percent increase. Why not ask them to at least pay the cost of administering their grazing subsidy?

If our national budget is truly about shared sacrifice, how about starting with the oil and gas companies that have profited so handsomely from the resources owned by the American public and from ranchers whose use of the public lands is heavily subsidized by the American taxpayer.

The second part of my amendment provides an additional \$18.6 million for the Indian Sanitation Facilities Program. It would simply restore funding to last year's level.

At the end of fiscal year 2010, there were about 230,000 Native American homes in need of sanitation facilities including 34,000 homes without running water. According to the Indian Health Service, Native Americans in these homes are at extremely high risk for gastrointestinal disease and respiratory disease at rates similar to Third World countries. Additionally, the Indian Health Service has noted that many of these homes without services are very remote with limited access to health care, which increases the importance of improving environmental conditions in these homes.

The least we can do is to provide the same level of funding that was provided this current year to the Indian Sanitation Facilities Program, which is an integral component of the Indian Health Service disease prevention activities.

I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, again, the chairman suggested that there were no special interests. Well, this disproves that. There are special interests. Oil and gas companies already getting subsidies from the American taxpayer of about \$4 billion a year, they get increases in this bill. We're simply asking them to pay a little more towards the Federal Government's cost of managing the fees that they should be paying.

□ 1510

Just a little bit more, we're asking them to pay. And we're also asking the ranchers who, again, get special interest subsidies of about \$400 million in this bill, more money for the ranchers, more subsidy, more subsidy for the oil and gas companies; and yet at the same time, we cut the money that would

provide sanitation facilities for 230,000 Native American homes in need, and 34,000 of those homes are without even potable water. They are the losers. Oil and gas companies and the grazers are the winners in this bill. That's why I would urge support for the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend and colleague from Virginia.

Honoring our Nation's obligations to American Indians and Alaskan Natives is an unshakable bipartisan sentiment shared by Members of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee and is an accomplishment in this bill that I am most proud of. This bill increases funding for Indian Health Services by \$392 million over the current fiscal year while almost virtually everything else is being cut, a 10 percent increase that also happens to be one of the rare and, by far, the largest increases in this bill. This bill includes the same \$19 billion cut for sanitation facilities that was proposed by the President. And I note that the President's Indian Health Service budget was an additional \$162 million higher than this bill.

The problem is the offset. The BLM's management of land resources account has already been cut by \$43.5 million below the FY 2011 and \$15.5 million below the President's budget request. This account funds the management of the BLM's more than 245 million surface acres and 700 million subsurface acres. Further cuts to this account are not appropriate.

Mr. Chairman, am I proud of the increases we were able to provide in this bill and in previous bills by my predecessors Mr. MORAN and Mr. DICKS? You bet I am. Will I continue to fight for more funding for Indian country despite the attacks from virtually every other interest group who isn't happy with their share of the pie? You bet I will. Will I stand by and let my friend and colleague from Virginia continue to systematically dismantle the budget of the largest landowner in the West, the BLM? Absolutely not. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I support my friend from Virginia's (Mr. MORAN) amendment which would increase funding for the Indian Health Service sanitary facilities construction program. The amendment would provide \$18 million for this important health program, which would bring the funding level back up

to the enacted level for this year. The offset for this increase comes from a couple of programs that help support the private sector energy and livestock industries.

I think this amendment is a very good deal for the American taxpayer. And, by the way, if you've ever been out in Indian country, one of the problems that they have is a lack of sanitary facilities. I can think of the Skokomish Indians in my district in Mason County, Washington, where they have a very serious need for new sanitary facilities. And across Indian country, this is still a major problem. In fact, there was a group of scientists a few years ago who were asked, What was the greatest thing that happened in the 20th century to improve health care? They came up with sewers and sanitary facilities as the thing that improved health care around the world the most substantially.

The Indian Health Service program to construct sanitary facilities that would benefit from this amendment improves the lives of some of our poorest fellow citizens. The Indian Health Service program provides funding for people who often lack basic sanitary facilities, such as the delivery of potable water to their homes. For me, the choice is simple. I urge my colleagues to choose to help provide basic sanitation to Native Americans by making small cuts to programs that assist the energy and livestock industries. This is a good amendment and should be adopted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I move to strike the last word, Mr. Chairman.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to also support the Moran amendment for providing more access to clean drinking water.

And to Chairman SIMPSON's point, we did do a good job working together to significantly improve the quality of life in Indian country, and we did that working together. But one area in which some of us felt we could have done a little better is in the area of Indian sanitation. We're seeking to put the funding level back to where this Chamber had it in FY 2011, not a cut. And the way that we're asking to do that—and I will speak to the issue of grazing because I offered the amendment in the full Appropriations Committee—is to ask cattle ranchers to pay a fair fee to graze their cattle. A fee of \$1.35, as Mr. MORAN pointed out, is less than what most States are charging for the use of their public lands. And it is significantly less, as I found in some information gathering that I did, than the private sector charges for the use of their lands.

When we have our lands at \$1.35, not only is it not of benefit to the taxpayers, but it leads to overgrazing of our lands, which does nothing to help improve the quality of public lands for

future generations of cattle ranchers. Fifteen million dollars to grazers in this bill, \$4 million to oil and gas. And the numbers again: 230,000 Native American homes without sanitation facilities; 34,000 homes without clean, safe drinking water.

No infant and no child in this country or in Indian country should be at risk of gastrointestinal disease rates that are found in Third World countries. Let us provide the same level of funding that we had in the FY 2011 bill for Indian sanitation. Let us support clean drinking water for our children.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUELSKAMP

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$70,000,000)".

Page 4, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,880,000)".

Page 8, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$85,000,000)".

Page 9, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$11,804,000)".

Page 10, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$15,047,000)".

Page 10, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000)".

Page 10, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$120,000)".

Page 14, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$9,000,000)".

Page 15, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$32,000,000)".

Page 32, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$75,000,000)".

Page 39, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$47,000,000)".

Page 65, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$150,000,000)".

Page 65, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$900,000,000)".

Page 66, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$16,000,000)".

Page 68, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$771,000,000)".

Page 68, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$344,000,000)".

Page 68, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$427,000,000)".

Page 76, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$78,000,000)".

Page 78, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$12,500,000)".

Page 88, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$432,000,000)".

Page 96, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$9,000,000)".

Page 103, line 14, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$12,000,000)".

Page 105, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$135,000,000)".

Page 105, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$135,000,000)".

Page 105, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$125,000,000)".

Page 105, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 105, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$8,000,000)".

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,231,000)".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Today I rise on behalf of the Republican Study Committee to offer an amendment to bring the Interior appropriations bill in line with the RSC budget.

Mr. Chairman, credit rating agencies around the country are threatening to downgrade our debt, and not because we won't pass a debt ceiling increase but more so because we have not passed a credible plan to pay that debt back. Every child born in America today owes the Federal Government over \$46,000, and that bill rises every day.

The times we are in demand that we look at the effectiveness of every Federal dollar we spend, and that is why I offer this amendment today. This amendment makes cuts across the bill, but the biggest cuts come from the EPA. In my opinion, no agency in our Federal Government has done more to negatively impact our economy than the EPA.

In my district in western Kansas, EPA foot-dragging and redtape is delaying the construction of a new power plant. The construction of the plant would create 1,900 construction jobs and 261 permanent jobs, yet they cannot even break ground. Region VII is asking for changes. Environmental groups continue to file lawsuits based on EPA rules, exacting a death-by-litigation strategy against the rural electric cooperative members seeking to build this plant.

□ 1520

According to a study by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 351 proposed solar, wind, wave, biofuel, coal, gas, nuclear and energy transmission projects have been delayed or canceled due to significant impediments, such as regulatory barriers, including inefficient review processes and the attendant lawsuits and threats of legal action.

The study found that these projects would produce 1.9 million new jobs during construction and almost 800,000 jobs on an ongoing basis. These jobs are simply in limbo when our economy sorely needs them. In fact, not a week seems to go by without the EPA issuing a new rule or regulation that increases costs to businesses and consumers. BoilerMACT, water cooling intakes for power plants, interstate air

quality, dust and other particulate matter, ozone, and the list goes on and on.

These actions not only drive up costs but they create higher degrees of uncertainty in our fragile economy. And when the EPA isn't hampering our economy at home, they are sending our tax dollars abroad. Nearly \$1.3 billion was sent to China in grants over the past 2 years. Yes, that's right, these grants were sent to the China Coal Institute, the China University of Petroleum, the China Urban Construction Design and Research Academy, and the China Association of Rural Energy Industry. I guess the hundreds of billions of dollars of debt we owe them is not enough.

The EPA has long given up sound scientific methods to ensure a clean environment for a left-wing agenda that heaps billions in costs on our economy in exchange for nearly immeasurable incremental changes in our water and air quality.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment also zeroes out funding for the NEA and the NEH. Federal spending on the arts and humanities has long been controversial, not only for the nature of some of the grants but also for the fact that I believe the Federal Government should not play such a role in our society and certainly should not at a time when we are facing an impending debt crisis. If we cannot make relatively easy decisions to eliminate this funding, how can the American people expect us to make the harder decisions necessary to balance our Federal budget?

Mr. Chairman, the amendment also ends funding for National Heritage Area grants. This provision was included as a result of the YouCut program where the American people could vote on a government program to cut, and this is the one they selected. Federal funding for heritage areas was supposed to be seed capital to get them up and running for the States, localities, and private sector who requested them. Many of the grants have exceeded their original 10-year limitation. Even the President recommended a 50 percent cut in his budget for them, which was included in the bill; but in this time of much needed Federal spending restraint, it is time to cut them altogether.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to pass this amendment and help put us on a track to balance our budget in the next decade.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment cuts every environmental, conservation, and cultural program across the bill, totaling \$3 billion in cuts, and then puts those funds in the spending reduction account.

The funding in the bill is already grossly inadequate, and this amendment would cut the bill by more than

10 percent. The amendment zeroes out U.S. Fish and Wildlife construction by cutting \$12 million. It zeroes out U.S. Fish and Wildlife land acquisition by cutting \$15 million. It zeroes out Forest Service land acquisition. It zeroes out the National Endowment for the Arts. It zeroes out the National Endowment for the Humanities. It cuts State and local water infrastructure by \$770 million, 30 percent, even though the infrastructure needs across this country, as Mr. DICKS has stated, is \$688 billion.

This amendment goes on to cut the National Park Service, the Office of the Secretary, Wildland Fire Management, EPA Science and Technology, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

Mr. Chairman, we should all oppose these draconian cuts. They don't make sense. I don't think the gentleman proposing them necessarily knows what the full impact would be. I suspect, though, that if his constituents, let alone the American people, knew what was being attempted, they would agree with me that this amendment should be soundly defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to join with my good friend from Virginia in speaking against this amendment, although I do appreciate my friend from Kansas in offering it, because this is precisely what would be required if the budget gimmick that was offered by the Republicans last week to restrict funding to 1966 levels, a budget level that was never met by Ronald Reagan, who never proposed a budget that was less than 21 percent, but this is exactly what would be required. It's why the House is going to demonstrate the schizophrenia on the part of my friends on the other side of the aisle, because this amendment is going to be rejected, I predict. It will be rejected, even though that is what they would wish on the American public.

Zeroing out the resources for the National Humanities, for the NEA, things that, when push comes to shove, the American public embraces, supports, have dramatic economic impact at home, that leverage private dollars, but this is just the tip of the iceberg. I appreciate it being offered. I wish that people would look at it closely because this is what is being proposed by our Republican friends in their effort going forward.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I will yield back, but I do hope people pay close attention to what is embodied here, because this is a taste of what people have in store for the American public.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, and while I appreciate my good friend from Kansas's passion for cutting spending, the reality is that this is exactly what we're doing. This bill comes in under the allocation. We passed the budget earlier this year on the floor—we're the only body to have passed a budget, actually. The Senate has not passed one yet. We were given an allocation, and this bill comes in under that allocation.

We all know that we cannot balance this budget simply by cutting, but we also know that reducing Federal spending is a necessary priority and a first step toward getting us toward a balanced budget.

I think that this amendment goes too far. It would take \$3 billion from the numerous accounts in this bill, including the BLM, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, NEA and NEH, as was mentioned, and transfer it to the budget reduction account.

While I appreciate the gentleman's concern that he expressed about the impact that the EPA is having in this country on job creation, and I have said repeatedly that when I go out and give a speech somewhere to a chamber of commerce or Lions Club or whatever, I'll talk about the Interior bill and the agencies that we fund, and when I get to the EPA, someone in the audience will say, Just defund it, get rid of it, and it's the first applause line in the speech. That's the reputation the EPA has out in the public, and that's the concern that the public has about the direction that the EPA is headed.

So I appreciate the gentleman's concern about the EPA; but as I try to explain to people, you can't just do away with the EPA because if you're out there and you have a business and the underlying law requires you to get an air quality permit or a water permit or something like that and you call the EPA to get your air quality permit and no one's there to answer the phone, to help you with that, then you've got a problem. We don't want to eliminate the EPA. What we want to do is rein the EPA back in, because I think they've got an overly aggressive agenda; and, as I have said, I think they're the biggest wet blanket on the growth in our economy that there is.

I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I would hope that my colleagues would oppose the amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I move to strike the last word to oppose this amendment.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, what the American people want from their leaders in Washington can be summed up in a single word: jobs, J-O-B-S. The Republicans have now controlled the House for more than 200 days, and they haven't lifted a finger to address the single overriding priority of the people we work for, that is, jobs.

□ 1530

It's a gross failure of leadership.

Instead, what's on their agenda this week? Only the biggest assault on environmental protections in several decades.

I have yet, Mr. Chairman, to see a poll where Americans are clamoring for the Congress to undermine pollution controls, damage public health, and unravel a 40-year bipartisan conservation consensus. I can't think of a single environmental program or initiative that is spared under the base legislation, and this amendment makes it even worse.

The base bill would mean more toxic mercury, arsenic and soot pollution released in our air. It leaves the area surrounding the Grand Canyon, the Grand Canyon, an iconic national park, open to toxic uranium mining.

It cuts the Land and Water Conservation Fund by 78 percent. It tears the heart out of the Clean Water Act, and it guts the Endangered Species Act. And it removes those pesky regulatory obstacles that keep pesticides out of our waterways.

The Republicans want to block EPA's efforts to protect communities from stormwater runoff and to issue new energy-efficiency standards for new vehicles after 2016. Everything we've put in place that makes sense is what they want to get rid of.

And on and on and on and on it goes, Mr. Chairman, one extreme policy rider after another. None of this will do anything to save taxpayers money. It is an absolute frontal assault on the water we drink, the air we breathe, the public lands we cherish.

This is a big special interest giveaway, and that is simple. It's a classic example of legislating to benefit friends and benefactors, Big Oil and other corporate polluters at the expense of national interests. The Nation's natural resources are not ours to exploit at our will. They are on loan to us. We must be the responsible stewards.

It will be a moral failure if we don't pass an improved environmental bill, and if we don't pass an environment on to the next generation, one that is in even better condition than the one we have today.

But that's what this disgraceful legislation would do. It breaks a covenant that the American people take very seriously, a covenant they actually take for granted. It's Republican extremism run amok on steroids, voraciously ramming out of control.

The base bill, H.R. 2584, must be stopped. This amendment cannot see the light of day. I urge all my colleagues to vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. I want to commend Chairman SIMPSON for opposing this

amendment. This is an amendment that goes way too far. This bill is \$3.8 billion, almost \$4 billion below what the President requested. It's \$2 billion below the FY11 level, which we just passed a few months ago, and it would have a devastating effect on our environment.

When I hear people talk about growing the economy by cutting the budget, I wonder what school of economics they attended. In fact, there was an outstanding article just a few weeks ago in *The New York Times* that really laid out the basic problem we have in this economy, and that is that consumer spending has dropped by 7 percent. Normally, in previous recessions, it only went down 3 percent.

So then when you cut State and local government funding, when you cut Federal funding, you make a bad situation worse in terms of consumption. And that is why the economy has slowed down, and that's why it's not going to go up as a result of these kinds of reckless cuts being offered by the other side.

Let me give you one example. The former EPA administrator, Christine Todd Whitman, from New Jersey, did a study of what the backlog on wastewater treatment facilities was. And it was \$688 billion, and this was in 2002. It's definitely gone up.

And yet we're slashing, and would slash again, the amount of money for the Clean Water Revolving Fund and the Safe Drinking Water Revolving Fund and the State and Tribal Assistance Grants. Those are exactly the programs that we should be plussing up in order to get people back to work. It's infrastructure. That's one thing we used to be able to agree on, both Democrats and Republicans in this House, that we need infrastructure work. This will put people to work.

How are you going to get the deficit down? Not by slashing government spending. You're going to get it by putting people back to work. When you put them back to work, they start paying taxes, they start buying goods, and that will drive down the deficit. It will drive down unemployment.

This reckless amendment from the gentleman from Kansas, again, would make this bad situation even worse in terms of job creation. So I am pleased that the majority is resisting this ill-thought-out amendment, and I urge its defeat.

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 noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. 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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEAVER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

Page 65, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, in the committee report for this bill, the appropriations committee included some language expressing concerns in regard to the Environmental Protection Agency's Urban Waters Initiative and provides no funding in the bill for this program for fiscal year 2012.

I understand the committee's reluctance to extend funding for new broad, cross-cutting initiatives, given our economic situation. However, I feel this initiative has immense value to millions of people who live in urban centers and who rely on the government to ensure that they have clean water to drink and use in their daily lives. This amendment would restore partial funding for the Urban Waters Initiative for fiscal year 2012. This amendment does not increase the spending by one single penny.

Cities share one key characteristic: they're full of people, buildings, and businesses. Because everyone shares the same relative space, air and water environmental impacts are concentrated in smaller areas, including waterways. Urban waters take on large amounts of pollution from a variety of sources, including industrial discharges, mobile sources, such as cars and trucks, residential/commercial wastewater, trash and polluted stormwater runoff from urban landscapes. As urban populations often share centralized water sources, this pollution creates public and environmental health hazards like lowered drinking water quality and water bodies that aren't safe for human swimming.

The EPA launched the Urban Waters Program to address water quality challenges in the urban watersheds and build capacity of disadvantaged communities through projects that revitalize these watersheds. If maintained properly, urban waters can also yield positive impacts for populations in both urban and upstream communities. Revitalization of waterways can spur employment and the growth of local businesses and promote improvements in housing, safety, and quality of life in these areas.

□ 1540

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. REICHERT). The gentleman will suspend.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF OFFICER JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the Chair's announcement of earlier today,

the House will now observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson.

Will all present please rise for a moment of silence.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri may proceed.

Mr. CLEAVER. Communities across the country are coming together, working with the EPA, State and local agencies, and taking steps to access, restore, and benefit from their urban waters and the surrounding lands. My Missouri 5 District, a large section of which is Kansas City, is one such community. The EPA regional staff are working with Kansas City and local citizen groups to monitor water supply and plan and conduct improvements to the Blue River watershed and Brush Creek.

Covering 270 square miles, the Blue River compromises the largest watershed in the greater Kansas City metropolitan area. Its drainage is divided between the States of Kansas and Missouri and flows through three counties, 12 cities, and 10 school districts. Brush Creek is the most visible tributary to the Blue River and runs completely through an area that we are trying to rebuild called the Green Impact Zone. The EPA is monitoring water quality along the watershed and assisting in local efforts to conduct large-scale watershed planning for Brush Creek and the Blue River.

Whether as a part of a cleanup leading to waterfront development or putting monitoring in place to ensure safe drinking water with the EPA's help, community groups across the country have taken the initiative, engaging volunteers, community organizations, and local and State government to make their waters safe for many uses.

This amendment provides \$3 million for urban waters within the EPA's Environmental Programs and Management account, though it is by no means the maximum amount of funds that this program could utilize. It will ensure that this vital, community-driven initiative can continue, and I ask for the approval of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The amendment would take \$3 million from the BLM Management of Lands and Resources and transfer it to the EPA's Urban Waters Initiative. The BLM Management of Lands and Resources account has already been cut by \$43.5 million below the FY11 and \$15.5 million below the President's budget request. This account funds the management of the BLM's more than 245 million surface acres and 700 million subsurface acres. Further cuts to this account would not be appropriate.

We eliminated funding for the EPA's new Urban Waters Initiative because it

was duplicative funding. Regardless of whether a water body is in an urban or a rural area, EPA and States should be addressing the most impaired waters first, and there are a number of well-established programs that handle that. There is no need for a separate, duplicative initiative in order to protect our urban waters; it only results in duplicative spending.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I support the distinguished gentleman from Missouri. Mr. CLEAVER’s amendment would add a modest \$3 million to the Environmental Protection Agency for the Urban Waters Initiative, which the subcommittee refused to fund.

EPA and the Department of the Interior announced the first pilot demonstrations of this program last month. They included Baltimore’s Patapsco watershed, the Anacostia watershed in the District of Columbia and Maryland, the Bronx and Harlem River watersheds in New York, the South Platte River in Denver, the Los Angeles River watershed, the Lake Pontchartrain area in New Orleans, and the northwest Indiana area, all areas in drastic need of attention.

The subcommittee report chides EPA for reprioritizing funds to begin the program in fiscal year 2011 without the express approval of the committee. But my friends on the other side should know that when you fund the government under a continuing resolution, the agency has more flexibility. If we don’t want EPA or any other agency to decide how to prioritize funding, then we should pass real bills. And, frankly, they did exactly the right thing in moving forward with this Urban Waters Initiative—that’s where the need is.

Furthermore, denying funds to urban watersheds—where a majority of our population lives—because of a dislike for all things EPA does is simply unfair to these urban communities.

On a bipartisan basis, we have worked together to provide needed funding for rural water programs. We agree that should be a priority, but we should also show the same level of commitment for the Urban Waters Initiative.

This program will also capitalize on work being done through EPA’s broader geographic programs, such as Chesapeake Bay and Lake Pontchartrain. These are two very critical water bodies that are endangered. I don’t think I need to get into the extent of the endangerment for Chesapeake Bay and certainly not Lake Pontchartrain. Imagine, just think back to what happened in New Orleans just a few years ago. This offset is from the management account of the Bureau of Land

Management, which is adequately funded in the bill.

So I really do support this amendment, and I would urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. I just want to associate myself with the gentleman’s remarks. I support this amendment.

I can think back to when I was going to the University of Washington, when Lake Washington, which is between Seattle and Bellevue, was completely polluted and you couldn’t swim in it. The people there bonded themselves and completely restored the lake. Today, that is some of the most valuable property in the entire Pacific Northwest.

So these urban water initiatives are critically important for the environment and for the health of the people of those areas.

I think this is a modest amendment, and I urge our colleagues to accept it.

Mr. MORAN. I very much thank the distinguished ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee.

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

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

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

Mr. MORAN. 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 Missouri will be postponed.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, it is true that no bill is perfect, but this bill is truly atrocious. I have come here as co-chair of the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition to talk about how this bill represents a wholesale failure to really recognize our stewardship responsibilities of the greatness of this country. And it is a great country. I fly across it every Monday and Friday, and the words of the song that God’s grace was shed on thee in this country are really true. But this bill shows nothing but disdain for the precious assets of clean air, clean water, and good open ground that we have in this country.

I’m sad to say that when you look out across America today you will see Republicans and Democrats out recreating—they understand what a beautiful playground we have in our national lands and clean water—but right now all this bill is is a playground for the special interests. And it’s sad to say that a party that we have worked

with historically has now turned its back on its stewardship responsibility. Teddy Roosevelt, who started this effort, would be rolling over in his grave to see this wholesale abandonment of this stewardship responsibility of this great country.

Republicans and Democrats alike want more clean air; this bill gives them less. They want more clean water; this bill gives them less. They want more open good ground; this bill gives them less. And the reason is is that it’s based on a huge, mistaken belief that dirty air is good for our economy, that dirty water is good for our economy, and that despoiled land is good for our economy. These are falsehoods.

You want to talk about job creation, I’d like to talk about some jobs we would like to create and keep that are damaged by this bill. Right now in Puget Sound out in Washington State, we have historically grown some of the best oysters in the world in Hood Canal and other places. And now, because of water pollution, the oyster industry that employs thousands of people in my State is endangered by water pollution.

□ 1550

Now, one would think, when we’re trying to protect jobs in every industry, including the oyster industry, we might be interested in preventing pollution that destroys a whole industry. But no, that’s not what this bill does. This bill weakens our ability to protect against dirty water and storm water pollution that is endangering jobs in my State and other places in this Nation. Now, if you go to talk to people in this industry, they’ll say their jobs are important. But according to this bill, they are not. What’s important are the special interests and the ability to degrade our environmental protection.

Take a look at the alternative fuels industry that is now growing across this country and its ability to create millions of new jobs. A few weeks ago, I was at a company called Targeted Growth. Targeted Growth had an idea a few years ago of creating biofuels that we could fly airplanes with. Five years ago, people thought this was a pipe dream. But because of their intellectual prowess, just a few weeks ago, using Targeted Growth biofuels, we flew the first transoceanic flight using biofuels from camelina that can be grown in my State and refined in my State, the first time in American history. That’s something to be proud of.

Now, one would think in a bill like this, we would help new job-creating industries like that get started. But no. What this bill does is degrade the clean energy parts of our law that would give inspiration and additional innovation and investment in these clean energy industries.

This bill is an anti-job creation bill because it makes the assumption that dirty air and sick people are good for

economic growth, and that is not a recipe for economic growth in this country.

Now I'll just talk about one thing. There has been an 80 percent reduction in our Land and Conservation Water Fund, which is very disturbing, and it should be to Democrats and Republicans alike. This is one thing I hope we can fix in this bill, and it is not something that is so urban or rural. I think about this little city park in Mossy Rock, Washington. A police officer said, Why do I get all of these kids hanging around the bars? Let's get them in something. Let's get them off the streets. Using some of these funds, we now have a city park being built in Mossy Rock, Washington. Is that such a dangerous thing for our economy?

I hope the Bass amendment is successful later on so we can at least fix one thing in this bill. Otherwise, reject this bill.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I take modest exception to the comments of my good friend from the State of Washington because, having read "Wilderness Warrior" about Teddy Roosevelt, there is no doubt that T.R. is spinning in his grave.

This Interior Environment appropriations bill represents an abdication of responsibility on the part of the Federal Government. Not only does the bill cut funding for clean air, clean water, and protection of public lands, it is polluted with anti-environmental riders. These riders have nothing to do with reducing the deficit and everything to do with undermining the role of the Federal Government in protecting our Nation's environment and public health.

This is a partisan attack on 40 years of progress to protect our health and environment. It places profit-seeking interests of large polluters over the health of the American public, privatizing the benefits while forcing the children and elderly to bear increased health care costs.

Most of all, this bill is a waste of time. In the midst of a looming debt crisis, we are engaged in a rhetorical debate about legislation that moves us backward and will never become law, either defeated in the Senate or vetoed by the President.

Republicans are risking the stability of our economy for the opportunity to demonstrate once again they are more concerned in protecting industry profits than the American people.

In the midst of a heat wave in Washington, D.C., and around the country, the bill pretends that climate change isn't happening, and even prevents the EPA from following the law and a Supreme Court decision to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It threatens 2 million jobs and over \$363 billion of the Nation's economy that depends on the

support of the programs of the Department of the Interior.

There are devastating cuts to clean water and the State revolving funds. The Land and Water Conservation Fund, as is referenced, an 80 percent cut, the most dramatic reduction in 45 years. It cuts EPA's operating budget, oversight budget for offshore drilling, and will leave communities around the country struggling to provide services to their citizens and even comply with Federal laws.

In Oregon, the cuts to public lands funding will mean missed opportunities to protect special places like the Columbia River Gorge.

It will also cripple local economies. Studies have shown that for every billion dollars invested in water infrastructure, between 20,000 and 26,000 jobs are created. It cuts almost a billion dollars from the State revolving fund that helps States finance federally mandated upgrades in repairs to water and sewer systems. It will put additional pressure on already tight local budgets, as well as potentially increasing water and sewer rates. And in communities like mine, we've seen them skyrocket in recent years.

The bill rolls back lifesaving and cost-saving measures under the Clean Air Act and other environmental laws which were enacted to protect the health and environment of the American people. It should be no surprise that it is cheaper and easier to prevent toxics like mercury and arsenic from going into our air and water in the first place than trying to remove them later. The EPA studies show that the benefits far outweigh the costs.

There is no doubt why a number of public health organizations, including the American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association, and the American Academy of Pediatrics have all written to Congress opposing these clean air policy riders.

The policy riders in the spending bill can only be described as fulfilling a special interest wish list. From blocking clean air regulations and oversight of mining to preventing Federal action to clarify the jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act and to a new moratorium on listings in the Endangered Species Act, the bill countless times ignores the needs of our communities and instead implements what polluting industries have been asking for. Why are we talking about allowing new mining around the Grand Canyon?

Finally, most paradoxically, this bill restricts the funding for the EPA Office of Sustainable Communities. This is an office that provides technical assistance and guidance to local communities that wish to plan for increased economic growth and development, and account for the changes in their community and demographic impacts. This office has been in existence for over 15 years. It is an extraordinarily useful tool to help communities understand how to put the pieces together, how to coax out more value. The demand is so

high for their services, they can only help 9 percent of the applicants. Now would not be the time, it would seem, to make it harder for communities who wants to encourage economic development and growth in a thoughtful and sustainable fashion.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. We can and must do better for our communities.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, during our full committee markup on the Interior bill, Congressman LATOURETTE offered an amendment to prevent the Great Lakes States from receiving any EPA funding if they have implemented ballast water rules that have stronger timelines or standards than the Federal or international requirements that are currently in effect.

At the time, Mr. Chairman, I asked that we look more thoughtfully at the potential impact this amendment might have.

Since that markup, I have heard concerns from numerous groups and the State of New York. In addition, it is my understanding that both EPA and the Coast Guard are working towards finalizing national standards. Would you be willing as we move toward conference with the Senate to work with the New York Members, Congressman LATOURETTE, and other Great Lakes Members to help us find a workable solution to this problem of invasive species and ballast water discharges?

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

The gentleman from New York has spoken to me about these concerns, and I am aware that this is a serious issue that will have an immediate impact on the State of New York and other Great Lakes States. Before conference, I will work with you, Congressman LATOURETTE, and other Great Lakes Members to try to resolve these concerns.

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the gentleman for his assistance.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. I want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) for the reasoned and balanced approach he has taken to this. Rather than filing a knee-jerk reaction either in committee or now on the floor, he has recommitted to working together to solve this problem.

□ 1600

It's a problem that needs to be solved. And I just want the record to be clear: In 2008, the New York Department of Environmental Conservation—not the State legislature, not the State—enacted ballast water exchange

regulations that would have gone into effect, had they pushed the issue, that are 100 times more stringent than the international standard and would have gone to 1,000 times more stringent a year after that. Only two States, New York and Minnesota, had something in their regulations called “innocent passage,” and that is it applies to all ships that pass through New York’s water, whether they take on ballast water or discharge ballast water or whatever.

I take a backseat to no one in this Congress on the issue of invasive species in the Great Lakes. My first piece of legislation I wrote was with Senator John Glenn, the Invasive Species legislation, in 1996. But this particular provision by the New York Port Authority would cripple and perhaps eliminate commerce on the Great Lakes.

So this deserves thoughtful consideration. It deserves our study. And I would again commit to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) to work with you and the chairman to find a way that solves this horrible problem of invasive species in ballast water or anything else but doesn’t stop interstate commerce on the Great Lakes.

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

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. I hope the press and the American people are paying attention to what’s going on on the House floor. I know the news is all about raising the debt ceiling and all the cuts or revenues that might be involved before we can get legislation to do something that has been routinely done—almost automatically done—every year or two for decades.

What is happening on the House floor deserves the attention of the American people. This is the most antienvironmental House of Representatives in history. The new Republican majority seems intent on restoring the robber-baron era where there were no controls on pollution from power plants, oil refineries, and factories.

This year, we’ve witnessed weather disaster after weather disaster. There have been massive floods, record-breaking fires, record-breaking droughts, and now record-breaking heat waves. Yet earlier this year, the House passed a bill that repealed EPA’s scientific finding that climate change is occurring, is caused by man, and is a serious threat. We don’t hear about the connection between these weather events and climate change and carbon emissions. We’re not hearing about it when we watch the daily news shows and we’re not hearing about it from this administration.

I just sent, recently, a letter to Secretary Chu, the Secretary of Energy, a Nobel Prize winner, asking him to speak out. We need to educate the

American people so we can educate our colleagues here in the House of Representatives.

In this bill, the Republican majority wants to block EPA from issuing regulations to reduce carbon emissions from power plants and oil refineries that are causing this catastrophic climate change. The majority also wants to block regulations to cut carbon pollution from motor vehicles, even though these regulations help break our dangerous dependence on oil, save American families money, and clean the air we breathe.

This House can deny science, we can amend our Nation’s laws, but we cannot rewrite the laws of nature. The longer we ignore the scientific reality that our actions are destabilizing the environment, destabilizing our climate, the more costly and disruptive our response will need to be—and the more we endanger our children’s future.

When we were debating carbon regulations earlier this year, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claimed that they supported reductions in what they call “real” air pollution, whatever that means. But it turns out they’re gutting those protections as well. This legislation includes provisions that will block landmark rules to protect the health of our children by cutting air pollution and reducing toxic mercury pollution.

The bill blocks the Cross-State Air Pollution rule—an important rule that is designed to prevent dirty power plants in one State from contributing to air quality problems in other downwind States. EPA estimates that this rule will prevent up to 34,000 premature deaths and nearly 2 million sick days a year beginning in 2014.

The bill indefinitely delays mercury and air toxics standards from power plants. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin that damages brain development in infants and children, impairing their ability to think and learn. EPA’s mercury rule will clean up this pollution and prevent 17,000 premature deaths each year.

Republicans like to argue that environmental regulations must be justified by a rigorous cost-benefit analysis. Well, these regulations have been thoroughly analyzed and their benefits are 10 times greater than their cost, yet they want to stop those regulations from going into place.

These essential health protections are not being targeted because they are too costly. They are being targeted because they are opposed by powerful special interests like oil companies and electric utilities. We need to stop putting the special interests ahead of the public interest.

This bill poses a choice: Are we for protecting pregnant women, infants, and children from toxic pollution or are we for protecting the profits of special interests? A strong and vital EPA is in our national interest and the public interest. If we disarm EPA—as this

bill would do—there is no one to stand up to the polluters and protect American families.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. CHU. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WESTMORELAND). The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHU. I rise today in strong opposition to the 2012 Interior appropriations bill, the most anti-environment bill I’ve seen on the House floor since I was elected to Congress.

If this bill passes, our air will be more polluted, our water will be dirtier, and we will know that much of what we love will disappear. This bill rolls back the clock to a time when big companies could poison our streams and rivers with impunity, when power plants could freely contaminate the air we breathe, and when our national treasures were destroyed by corporations, all for a bigger profit.

First, the bill slashes funding to the EPA by \$1.8 billion, stealing funding that keeps our drinking water and wastewater systems clean.

Then it guts the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This program has done more than any other to expand local parks, recreational green spaces, and public lands enjoyed by hundreds of millions of Americans. This bill cuts this program by 80 percent, to its lowest level in history, nearly eliminating efforts to ensure that our treasured places are protected for families to enjoy for generations to come.

Then it abolishes the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Climate Service, which is crucial to understanding how the changes in our national climate affect our farms, coastal communities, and businesses.

Finally, it proposes crippling cuts to the development of renewable energy sources and energy efficiency, only making our Nation more dependent on importing oil and gas from foreign countries. But what’s worst of all is that these cuts severely jeopardize the 12.5 million jobs that could be created as a result of American clean energy innovation and undermine growth in our Nation’s clean tech industries.

Even though some are calling this a cost-cutting bill, it’s really a bill to pad the pockets of big corporations and the worst polluters. Unbelievably, it gives away \$55 million in subsidies to oil and gas companies and blocks the necessary increase in fees to inspect oil and gas stations from disasters like the BP gulf spill. That’s not all.

The bill includes 39 different environmental policy bans that open up our natural resources to greedy polluters and keep our environmental agencies from doing their jobs to protect us from contamination. It allows more soot pollution in our air by blocking critical public health standards that ensure our air is very healthy for Americans to breathe.

It blocks the EPA from implementing greenhouse gas pollution

standards for new cars in 5 years, jeopardizing 7,000 new jobs and the estimated 2.4 million barrels of oil a day saved in just two decades. It prohibits my home State of California from moving ahead with its own clean air standard. It exempts oil companies from complying with Clean Air Act standards for offshore drilling—again, protecting the special interests of Big Oil.

□ 1610

It puts the drinking water of 117 million Americans at risk by blocking EPA from keeping our water clean—half of America's streams and some 20 million acres of wetlands. It allows the unregulated discharge of pesticides directly into our rivers and lakes.

This bill is a direct attack, a declaration of war, on our air, water, wildlife, and wildlands. It is clear that this bill isn't about cutting spending. It is about cutting years off our children's lives by increasing their exposure to contaminants in the air and water. The Republicans are putting polluters ahead of the health and safety of the American people, so I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, when some of us go home and we speak to different groups about how Congress conducts its business, one of the parts of those conversations that may be hard to understand is that we have personal relationships and that we have people on both sides of the aisle who we respect and we like. So especially during these times it becomes difficult for some of us when, for instance, a person like myself looks at a Chairman ROGERS or a Chairman WOLF or a Chairman SIMPSON, and we know that these are good people who are totally confused as to what it is we're supposed to be doing.

You say to a Republican these days, Good morning; and he or she answers, Cut the budget.

The sky is blue.

Cut the budget.

We all understand the need to get certain amounts of spending under control, but the problem is that some folks—and this bill shows that—continue to totally misunderstand that, yes, we may have economic issues that we have to deal with—that's a given—but we are also still—and are perhaps forever—the greatest country on Earth.

How did we get there?

We didn't get there because we decided every couple of years to simply cut the budget. We got there because we invested money; because we created, yes, rules; because we created, yes, laws that protected our way of life

and the way that we wanted our future generations to be treated.

What you see across the board now is this belief that if you get the budget down to a certain number—and I say this profoundly sarcastically, perhaps, that some people would like to get it to zero, and I don't know what happens constitutionally after that if the budget is at zero—then the country will do better and everything will be well. Couple that with the fact that, while some folks on that side are, in fact, strong believers that you must cut spending, others have taken the opportunity to roll back language, to roll back regulations that have made the environment safer, that have made our lives better, that have made us safer as Americans.

The public is being told it's about cutting the budget. The public is being told it's about not having a national debt. The public is being told it's about the future of our country in terms of what we owe. Yes, that is a legitimate concern; but what the country is not being told is that, for instance, in this bill, through riders, we are going back, perhaps not even to the sixties, but to the fifties or even the forties on environmental issues and on other issues.

So what we need to do is to continue to be a voice on this side, as well as the folks on that side who believe as I do, that this is a wrong route to take and that we have to continue to stand up and say, We all understand the need to address the issues we have to, but we can't throw away everything that we've had; we can't throw away everything that we've built, and we can't simply not invest in the future.

I sit on other committees, committees that have traditionally given us an opportunity to invest. Somewhere right now in this country, there is a person, male or female, sitting with a white robe, in a laboratory, who is coming up with the next medicine, the next Velcro, if you will—the next invention that will make us a better Nation and a better society, that will help us and help the world.

If you look at those budgets—and they'll be coming to a floor near you pretty soon—those budgets are devastated when it comes to investing money in research. So, while it's good to tell the public to cut the budget, we need to be honest and say, In the process, we may set you back 30 or 40 years.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SARBANES. This bill, H.R. 2584, is a terrible bill. It is a terrible bill for our country, and it represents an assault on our environment.

Actually, I was looking through the various assessments about this bill, this Interior and Environment appropriations legislation for 2012, from different advocacy groups out there that are concerned about the environment, that are concerned about clean air and

clean water. That's the word they kept using, "assault." This is an assault on clean water. It's an assault on clean air. It's an assault on conservation. It continues the assault that was begun at the beginning of this year with H.R. 1—to completely dismantle our environmental protections.

I confess to you, I just don't understand the motivations of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Do we not breathe the same air? Do we not drink the same water? Do we not traverse the same beautiful terrain across this country? I can't imagine. I can't fathom what the motivation is to engage in this wholesale attack on our environment.

Let's look at that attack.

They are proposing to cut the EPA's budget. This is the agency that is charged with protecting our environment. They are proposing to cut that budget by 18 percent below 2011 levels and by 40 percent below 2010 levels.

I come from the Chesapeake Bay. I grew up fishing for crabs in the Nanticoke River on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. My grandmother lived in Salisbury. That's where we used to go during the summers. This would be devastating for the Chesapeake Bay. It cuts funding to the Chesapeake Bay Program, which is designed to put the Bay on a pollution diet so we can clean up the Chesapeake Bay. This would undermine that. It puts all these policy riders on it. It's loaded up with policy riders. It would prevent the regulation of coal ash as a hazardous waste. We have that issue in my district, regulating coal ash. I want the Environmental Protection Agency to be able to do that work, but this bill would undermine it. So it is an assault on clean water, and that affects the Chesapeake Bay.

Let's look at what else it does.

It's an assault on clean air. This bill, with all of these policy riders, would block standards to cut air pollution from cement kilns, delaying standards for power plants by 6 months, standards that would do—what?—reduce mercury, arsenic and lead in the air. Don't we want to do that? So why would we undermine that effort?

It would exempt oil companies. Now, this is no surprise. That has become a common practice. How many exemptions can we give to the oil and gas industry? Here is another one. It would exempt oil companies from complying with the Clean Air Act in offshore drilling operations. It's an assault on clear air. Do you know what? A study was done by the EPA that said the air quality improvements under the Clean Air Act, if maintained for the period from 1990 to 2020, will result in \$2 trillion in savings for this country and will prevent 230,000 deaths. So why would you want to undermine the protections with respect to our clean air?

□ 1620

It's an assault on environmental education, taking funding away from the

National Park Service in terms of needed construction that has to be done. It's an assault on our National Wildlife Refuges. The reduction in funding for our National Wildlife Refuges would result in 140 of them being closed. That's 25 percent of them across the country. It's an assault on conservation, reducing the Land and Water Conservation Fund to a 45-year low of \$66 million. That's an 80 percent cut from 2011 levels.

But here is the great shame of it.

The great shame of it is the American people are ready to step up and be stewards of the environment. They want to do that. They want to take ownership in their own backyards, but they can't do it if the Federal Government isn't there as a partner, so I urge the defeat of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. The American public was concerned mainly about two things in this last election:

A, jobs—trying to get opportunities for themselves and their children and young people to earn a living. They were also concerned, correctly, about the debt and deficit that confronts this country. Those were the two items that they were very focused on and concerned about, and I think almost everyone on this floor shares their concerns.

I got no message from any voter that I ought to come to Congress and undermine the air, water, land that they survive on, recreate on and rely on for the quality of their lives. Not one constituent, whether they voted for me or against me, said, "Undermine the protections of our land and water and air." Not one. However, that is what we're dealing with today—not jobs, not deficit—but undermining the integrity of our air, our water and our land.

I rise, therefore, Mr. Chairman, in strong opposition to this bill, which puts some of our Nation's most precious natural resources at severe risk. This bill slashes funding for the Environmental Protection Agency by nearly 20 percent, after a year in which its funding already declined by 16 percent. The result of these cuts will be an agency unequipped.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't have to address you, but if I didn't under the rules have to address you, I would address all of America about their concerns about this undermining of the Environmental Protection Agency. Americans want the environment protected. They don't want that effort undermined.

It will mean higher risks of dirtier air, unsafe water and carbon pollution in our atmosphere. No American said that that's what they wanted when they talked to me.

This bill also includes a rider that would defund the listing of endangered

species and habitats—a true failure of environmental stewardship.

Perhaps worst of all, this bill comes with 39 separate anti-environment riders that cater to some of our Nation's most powerful special interests.

Now maybe I missed it. Maybe there's an American somewhere who said, "Look, protect the special interests and undermine our environment," but I just missed talking to them maybe. Maybe that was it.

These riders would endanger and exploit our public resources, including such treasures as the Grand Canyon and the Colorado River, the quality of our Nation's air and water for the private gain of just a few.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund, which reinvests money we can gain from offshore oil and gas drilling into protecting our public lands—now, we have just seen a dramatic assault on our lands on the gulf coast—it's cut 78 percent from the current year's funding in this bill.

Communities waiting for funding for new sewer and drinking water systems will find a 40 percent cut from current levels. No American asked me for that.

In 1995, the very first vote the new Republican majority cast was on a bill like this one, one that attempted to slash the EPA and an active wish list of special interest priorities. The year is different but the policy is the same. But there was one major difference. That failed bill had just 17 environmental riders—less than half of this one. This one has 39. These provisions do nothing to control spending. They are end-runs simply around laws to protect our environment.

Now, as then, the wish list deserves to be voted down. Sherry Boehlert, who was a member of the Natural Resources Committee, stood on this floor when that 1995 bill was offered. A Republican leader in the House of Representatives said: Do not do this to our land, our air, and our water.

Let me close by quoting the wise words of the ranking member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, my colleague and friend Congressman JIM MORAN: "There are those who want to make this controversy between humans and the environment, but that is a false assertion."

I urge you to read the balance of Mr. MORAN's quote in opposing this bad bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. H.R. 2584 is, without question and without precedent, the most regressive, destructive, and shameless attack on our environmental protections, this country's public health, and conservation in over four decades.

This is accomplished through the backdoor changes, 40 ideologically driven policy riders in the legislation,

and it's easily the biggest payout to polluters and special interests who helped craft these riders and who are now adding those to our laws. And it's also accomplished on the riders, riders on an appropriations bill that legislates.

It's also accomplished through defunding agencies, such as the EPA, so that their oversight is weakened and their enforcement becomes non-existent.

Giveaway public lands. These mechanisms are used in this legislation to not only undermine but to dismantle protections that have been part of the legacy of this Nation for years upon years and decade upon decade. Matters of life and death to the American people, clean air and clean water, are left without funding to protect American families.

And the legislation before us does not create jobs. If the reason of the deficit—the reason that this is being done, as we hear from the other side, is for deficit reduction, that sounds hollow and contrived when one measures the cost of public health and cleanup that awaits the taxpayer in the very near future. It sounds hollow when the taxpayer sees the tax breaks, the public resource giveaways, and unregulated privileges to industry and big business. It seems hollow when the average American taxpayer suffers both the financial and human costs of this legislation.

Let me use one example of a rider introduced by my colleague from Arizona, a son of Arizona, to the Grand Canyon. This would effectively defund any opportunity to study, to analyze the consequences of uranium mining on 1 million acres around the Grand Canyon.

□ 1630

If anything else were to be an important point for this Congress, it is the icon of all our national parks, the Grand Canyon. And the uranium mining in that area has caused damage to people and the environment for years upon years. And now with this rider, we are perpetuating the same climate, the same strategy that has caused the problems in the area. We are jeopardizing the water, the Colorado River, and water users in Nevada, California, and Arizona. And they use an expert; they tout an expert, as of today and recently, a person who rationalized that there will be no real damage to the Grand Canyon. Isn't it ironic and somewhat interesting to note that this expert is sitting on 30 or more mining claims in the withdrawal area around the Grand Canyon and would stand to do very, very well financially upon the sale and resale of these claims? This is the expert.

This legislation, H.R. 2584, is a feeding frenzy for polluters, Big Oil, and speculators who make their huge profits by cutting corners, ignoring regulations, and skirting the responsibilities that we all have to follow the law. Now

their mission has an eager partner—the majority of the House of Representatives. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this legislation and to protect the health of the American people and the health of our legacy as a Nation.

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, as we sit and endure this mini-filibuster about how horrible Republicans are when it comes to this bill and the environment, I want to give a perspective about how some of these riders actually got in the bill.

I and a number of my colleagues have spent a lot of time talking with this EPA, this EPA administrator, and it's like talking to this lection. Nothing gets through. And I want to bring to your attention one particular matter that I put in this bill that's a rider, and it has to do with the U.S. EPA draft notice 2010-X, and that was a notice that went out to the manufacturers of lawn fertilizers.

Now, everybody in the Chamber would agree that the people who manufacture lawn fertilizer, what they put in the bag should be safe; it should not harm the environment; and it should actually what do it's supposed to do, and that's grow grass or do something else. However, the EPA, because they had precious little to do, decided that they weren't content with regulating what was in the bag. They want to regulate what's on the bag, and not the list of ingredients but what the product is called.

So draft regulation 2010-X says that these companies need to reevaluate the trademark names—some of them that have been in effect since the 1960s—and remove those that the EPA determines are misleading to the public. Now I sat down with Ms. Jackson, the administrator of the EPA, and went over this. She sort of smiled and said, You know what, this really doesn't make a lot of sense to me. I brought it up in subcommittee last year and withdrew it at the request of the then-majority who said they'd work on it. Well, it's still here.

And here is a list of the words that they determined you can't use if you are in a lawn fertilizer business: “Germ shield,” “100 percent protection,” “professional grade,” “pro,” “safe,” “safer,” “safest,” “natural,” “environmentally safe,” and “green.”

Now, hold on a minute. There's a company in Ohio. It's not in my district—full disclaimer—but it's called Scotts, and they make a product called Turf Builder. They also make a product called Turf Builder Pro. This draft notification tells them they can't call it “Pro” anymore because it's misleading to the public, even though the word “Pro” was installed to create a brand that small hardware stores could sell so you didn't have to go to the big-boxes, the Wal-Marts, the Kmart, and

those other companies. So it's a niche brand for smaller retailers. But you can't call it that anymore.

You can't claim that a bag of lawn fertilizer does anything green, unless that “green” applies to livability and sustainability. Now, Mr. Chairman, when I was growing up, green was a color. This folder was green. Not anymore. If I can't demonstrate this folder has something to do with livability and sustainability, I am misleading the people that are watching this program.

There's another company in Ohio that's over in Toledo—Ms. KAPTUR's district—they have a product called Anderson's Golf Pro. And the EPA has indicated that they are not allowed to call it “Golf Pro” anymore because you don't have to use the seed or the weed and seed on a golf course. You could use it, Mr. Chairman, on your front lawn. So they have to call it “Anderson's Pro.” Well, wait a minute—they can't call it “Pro” anymore either because that's misleading. So they can call it “Anderson's” and hope you can figure out what you are supposed to do with it.

I told my friends at Scotts, You have really barely scratched the surface on this thing because the product that Scotts manufactures that I like so much is Miracle-Gro. Now can you imagine, Mr. Chairman, how is the EPA going to be able to certify when I put that Miracle-Gro on my tomato plant that a miracle has occurred? You are going to put a tremendous burden on the Vatican. All these little old ladies are going to be at the airport, flying over to Rome to talk to the College of Cardinals and say, Did a miracle occur? That's why some of these riders are in here. You have to be able to talk to people. And if they won't talk to you, you have to take action, as is contemplated by the Constitution as a co-equal branch in the government. We have done that. And I'm sorry that it offends some of our colleagues.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. HOLT. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, when Americans think of America, they think of our great resources. Now for Big Oil, that probably means the oil that's found on public lands and off our shores, where they can get it for a song and charge a fortune.

But for most Americans, it's the spacious skies and purple mountain majesties. This bill, this legislation that we're considering here now has no appreciation for America's priceless resources. According to the League of Conservation Voters, though, going farther than just beautiful vistas or purple mountain majesties, “This bill is the biggest assault on the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the wildlife and wild places we hold dear to ever come before Congress.” Continuing, the Clean Water Network or

the American Lung Association or the American Public Health Association or Physicians for Social Responsibility, they all go on to point out that the budget cuts or policy riders in this legislation undermine the laws that protect public health and reduce health care costs for all by preventing adverse health outcomes, including cancer, asthma attacks, strokes, and emergency department visits. It is not just for the beauty of this country, although that might be reason enough to try to preserve all of these things; it is for the health of America's people.

This legislation would put children's health at risk at the same time that it would be exempting oil companies from complying with clean air standards. We cannot tolerate this. Unregulated discharge of pesticides into our waterways, withholding funding for wild lands, allowing uranium mining all around the Grand Canyon. Mr. Chairman, this is an unprecedented attack, and not just on those things I've mentioned, not just on lifesaving public health protections and essential pollution control; it's an attack on science as well.

This bill includes reductions in funding for the U.S. Geological Survey, research in climate and land use, scientific research, monitoring, modeling, forecasting. Let me give an example: The LandSat 7 satellite just in the past month has been used to track the largest fire in Arizona's history. Yet because of the cuts that would come to pass through this legislation, the data coming from the LandSat system would go unrecorded, unanalyzed, unused. Talk about false economy.

And it's an unprecedented attack on our public lands. The largest cut in the Land and Water Conservation Fund that most of the Members of this House have seen in their service. And I must say, that's particularly important to a State like mine, New Jersey. My constituents reside in the most densely populated State in the Union, and yet they've demonstrated again and again with their votes their support for open space preservation, for fighting sprawl, for providing their kids, our kids, with safe places to experience the outdoors.

□ 1640

Mr. Chairman, there is a long list of reasons, and you'll be hearing still more about why this is terrible legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. TSONGAS. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the underlying bill, H.R. 2584, and am disappointed that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are using this appropriations process to put at risk the air that we breathe, the water that we drink, our public lands, and our public health.

For example, this bill would dismantle the Clean Water Act, which

would not only undermine our constituents' access to clean and healthy waterways but also would mean the loss of tens of thousands of jobs.

My district, the Fifth District of Massachusetts, is home to dozens of remarkable rivers and streams which are a key part of the history, culture, economy, and natural beauty of the Fifth District. Most of our rivers have excellent water quality; and it is common on warm days to see people swimming, fishing, and paddling. But our rivers were not always so hospitable. There was a time when the Merrimack River, one of the largest watersheds in New England and the river that flows through my hometown of Lowell, was a depository for waste and pollution. For 150 years, the Merrimack River was one of the 10 most polluted rivers in the country. It was the Clean Water Act enforcement of the early 1970s that changed the future of our rivers. Because of the act, and the enforcement authority it afforded the EPA, a clean-up plan was put in place and polluters and violators were held responsible. Slowly, the Merrimack and surrounding rivers were monitored and improved to meet the clean water standards we take for granted today. This is just one unfortunate example, but replicated all across our country, to our great good fortune and that of our children and grandchildren.

While some States may adequately protect their waters on their own, not all do. That is why Congress has given the EPA the authority to protect our waterways under the Clean Water Act. We must continue to strengthen safeguards for rivers and streams to ensure that all across the country Americans enjoy the benefit of clean, safe water.

I urge my colleagues to reject the shortsighted proposal to undercut the Clean Water Act and help protect America's clean water legacy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to a reckless and unconscionable Interior appropriations bill put forward by the House Republican majority. Once again, they have put a radical, out-of-touch agenda and the desires of Big Oil and big polluters before the interests of the American people, the need to create jobs, and the health of our environment. This appropriations bill is more than just a danger to the health and safety of American families. It represents the worst assault on clean air and clean water in our Nation's history.

This legislation slashes funding for the Environmental Protection Agency by 18 percent. The majority has shown time and time again that it opposes any environmental regulation that might hurt the bottom line of polluters. But it doesn't stop there.

This legislation also slashes the Clean Water State Revolving Fund,

which helps States finance wastewater system improvements by providing 55 percent of the resources, meaning that America's waterways will be put at risk of sewage and urban runoff pollution, and good middle class jobs will be lost. And it cuts the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which protects national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges from development, by 78 percent. In addition, this partisan legislation includes at least 38 policy riders that, for purely ideological reasons, would harm American families and the environment.

The bill would prohibit the EPA from implementing rules to protect communities from power plant pollution. It blocks the EPA from restoring Clean Water Act protections to more than half of our Nation's streams and 20 million acres of wetlands, meaning the drinking water of 117 million Americans is put at risk. It blocks the EPA from moving forward on fuel efficiency standards that will reduce foreign oil imports and cut pollution. It blocks the EPA from regulating carbon pollution at power plants, refineries, and industrial sites. It even stops indefinitely long overdue standards to control air pollution from toxic mercury, endangering pregnant women, infants and children.

This legislation would open up more of our coastline to offshore drilling and 1 million acres of land around the Grand Canyon, a national treasure, to toxic uranium mining.

Mr. Chairman, there was a time when the Republican Party was known as defenders of the environment. It was a Republican President, Teddy Roosevelt, who inaugurated the National Forest Service and who worked to conserve 230 million acres of American land, including the Grand Canyon, which is now put at risk. He called the canyon, and I quote, a natural wonder, which is in kind absolutely unparalleled throughout the rest of the world. "Leave it as it is," he said. "You cannot improve on it. The ages have been at work on it, and man can only mar it."

It was a Republican President, Richard Nixon, who signed significant expansions of the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts and who brought life to the Environmental Protection Agency. Twenty years later, another Republican President, George Bush, Sr., expanded the Clean Air Act even further to protect Americans' health.

Yet today, a Republican majority brings us an Interior appropriations bill which undoes all of this good work, which endangers American families and threatens to do permanent and irrevocable damage to the environment.

I urge my colleagues in the majority, return to your roots to once again put the American people before the interests of polluters, and to oppose this disastrous legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the underlying bill. Instead of working on a bipartisan solution to address the looming default crisis or to create American jobs, today House Republicans have brought to the floor H.R. 2584, unprecedented legislation that would gut pollution controls and public health protections in order to give bigger profits to Big Oil and other special interest polluters.

By attaching more than three dozen policy riders to this bill, the House GOP is attempting to use a spending bill to make backdoor changes to 40 years of Federal laws that protect clean air, water, lands, and wildlife. The legislation would also cripple the budgets of key Federal agencies charged with protecting American citizens and our natural resources.

This is a new low for the 112th Congress, which has already seen the new House GOP majority attempt to gut the Clean Air Act, overturn the Clean Water Act, repeal cost-saving energy efficiency standards, and pull the plug on American jobs in clean energy innovation and manufacturing. This legislation would overturn 40 years of bipartisan progress protecting the American people and the environment.

One area I choose to focus on is the continued attacks on the Clean Air Act, which has saved hundreds of thousands of lives and improved the health of Americans in every State. It protects the air we breathe and the water we drink. It protects our children from developing asthma and our seniors from developing emphysema. According to the American Lung Association, in 2010 alone, the Clean Air Act saved over 160,000 lives. Since 1990, the EPA estimates the Clean Air Act prevented an estimated 843,000 asthma attacks, 18 million cases of respiratory illness among children, 672,000 cases of chronic bronchitis, 21,000 cases of heart disease, and 200,000 premature deaths.

It is clear that the Republican majority is doing all it can to stop EPA from carrying out its mission of protecting public health and protecting the environment. Many will claim that the EPA is moving at a faster pace than any other administration in history. However, the EPA has proposed fewer Clean Air Act rules under President Obama over the past 24 months than in the first 2 years of either President Bush or President Clinton.

That is why in December of 2010, 280 groups, including the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association and others sent a letter urging the Congress to "reject any measure that would block or delay the United States Environmental Protection Agency from doing its job to protect all Americans from life-threatening air pollution."

□ 1650

This bill, an appropriation bill, is not the place to legislate these types of changes. These should be policy changes, not made during this process.

The Clean Air Act is promoting innovation and breaking Americans' oil dependence, but Republicans would give big polluters a loophole to roll back our clean energy progress and continue our addiction to foreign oil. The Clean Air Act is good for the economy. Many studies have shown that the Clean Air Act's economic benefits far exceed any costs associated with the law by as much as 40-1 ratio.

As President Obama so eloquently spoke of during his State of the Union address, we must out-innovate, out-educate, and out-build our global competitors and win the future. Rolling back a law that protects the air our children breathe to allow oil companies, companies that are already reaping record profits the ability to spew chemicals, smog, soot and pollution into the air just to please a lobbyist or a big oil corporation is irresponsible and, yes, extreme.

The Clean Air Act has been on the books for decades with positive results for our economy, our environment, and our businesses. Rolling back these protections will hurt our most vulnerable. We simply cannot afford to go backward.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. CICILLINE. I move to strike the last word, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, the Interior and Environment appropriations bill before us today represents an all-out assault on clean air, clean water, and land conservation efforts in our country. To be clear, passage of this measure is an absolute abandonment of this body's responsibility to provide for the general welfare of the United States.

This bill seriously undermines the significant advances that we've made as a country as responsible stewards of our land and natural resources, our wildlife, our air, and our water. And perhaps most important, this legislation is a threat to the health and well-being of all Americans.

Some have argued that the riders attached to this bill are sensible and an attempt to rein in what they call the excesses of the Environmental Protection Agency and job-killing regulations. This is an absurd claim. This legislation is nothing more than a complete caving in to special interests and Big Oil and some of our Nation's worst polluters.

For the people I represent in the First Congressional District of Rhode Island, the stunning reductions to the EPA and the related policy riders that strike against the gains we've made to clean air and clean water are a threat to public health and the environment.

Let me give you one example, Mr. Chairman: According to reports from

Rhode Island Clean Water Action, Rhode Island has the third highest rate of childhood asthma in the Northeast and the fifth highest nationally. The State spends \$316 million providing health care for problems attributed to particulate matter every year.

What's more, 27,000 Rhode Island children currently suffer from asthma. The average length of a hospitalization stay for children with asthma in Rhode Island is 2 days, with an average cost of \$7,840.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle need to realize that the drastic reductions and the anti-environment riders in this bill threaten not only our air and water quality, but they will have real and economic consequences on real people, on real families, increasing health care costs, generating additional lost days of work and productivity, and inciting detrimental long-term health and developmental consequences for our children.

In addition, this bill slashes vital infrastructure funding that's not only essential to protecting our environment and public health, but also creates jobs and supports State and local economic development opportunities.

This bill sets the Clean Water State Revolving Fund at 55 percent, or \$833 million below the FY 2011 level. The bill sets the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund 14 percent below the fiscal year 2011 level, and that's a cut of \$134 million.

I'd like to read an excerpt from the 2010 annual report of the Rhode Island Clean Water Finance Agency, the entity charged with administering Federal and State programs relating to municipal wastewater and drinking water financial assistance: "A revolving fund allows the perpetual availability of funds to assist local governmental units in meeting water quality goals by providing loans and other forms of financial assistance. Our primary goals are to provide low-cost means to reduce pollution caused by wastewater, help provide safe drinking water, and to provide low interest loans to cities and towns to help citizens repair failed, failing or substandard septic systems."

Undeniably, at this moment we're working to rein in our public debt, we have to be smart about the investments we make. Just consider the mission of this State agency whose efforts are supported through the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds to provide low-cost means to reduce pollution caused by wastewater and to provide safe drinking water. These are fundamental objectives to safeguard the health and well-being of Rhode Islanders and of men, women and children all across this country.

And what's the response by our friends on the other side of the aisle in this Congress? To cut these vitally important infrastructure programs by more than \$1 billion. If this Congress wants to be serious about reigning in spending, we can no longer try to fool ourselves with the misguided belief

that critical infrastructure projects, especially those supported through State revolving funds that protect our health and environment, are going to miraculously become less expensive with time.

Reducing Federal funds that help support these kinds of projects to improve our water and wastewater systems will only incite deferred maintenance. Deferred maintenance only makes future projects more expensive and, in many instances, will increase the likelihood of infrastructure failures that threaten public health and the environment and impede economic growth. These will undoubtedly cost us more in the long run.

Some have called this bill the worst assault on clean air and clean water in history. I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this assault on the health, welfare, and economic vitality of our States, our cities, and our towns. Let us not be known as the Congress who betrayed our solemn responsibility to be good stewards of the earth.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Having set sail in search of new shores for pirating and profiteering, it's quite apparent that the GOP is lost at sea under the helm of a confused, misguided leadership. Under the guise of austerity and deficit reduction, they have plotted our Nation on a fateful course that will only result in the surging of torrents of sewage, untreated chemicals and other hazardous materials into our rivers, streams and creeks, along with factories, plants and refineries belching smoke, smog and mercury into our blue skies. Sick children and the aged who suffer from asthma, respiratory illnesses, they'll get sicker and sicker, while oil and gas companies and mining companies get fatter and fatter.

Mr. Chair, as I see it, this bill is nothing more than an attempt to remove 40 years of Federal laws that protect our air, water, land, and wildlife. Only in a Republican-controlled House would we increase access to oil and gas leases, while reducing our ability to ensure drilling operations are environmentally safe.

Only in a Republican-controlled House would we reduce the ability of States to safely manage their sewage and wastewater run off.

And, Mr. Chair, only in a Republican-controlled Congress would we allow more uranium mining near the Grand Canyon.

Mr. Chair, these efforts are opposed by the majority of Americans who believe in oversight of drilling operations, protection from tainted drinking water, and those who believe that the Grand Canyon, with all of its majestic beauty, should be a natural national treasure for the enjoyment of

families and tourists, not a wasteland laid bare by mining companies whose insatiable appetite for profit is equaled only by the magnitude of the damage they would inflict upon our environment.

□ 1700

These aren't the rants and raves of liberal environmentalists hell-bent on protecting nature at all costs. These are the sentiments of red-blooded Americans who believe that our natural resources, like the Grand Canyon, improve our quality of life.

The American people don't want progress if progress means that our skies get darker, our water gets murkier, and they don't want our wildlife to go extinct, but clearly that will be the effect of this bill should this ill-gotten measure pass.

Mr. Chairman, day after day, week after week, and month after month House Republicans hand out life preservers to special interests while kicking the American people overboard like the bundled tea kicked overboard by the real tea partiers at the start of the American Revolution. Sure our children have asthma, but big business gets to pump more pollution into our air. Sure our water is tainted, but special interests get to dump runoff in our streams. Yes, our endangered species are slowly fading away, but now we can drill in their habitats. What happens, Mr. Chairman, when our air becomes too dirty to breathe, when our water becomes too dirty to drink, and when our wildlife all go extinct?

I urge a "no" vote on this bill. But before I close, I would like to remind my colleagues across the aisle that the captain always goes down with the ship. And that's the real deal.

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

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Colleagues, Mr. Chairman, if I might, I just wanted to start by acknowledging the loss of our valiant Capitol Police, Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson, who were honored today. I just wanted to acknowledge the men and women of the United States Capitol Police for their service, and my sympathy again to the families of Officer Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson.

I also wanted to make note of my worshipping with the Norwegian Seamen's Church yesterday in Houston and let the Norwegian people and the people of Norway, of course, know that America stands with them during this very difficult time.

I thought it was appropriate to acknowledge those tragedies because it is a time when we have had to come together. And I also believe that as we look at where we are today, this should be an opportunity for us to be able to

come together. So I'm disappointed in this legislation because it really does not seem to call us to do that.

I want to remind America and my colleagues that we are 50 States, but there are times when we act on behalf of our States and districts and there are times when it is important to exist as a single nation.

One single State did not defend the Nation after the attacks on Pearl Harbor; we came together. One State on its own or one region did not end segregation and establish civil rights; we did it together.

There are times when the stakes are so high that we simply must unite. And so I raise the question of: Where are we with this bill that seems to attack both clean air and clean water by repealing requirements that prevent pesticides sprayed from chemical companies from entering rivers and streams?

I come from the energy sector, and I believe that the energy sector creates jobs. I also believe that we can be a good neighbor, strong in our domestic development and production, but also concerned about clean air, clean water and the environment.

When you listen to those who have worked in this area for so long, you hear opposition from the Wilderness Society that says this Interior bill is an extreme assault on America's bedrock—environmental protection; the Clean Water Network that says these severe spending and budgetary cuts in this bill include not only cuts but a series of policy riders, really having no place in the appropriations process; and the American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association, Physicians for Social Responsibility, these budget cuts and/or policy riders would impact EPA's ability to do their job.

I don't know if our Members realize that in 2011 we cut 16 percent from the EPA; now we want to cut 18 percent, over \$1.5 billion. That cripples the very agency that protects our water and our air, protects our children and our elderly.

What is the response to our responsibility to be the custodians of this wonderful Nation? What a beautiful country we have. And then to hear that another one-third is being cut from the National Landscape and Conservation System that does monuments and trails and our wild rivers. How many families pack up in times that are hard and take those family members on a road trip to travel the beauty of this Nation—the tall mountains, the deep valleys, and the wonderful rivers?

Well, let me tell you what this legislation will do. It will be a bill with a litany of additional cuts, important for programs that cut climate change prevention programs, the Fish and Wildlife, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It is a program that, in essence, assaults what we're trying to do here in America.

How many friends know that we have been able to prevent 230,000 deaths each

year by regulating toxins in the air? We've already heard my colleagues come to the floor of the House and talk about the rising increase in many cities of asthma.

So let me make it very clear: We want to create jobs. I have joined together where we can deregulate and disentangle the regulations that would keep us from creating jobs. But I also believe that when it comes to protecting the Nation's assets, we join together as Republicans and Democrats.

I remind you that none of this creates jobs. I remind you that we have already engaged in these cuts. Isn't it interesting that in regular order we are now doing, even though there is disagreement, what our friends on the other side of the aisle said they can't do? That's why they're not raising the debt ceiling. But I will tell you that these draconian cuts, along with the draconian debate on the debt ceiling, is what is going to undermine America.

Let's stand as Americans unified to fix this crisis.

First, I would like to thank my friends in the Congressional Progressive Caucus who are here today to stand up for the environment, and the health of our constituents. I am saddened that so many of my Republican friends are willing to sacrifice the quality of the very air we breathe, and water that we drink.

This harmful legislation cuts the budget of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) by 18 percent, in addition to a 16 percent cut in funding for FY 2011. This is unacceptable; in order to protect the environment without harming industry, we must reach a compromise instead of haphazardly slashing the EPA budget.

The cuts to the EPA budget included in the bill reduce funding for the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, grants for state implementation of environmental programs, and restorative funding for the Great Lakes, Chesapeake Bay and Puget Sound.

The Administration estimates that cuts to the Clean Water State Revolving Fund will cut off funding for nearly 400 wastewater and drinking water infrastructure projects, resulting in thousands of lost jobs.

These cuts purposefully limit the EPA's ability to ensure that all Americans have access to drinking water that does not contain harmful pathogens and toxins that expose Americans to serious risks, such as typhoid, hepatitis, cancer, and organ damage.

This legislation has attached several riders to further undermine the Clean Water Act, by repealing requirements that prevent pesticides sprayed by chemical companies from entering rivers and streams, and stopping the EPA from treating coal ash as hazardous waste.

The assault on public health does not stop with the quality of our drinking water; this bill also takes drastic steps to weaken the Clean Air Act. A rider is attached that will prevent the EPA from implementing the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule, a regulation that was implemented to protect the public from dangerous air pollution and prevent up to 34,000 premature deaths, 15,000 heart attacks, and 400,000 cases of aggravated asthmas.

As a Representative of the 18th District of Houston, I am firmly committed to protecting the air we breathe, the water we drink, and

the land we need for our survival. Since 1999, Houston has exchanged titles with Los Angeles for the poorest air quality in the nation. The poor air quality is attributed to the amount of aerosols, particles of carbon and sulfates in the air. The carcinogens found in the air have been known to cause cancer, particularly in children. The EPA is the very agency charged with issuing regulations that would address this serious problem. Those regulations should be of course fair while doing the job they are intended to do.

But, my friends, the disregard this bill shows for the health of the American people does not stop there. Another rider prohibits the EPA from finalizing regulations to reduce mercury emissions from factories. There is no reason why Energy, jobs creation and the environment cannot work harmoniously.

Not only does this legislation irresponsibly eradicate life saving provisions of the Clean Air and Water Acts, it also cuts the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) budget by 78 percent. The LWCF funds many park and outdoor recreation areas that contribute over \$700 billion to the economy and facilitate 6.5 million jobs.

This bill makes a litany of additional cuts to important programs that cut climate change prevention programs, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It is full of perks for special interest, and reduces our ability to facilitate the upkeep of National Parks, protect the Grand Canyon, and add species to the endangered species list.

I am outraged that my friends on the other side of the aisle would consider passing this legislation that compromises our access to healthy air and clean water; that reverses EPA regulations that were implemented to save lives. Public lands, national parks, the air, the water, the wildlife in this nation belongs to everyone, and I cannot support a bill that trades the quality of these precious resources for benefits to big business and special interest groups.

There are times in which we are 50 states, and times when we exist as a single, united, nation. One single state did not defend the nation after the attacks on Pearl Harbor. One state, on its own, did not end segregation and establish Civil Rights. There are times when the stakes are too high, when we must unite as states and act as one.

Our Nation's parks are maintained by the National Park Service. The Park Service is responsible for preserving, restoring, and maintaining our Nation's monuments for the enjoyment of all Americans.

Recently, the Martin Luther King, Jr., National Memorial has joined other historic sites on our Nation's Mall. Martin Luther King, Jr., gave his life in the pursuit of a dream. His "I Have a Dream" speech has been read and heard by millions of men, women, and children around the world.

The Martin Luther King, Jr. National Memorial is one of many cherished sites honoring men and women who have advanced the society we know today; historic sites that include Freedman town and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. When the Republicans cut the National Park Service, they cut our ability to maintain and preserve our Nation's monuments.

The Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic site is operated by the National Park Service (under U.S. Department of the Interior). This

legislation contains \$2.5 billion for the NPS, which is \$132 million below last year's level. Operation of the National Park System is funded at \$2.2 billion, which is \$10 million below FY 2011 enacted levels. This funding will allow all National Parks to remain open and NPS activities to continue through next year without furloughs or reductions in full time or seasonal employees. These cuts result in the loss of jobs and the loss of our Nation's cherished and prized history.

The EPA has a broad responsibility, for research, standard-setting, monitoring and enforcement with regard to five environmental hazards: air pollution, water pollution, solid waste disposal, radiation, and pesticides. The EPA represents a coordinated approach to each of these problems. There has been a systematic effort to tie the hands of the EPA's ability to protect our environment and thereby protect the long term health of our Nation. Cuts to the EPA are just another means to bring down the agency. The EPA can keep our environment safe without hindering job creations. There are many critics out there who despise the EPA because they say that it is a burden to economic growth. I say that this is nonsense, for healthy populations are the foundation for prosperity.

Let us not forget what happened in Woburn, Massachusetts in the 1980s, where numerous families were afflicted with cancer as a result of toxins being placed in the water. It was the work of brilliant lawyers in conjunction with the EPA who proved that the chemical entities involved deliberately placed toxins in the water.

Let us also not forget The Love Canal of the 1970s near Niagara Falls either. In this region, scores of women had miscarriages and many more were contaminated from chemical wastes in the water. Are supporters of this bill encouraging our country to go back to a time when these problems were common?

Because the issues associated with Woburn and the Love Canal are well in the past, supporters of cuts to the EPA must feel that the water people drink is perfectly safe to drink and does not need to be regulated. Just last year in the small town of Crestwood, outside of Chicago, it was discovered that town officials were secretly introducing tainted well water into the town water supply for years. The people were told that the water came from Lake Michigan. When the story broke, the Department of Public Health conducted a survey of disease rates and found that men in the town had high rates of kidney and gastrointestinal cancer. I, for one, will not tolerate this and I know the American people will not tolerate this as well. The American people will not tolerate the fear of turning on their faucets and wondering whether or not the water coming out has lead, plutonium, or wastes from chemical entities.

Protecting the quality of our air and water, protecting the health of each and every one of our constituents, is an example of a time when Congress must consider the implications beyond our districts and our states.

Surely preventing 230,000 deaths each year by regulating toxins in the air, and ensuring that millions will not lose their access to healthy drinking water is not controversial. I urge my colleagues to consider the constituents they represent, and take essential steps to protect the environment. Until that time, I cannot, and will not, support this damaging legislation.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak in strong opposition to this reckless bill and the abundance of extraneous and irresponsible provisions that it contains.

Right now we are down to the wire on defaulting on our debt. But instead of focusing on a way forward, the majority is offering up this ill-conceived piece of legislation, a bill that is polluted—and I emphasize "polluted"—with unrelated and inappropriate riders that do not belong in a spending bill. The reality is that these riders will have very little impact on our national deficit, but they will have a huge and lasting effect on our health, our environment, and our natural resources.

So why are these programs being targeted? Well, we've seen this before with H.R. 1 earlier this year, and we're seeing it again now. The majority is choosing to reward Big Oil and polluters at the expense of the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the wildlife and wild places we hold dear.

Mr. Chairman, it's not an exaggeration to say that this bill drastically undermines our government's ability to protect our environment. This bill jeopardizes the conservation and protection of places like the Channel Islands National Park in my congressional district and the wildlife this special place harbors; closing a quarter of national wildlife refuges across the country, affecting places like the Gueloupe Dunes near Santa Maria; slashing support for Federal programs that support our outstanding natural areas, like the Piedras Blancas Light Station or the Carrizo Plain National Monument in California; opening up protected and sensitive areas in California's national forest to off-road vehicle use, putting places like Los Padres National Forest at risk; and blocking the protection of wilderness-quality lands.

And as the bill stands, Mr. Chairman, it would bar new listings of threatened and endangered species as well as critical habitat designations. And it would gut the successful Land and Water Conservation Fund, which is our Nation's principal source of Federal funding to preserve irreplaceable lands and waters.

Under this disaster of a bill, the LWCF would be reduced to the lowest level in its 45-year history, an 80 percent cut compared to last year's funding.

□ 1710

And who will benefit from this cut? Not the American taxpayer because this fund is paid for from offshore drilling revenues. Instead, communities will lose important conservation and recreation projects that create jobs and improve the quality of life for working and middle class Americans.

But this assault isn't limited to our lands and wildlife. This dirty legislation is also littered with riders that seek to gut the protections of the Clean Water and Clean Air Acts, such as preventing the EPA from strengthening limitations on polluted storm water runoff, blocking the EPA's oversight on water used by power plants, and impeding the clarification of which streams and wetlands are protected under the act.

Under the House spending plan, the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds will also see significant cuts. These are the funds established for States to complete water infrastructure projects, projects which create jobs and provide clean, safe drinking water. The riders in this bill, Mr. Chairman, are also an assault on the very air we breathe. They would prevent the EPA from limiting carbon pollution from power plants and other stationary sources, from updating limits on smog and mercury emissions.

One rider would block the EPA from setting new mileage standards for cars, and won't even allow the State of California to set its own standards. Surely we can think of better solutions to solve our fiscal problems rather than attacking our air, our water, and our lands. Sadly, this Interior appropriations bill deeply undermines our important role of passing on an America whose land, water, and air are clean, healthy, productive, beautiful, and accessible for all to enjoy.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this terrible, terrible bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, as one of the former cochairs and leaders of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, the largest, bipartisan, bicameral caucus in this Congress, I reluctantly rise in strong opposition to this Interior appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill falls short on so many different levels—especially our responsibility to future generations to be good stewards of the public lands, the vital natural resources, and the wildlife that we have within our borders.

But don't take my word for it, Mr. Chairman. We have had a tradition in this place for many years of having strong, bipartisan support for reasonable, sensible, land and water conservation programs. That's why earlier this month, a coalition of over 640 outdoor recreation entities sent a letter to each of our offices, including the Congressional leadership, expressing their deep concern and dismay over the funding cuts proposed in this appropriation bill.

This letter was signed by entities such as the Boone and Crockett Club, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, Ducks Unlimited, National Fish

and Wildlife Foundation, National Wild Turkey Foundation, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, and Trout Unlimited, and it was also signed by the president of The Wilderness Society, Bill Meadows, and a board member of the Civil War Trust, John Nau. I would like to read that letter at this time.

"We are a broad coalition of organizations representing millions of members with very diverse political backgrounds and areas of interest united behind a shared belief that natural resource conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation, and investments in them, are vital to the future of our great Nation.

"Like you, we are concerned about our Nation's fiscal health. The Nation faces unsustainable future fiscal deficits, which must be addressed. As part of the overall solution to our deficit challenges, we know that conservation, recreation, and historic preservation programs will not and should not be exempted from scrutiny. We are willing to engage in a process to find further savings in spending and review the economic and budgetary benefits of critical conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation programs.

"The Federal budget cannot and should not be balanced disproportionately on the backs of conservation, outdoor recreation, and preservation. Doing so will impose on the future generations whose well-being depends on the conservation and preservation of our common natural and historic resources.

"As a diverse community of taxpayers and voters who care about natural resource conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation, we stand ready to work with you on serious efforts to address our Nation's economic and fiscal challenges, as they relate to investments in, and tough choices about, the programs we care about. We urge this Congress to address the Federal deficit while still investing in critical conservation, recreation, and historic preservation programs in 2012."

Mr. Chairman, these groups realize, as many of us realize too, this is more than just being good stewards of the land and doing right by future generations. Investment in these vital programs is crucial for economic development and job creation in this country. The Outdoor Industry Foundation has issued a survey from year to year showing the economic impact of many of these conservation programs on outdoor recreation activities. They found that outdoor recreation contributes \$730 billion annually to the U.S. economy, supports 6½ million private sector jobs, one out of every 20 jobs, and stimulates 8 percent of consumer spending.

In Wisconsin, my home State, hunting and fishing alone supports 57,000 jobs, and \$400 million in State revenue. Sportsmen spend \$3.1 billion annually, which helps stimulate the Wisconsin economy and other States.

Mr. Chairman, the irony in all this is that these organizations and these programs have been giving at the idol of deficit reduction for some time. In fact, over the last 30 years, American investment in parks, wildlife, clean water, and clean air has fallen from 1.7 percent of overall Federal budget to less than 0.6 percent. So throughout the years, there has been a continual reduction in funding for these programs. The irony is that for many of these programs, for every public dollar used, it is leveraged to draw in more private sector dollars. This too will be in great jeopardy with the dismantling of these programs. These aren't programs you can just turn on and off with a spigot. You need a continuity of care to keep them going. With funding reductions of this magnitude, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to maintain that continuity of care. Whether it is to clean water, clean air, to wildlife preservation and enhancement, all of these programs are under a direct assault with this Interior appropriations bill.

With the Land and Water Conservation Fund, an 80 percent proposed cut, the irony with this program is that it is funded by oil royalties. It has been a grand bargain that has been used in the past to allow development of oil on public lands.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this appropriations bill. We can do better than this. We have to do better.

JULY 6, 2011.

Hon. HARRY M. REID,
U.S. Senate,

Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
House of Representatives,

Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID AND SPEAKER BOEHNER: We are a broad coalition of organizations representing millions of members with very diverse political backgrounds and areas of interest united behind a shared belief that natural resource conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation, and investments in them, are vital to the future of our great nation.

Like you, we are concerned about our nation's fiscal health. The nation faces unsustainable future fiscal deficits, which must be addressed. As part of the overall solution to our deficit challenges, we know that conservation, recreation, and historic preservation programs will not and should not be exempt from scrutiny. We are willing to engage in a process to find further savings in spending, and review the economic and budgetary benefits of critical conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation programs.

The Federal budget cannot and should not be balanced disproportionately on the backs of conservation, outdoor recreation and preservation. Doing so will impose on the future generations whose well-being depends on the conservation and preservation of our common natural and historic resources.

As a diverse community of taxpayers and voters who care about natural resource conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation, we stand ready to work with you on serious efforts to address our nation's economic and fiscal challenges, as they relate to investments in, and tough choices about, the programs we care about. We urge

this Congress to address the federal deficit while still investing in critical conservation, recreation and historic preservation programs in 2012.

Please see attached for list of signers as of 7/6/11.

Thank you.

BILL MEADOWS,
President, The Wilderness Society.

JOHN NAU,
Board Member, Civil War Trust.

We are a broad partnership of nonprofits, organizations and businesses that represent tens of millions of American citizens who believe we must elevate the importance of natural resource conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation programs.

LIST OF SIGNATORIES

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Access Fund, Alliance of National Heritage Areas, American Alpine Club, American Association for State and Local History, American Bird Conservancy, American Canoe Association, American Cultural Resources Association, American Farmland Trust, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), American Fisheries Society, American Fly Fishing Trade Association, American Forest Foundation, American Hiking Society, American Land Conservancy, American Mountain Guides Association, American Recreation Coalition, American Rivers, American Trails, American Whitewater, Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies, Bird Conservation Network, Blue Goose Alliance, Boone and Crockett Club, Catch-A-Dream Foundation, Choose Outdoors, City Parks Alliance, Civil War Trust, Congressional Sportsmens Foundation, Conservation Force, Dallas Safari Club, Defenders of Wildlife, Delta Waterfowl Foundation, Ducks Unlimited, Endangered Species Coalition.

Great Old Broads for Wilderness, HistoriCorps, International Mountain Bicycling Association, Izaak Walton League of America, Land Trust Alliance, Marine Fish Conservation Network, National Alliance of Forest Owners, National Association of Forest Service Retirees, National Association of State Park Directors, National Audubon Society, National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, National Marine Sanctuary Foundation, National Park Trust, National Parks Conservation Association, National Preservation Institute, National Shooting Sports Foundation, National Wild Turkey Federation, National Wildlife Federation, National Wildlife Refuge Association, Northern Forest Canoe Trail, Openlands, Organic Farming Research Foundation, Orion—The Hunters' Institute, Outdoor Alliance, Outdoor Industry Association, Outdoors America, Outward Bound U.S.A., Partnership for the National Trails System, Pheasants Forever, Portland Trails, Preservation Action, Public Lands Foundation, Quality Deer Management Association, Restore America's Estuaries, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation.

Saving Birds Thru Habitat, Sierra Club, Society for American Archaeology, The Center for Desert Archaeology, The Center for Large Landscape Conservation, The Coastal States Organization, The Colorado Mountain Club, The Conservation Fund, The Forest Land Group, The Hawk Migration Association of North America, The Land Connection, The Lands Council, The National Trust for Historic Preservation, The Nature Conservancy, The Trumpeter Swan Society, The Trust for Public Land, The Wilderness Society, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Part-

nership, Tread Lightly!, Trout Unlimited, Western Rivers Conservancy, WildEarth Guardians, Wildlands CPR, Wildlife Forever, Wildlife Management Institute, Winter Wildlands Alliance.

STATE, LOCAL, AND REGIONAL NONPROFITS AND ORGANIZATIONS

Agricultural Stewardship Association, Alabama Historical Commission, Alabama Trust for Historic Preservation, Alaska Association for Historic Preservation, Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation, Alliance for Historic Wyoming, Alliance for New York State Parks, Alton Marketplace/Illinois Main Street, American Society of Landscape Architects, Amigos de la Sevilleta, Amigos de los Rios, Ammonoosuc Chapter of Trout Unlimited (New Hampshire), Angel Island Immigration Station Foundation, Appalachian Highlands Conservancy, Appalachian Mountain Club, Arabia Mountain National Heritage Area, Arkansas Historic Preservation Program, Arlington Heritage Alliance, Ascutey Mountain Audubon Society, Ashland Mainstreet, Inc., Audubon Outdoor Club, Audubon Society of Northern Virginia, Baltimore Department of Recreation and Parks, Baltimore National Heritage Area, Bear-Paw Regional Greenways, Bedminster Regional Land Conservancy, Berkley Conservation Institute, Bernheim Arboretum and Research Forest, Bird City Wisconsin, Blue Mountain Land Trust, Bosco-Milligan Foundation, Boston Harbor Island Alliance, Branford Land Trust, Breckenridge Outdoor Education Center, Bull Moose Sportsmen's Alliance, CA Japanese American Community Leadership Council, Cahaba Riverkeeper, California Capitol Historic Preservation Society, California Council of Land Trusts, California Heritage Council, California Preservation Foundation, California State Historic Preservation Office, Californians for Western Wilderness, Carolina Mountain Land Conservancy, Cascade Land Conservancy, Cashiers Historical Society, Catawba Riverkeeper Foundation, Inc., Center for Desert Archeology, Central Coast Land Conservancy, Central Virginia Battlefields Trust, Charles River Watershed Association, Chassahowitzka National Wildlife Refuge.

Complex, Inc., Cherokee County Historical Society, Cherokee Forest Voices, Chesapeake Conservancy, Chesapeake Wildlife Heritage, Chicago Wilderness, Chisago Lakes Main Street Initiative, Chisholm Trail Heritage Museum, Cienega Watershed Partnership, City of Madisonville, City of Minneapolis, Department of Community Planning and Economic Development, City of Shelby, Clinton Brown Company Architecture ReBuild, Coastal Conservation League, Colorado Mountain Club, Colorado Preservation, Inc., Columbus Landmarks Foundation, Community Open Land Trust, Connecticut Audubon Society, Connecticut Preservation Action, Connecticut State Historic Preservation Office, Conservation Council for Hawai'i, Conservation Federation of Missouri, Conservation Trust for North Carolina, Cooks Creek Watershed Association, Crossroads of the American Revolution, Crow Canyon Archaeological Center, D&R Canal Watch, DC Preservation League, Deer Creek Museum, Glenrock Historical Commission, Delaware and Raritan Canal Coalition, Delaware Highlands Conservancy, Delmarva Ornithological Society, Eau Claire Historic Preservation Foundation, Endangered Habitats League, Environmental League of Massachusetts, Finger Lakes Land Trust, Fire Island Land Trust, Florida Trail Association, Inc.

Florida Trust for Historic Preservation, Foothills Conservancy of North Carolina, Forest Trust, Foundation for Historical Louisiana, Four Corners School of Outdoor Edu-

cation, Frederick Historic Sites Consortium, Friends of Acadia, Friends of Back Bay, Friends of Blackwater, Friends of Camas National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Congaree Swamp, Friends of Dyke Marsh, Friends of Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Hagerman National Wildlife Refuge, Texas, Friends of Hakalau Forest, Friends of Heinz Refuge at Tinicum, Friends of Ironwood Forest, Friends of Las Vegas National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Louisiana Wildlife Refuges, Inc., Friends of Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Necedah National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Nevada Wilderness, Friends of Noxubee Refuge, Friends of Princeton Nursery Lands, Friends of Princeton Open Space, Friends of Rachel Carson National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Red Rock Canyon, Friends of Sherburne National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Shiawassee National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Sunhaze Meadows National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of the Arapaho Wildlife Refuge Complex, Friends of the Chassahowitzka National Wildlife Refuge Complex, Inc., Friends of the Florida Panther Refuge, Friends of the National Wildlife Refuges of Rhode Island, Friends of the Neches River, Friends of the Prairie Learning Center.

Friends of the Refuge Headwaters, Friends of the Sonoran Desert National Monument, Friends of the Southwest Louisiana Wildlife Refuges and Wetlands, Friends of the Tampa Bay National Wildlife Refuges, Friends of Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Walkkill River, Friends of Wertheim National Wildlife Refuge, Georgetown Trust for Conservation & Preservation, Georgia Forest Watch, Georgia Land Conservation Center, Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation, Glendale Heritage Preservation, Gold Coast & Hamburg Historic District Association, Grand Canyon Trust, Grand Canyon Wildlands Council, Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy, Great Egg Harbor Watershed Association, Greater Houston Preservation Alliance, Greater Lovell Land Trust, Greater Yellowstone Coalition, Greenbelt Land Trust, Guam Historic Resources Division, Harris Center for Conservation Education, Harrodsburg First, Hawk Mountain Sanctuary Association, Heart of the Civil War Heritage Area, Heart of the Lakes for Land Conservation Policy, Heritage Alliance of Northeast Tennessee & Southwest Virginia, Heritage Nebraska, Heritage Ohio, Historic Annapolis, Historic Boulder, Inc., Historic Charleston Foundation, Historic Chicago Bungalov Association, Historic Denver, Historic FL Keys Foundation.

Historic Fort Worth, Inc., Historic Hawaii Foundation, Historic Kansas City Foundation, Historic Madison, Inc., Historic Preservation Alliance of Arkansas, Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend & Joseph County, Historic Preservation League of Oregon, Historic Seattle, Historic Valley Junction Foundation, History Colorado, Hoosier Environmental Council, Housatonic Valley Association, Hudson Highlands Land Trust, Huyck Preserve and Biological Research Station, Ice Age Trail Alliance, Idaho Conservation League, Idaho Rivers United, Idaho State Historic Preservation Office, Idaho State Historical Society, Illinois Audubon Society, Illinois Environmental Council, Illinois Historic Preservation Agency, Indian River Lakes Conservancy, Iowa Wildlife Federation, Jackson County Tourism, Jay Heritage Center, Jefferson Land Trust, John G. Riley House Museum, Kentucky Woodland Owners, Keweenaw Land Trust, Kingston Greenways Association, Kingston Historical Society, Land Conservancy of Adams County, Land Trust for Santa Barbara County,

Land Trust for the Little Tennessee, Landmarks Illinois, Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation, Life of the Land, Little Beaver Creek Land Foundation, Los Alamos Historical Society, Main Street Corning.

Main Street Perryville, Maine Preservation, Malheur Wildlife Associates, Marine Conservation Institute, Maryland Commission on African American History and Culture, Maryland Historical Trust, Maryland Ornithological Society, Mendocino Land Trust, Messa Land Trust, Michigan Historic Preservation Network, Milford Preservation Trust, Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission, Minnesota Forestry Association, Mississippi Heritage Trust, Mississippi Land Trust, Mississippi River Trust, Mississippi SHPO, Missoula Parks and Recreation, Monadnock Conservancy, Montana Association of Land Trusts, Montana Audubon, Montana Preservation Alliance, Montana Wildlife Federation, Montpelier Mansion, Mount Grace Land Conservation Trust, MS Dept. of Marine Resources, Nantucket Historic District Commission, Napa County Landmarks, National Committee for the New River, National Outdoor Leadership School, Natural Resources Council of Maine, Natural Resources Initiative of Mississippi, Naturaland Trust, Nevada Conservation League & Education Fund, New Jersey Conservation Foundation, New Jersey Recreation and Park Association, New London Landmarks, New Mexico Archeological Council, New Mexico Heritage Preservation Alliance, New Mexico Wildlife Federation.

New River Land Trust, New York City Audubon, New York-New Jersey Trail Conference, NH Association of Conservation Commissions, North Carolina Coastal Land Trust, North Carolina Historic Preservation Office, North Country Trail Association, North County Conservancy, North Dakota Historical Society and State Historic Preservation Office, North Preston Properties, North Shore Land Alliance, Northeast Wilderness Trust, Northern Forest Canoe Trail, Northern Sierra Partnership, Northern Virginia Conservation Trust, Northwest Watershed Institute, Norwalk Preservation Trust, Oakland Heritage Alliance, Oblong Land Conservancy, Ohio Archeological Council, Ohio Forestry Association, Ohio Historic Preservation Office, Ohio Historical Society, Oklahoma Historical Society, Old Escondido Historic District, Open Space Institute, Oregon Natural Desert Association, Oregon Wild, Oregon-California Trails Association, Outside Las Vegas Foundation, Pacific Crest Trail Association, Pacific Rivers Council, Parker River Clean Water Association, Pasadena Heritage, Passaic River Coalition, Peconic Land Trust, Pleasant River Wildlife Foundation, Prairielands Preservation Foundation Board, Preservation Alliance of Philadelphia, Preservation Alliance of Minnesota, Preservation Alliance of West Virginia, Preservation America.

Preservation Buffalo Niagara, Preservation Commission, Rock Island, Illinois, Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach, Preservation Kentucky, Preservation Louisville, Preservation Pennsylvania, Preservation Resource Center, Preservation Texas, Inc., Preservation Trust of Vermont, Preservation Wayne, Preserve Calavera, Preserve Rhode Island, Providence Preservation Society, Public Land and Water Access Association, Putnam County Coalition to Preserve Open Space, Quindaro Ruins/Underground Railroad-Exercise 2011, Redlands Conservancy, Richland County Conservation Commission, Ridges to Rivers Open Space Network, Rio Grande Return, Riveredge Bird Club, Rock Island Arsenal Historical Society, Rock Island Preservation Society, Rowayton Arts Center, Sacred Sites International, Saginaw Basin Land Conservancy, Salem Audubon

Society, Saline Historic Downtown Alliance, San Juan Citizens Alliance, San Luis Valley Ecosystem Council, Santa Fe Conservation Trust, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation, Sayre Main Street, Inc., SC Coastal Conservation League, Scenic Hudson, Scenic Virginia, Scott County Historic Preservation Society, Sequoia Riverlands Trust, Serpentine Art & Nature Commons, Inc., SEWEE Association, Sheepscot Valley Conservation Association.

Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, Soda Mountain Wilderness Council, Solano Land Trust, Somers Land Trust, Sourland Planning Council, Southern Appalachian Highlands Conservancy, Spokane Preservation Advocates, St. Marks Refuge Association, Inc., Stanford White Casino Theatre corp., State Historic Preservation Office, Wisconsin Historical Society, State Historical Society of South Dakota, Swan Ecosystem Center, Tampa Bay National Wildlife Refuges, Taos Land Trust, Tapteal Greenway Association, Tennessee Clean Water Network, Tennessee Ornithological Society, Tennessee Parks and Greenways Foundation, Tennessee Riverkeeper, Texas Land Conservancy, The Arkansas Audubon Society, The Audubon Society of Greater Denver, The Cazenovia Preservation Foundation, The Clinch Coalition, The Connecticut Ornithological Association, The Conservancy of Montgomery County, The Cragmoor Conservancy, Inc., The Delaware River Greenway Partnership, The Foundation for Historical Louisiana, The Georgia Conservancy, The Grand Staircase Escalante Partners, The Great Swamp Conservancy, The Harris Center for Conservation Education, The Historical Society of Harford County, Inc., The Journey Through Hallowed Ground Partnership, The Lake County Forest Preserve District, The Land Conservancy for Southern Chester County, The Land Conservancy of New Jersey, The Maryland Historical Trust.

The Mississippi Department of Archives and History, The Oblong Land Conservancy, Inc., The Prairie State Conservation Coalition, The Preservation League of New York State, The Trustees of Reservations, The Villagers Inc., The Warwick Conservancy Inc., TN Environmental Council, Torne Valley Preservation Association, Tug Hill Tomorrow Land Trust, Tulsa Foundation for Architecture, Upper Midwest Archaeology, Utah Heritage Foundation, Valley Conservation Council, Vanceburg Renaissance on Main, Vermont Land Trust, Virgin Islands Historic Preservation Office, Virginia Forest Watch, Voyageurs National Park Association, Wallowa Land Trust, Inc., Washington Water Trails Association, Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition, Washington Wildlife Federation, Weeks Bay Foundation, Western North Carolina Alliance, Western Reserve Land Conservancy, Western Resource Advocates, WHALE—New Bedford, Wheeler Wildlife Refuge Association, Whidbey Camano Land Trust, Wildlife Mississippi, Williamsburg Main Street Program, Willistown Conservation Trust, Winyah Rivers Foundation, Woodstock Land Conservancy, WV Land Trust, Young Preservation Associates of Pittsburgh.

INDUSTRIES AND ASSOCIATIONS

1% for the Planet, Acorn Products, Advanced Flexible Materials, Inc. American Alpine Institute, American Outdoor Products, Inc., American Sportfishing Association, Angling Trade Magazine, B.A.S.S. LLC, Backpacker Magazine, Big Agnes, Bison Belts, Black Diamond, Blue Ridge Outdoors Magazine, BlueWater Ropes, Boa Technology Inc., Brandwise, Inc., Breathe Magazine, C4 Waterman, CamelBak, CarbonVerde, LLC, Cascade Designs, Inc., Casual Adventure, Chaco, Colorado Kayak Supply, Confluence Films,

Conservation Easement Consultants, Dale of Norway, Inc., Dansko, Inc., Deckers Outdoor Corporation, Deneki Outdoors, Deuter USA, Inc., DNF Media, Inc.—Outdoor USA Magazine, Eastern Mountain Sports, Ecosystem Management Consultants, Elevation Outdoors Magazine, Evergreen Mountain Bike Alliance, Far Bank Enterprises, Fly Fish 10k, Forest Capital Partners, G.Loomis, Inc., Gerber Legendary Blades, GoMotion Inc., Gramicci, Great Outdoor Store, Harboe Architects, PC, HCFR Outdoors, LLC.

Honey Stinger, Hornady Manufacturing, Horny Toad, Hurricane Kayaks, Immersion Research, Injinji, Karhu, KINeSYS Inc., Kokatat, Lafuma America Inc., Lawson Hammock, LEKI USA Inc., Leupold & Stevens, Liberty Mountain, Light and Motion, Loksak Inc., LOWA Boots LLC, Marmot Mountain, LLC, Merrell, Metolius Mountain Products Inc., Momentum Media PR, Morsel Munk, LLC, Mountain Gazette, Mountain Gear, Mountain Mama, Mountain Shades, Mountain Tools, Nantahala Outdoor Center, National Marine Manufacturers Association, Nau, Inc., NEMO Equipment, Inc., Nester Hosiery, New England Wood Pellet LLC, New Forests Inc., Noelani Hawaii SUP LLC, North Preston Properties, Oboz Footwear, One Source Apparel, Orvis, Osprey Packs, Outdoor Divas, Outdoor Industries and Associations Association.

Outside Adventure Film School, Pack Rat Outdoor Center, Paddlers Supply, Pennsylvania Fly Fishing Company, Petzl, Piragis Northwoods Company, Prana, Product Architects Inc., Pure Fishing, Red Wing Shoe Company, Reflex Sourcing Inc., REI, Remington Arms Company, Rock Creek Outfitters, Rose Creek Anglers, Inc., Sanitas Sales Group, Sasquatch, Saucony, Serac Adventure Films, Sierra Business Council, Skinny Skis, Small Planet, Smith Optics, SnowSports Industries America, Sport Chalet, Inc., Sporting Culture Advisors, Sportworks Northwest, Inc., Sullivan-Bishop Agency LLC, Suspenz Storage Racks, Terra Public Relations, Terra Strenua Outfitters, Terramar Sports Inc., The Fly Shop, Inc., The Forest Group, The Lyme Timber Company, The Mountaineers, The Painted Trout, The Seeley Lake Nordic Ski Club, The South Carolina Aquarium, The Trailhead, The Walton Works, LLC, Thompson Manufacturing, Inc., Tierra Environmental, Timbuk2, Twenty Two Designs, LLC, W & W associates, Inc., Waterwisp Flies, West Coast Corp., Wild River Outfitters, Inc., Yellow Dog Flyfishing Adventures.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, there is an unfortunate time-honored tradition in the House of people coming to the floor and objecting to reductions in spending with heartfelt arguments as to why the spending is necessary and never offering any suggestions about where the money might be made up instead. That, frankly, is one of the reasons we have the huge deficits and debts that we do. So I want to break with that tradition and talk to you about a spending reduction I have a great concern about and then talk about how we might make it up instead.

There is not a person in this House who has not been touched in some way by cancer in their family, in someone they love, some friend. I don't think there is anybody here who hasn't had the heartbreak of dealing with malignancy in their family. Let me say from the outset, Mr. Chairman, I don't think there is a Member of this House that doesn't want to do everything he or she could to deal with solving that problem. There is not a Member in this place, Republican or Democrat, who is indifferent to the problem of fighting cancer.

Now, cancer comes from a lot of things. It's genetic. It's hereditary. It comes from foods. But a lot of it comes from the environment. It comes from water. If the water we drink or we cook with or we bathe in is not clean, it can sometimes be the trigger that triggers the dreaded disease of cancer for someone we care about.

So a long time ago when this was discovered in the 1960s, there was a bipartisan agreement to try to do something to try to clean the water of this country and keep it clean. It was upheld by Presidents like Ronald Reagan and George Bush, Bill Clinton, Jimmy Carter, Barack Obama, many others, Democrats and Republicans in control of Congress.

That's why I have to look at the bill before us today and just be astonished by the fact that the Clean Water Fund is cut by 55 percent. Let me say that again. The fund that has been set up to protect the clean water of our country that is consumed by Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, cut by 55 percent. The amount of that cut is about \$833 million below the amount of money that we spent last year; about \$833 million.

□ 1720

Usually, people stop there. But I want to talk about where we should get the money instead.

Now, \$833 million is less than 3 days' worth of spending in Iraq and Afghanistan. How about that? We will spend more than \$833 million in the next 3 days in Kabul and Baghdad, in part to help build clean water systems there, in part to help create jobs there. I just think that's inexcusable that we find ourselves in a position where we're spending in 2 or 3 days in Iraq and Afghanistan what we could spend to eliminate this cut and provide clean drinking water for the people of our country.

The amount of subsidies we're going to give oil companies—the oil companies made record profits in 2010. They made about \$60 billion in profits, if I'm not mistaken—\$77 billion, actually, in profits last year. We'll spend six times as much of this cut in the Clean Water Fund to give money away to those oil companies this year. These are people who made \$77 billion in profits last year, whose stocks are off the charts, who are paying their CEOs hundreds of millions of dollars in compensation,

and we're going to give them about \$7 billion from the wallets of the people of this country this year. That's six times the amount of this cut in the Clean Water Fund.

So I understand if you come to the floor you've got the responsibility of saying, Well, if you don't want to cut this, you've got the responsibility to say, Where else should we get it from? I think that's a reasonable rule under which to live.

So, ladies and gentlemen of the House, my proposal would be this: Let's not reduce the Clean Water Fund by 55 percent. Let's not say to cities and villages and towns and States and Indian tribes around our country that the money that we lend to them—we don't give it to them; most of the time it's a loan—to help build clean water systems that bring clean water to our kitchens and our homes and our places of worship and work, hospitals, let's not reduce that. Instead, let's take 2½ days of what we're going to spend in Iraq and Afghanistan and put it there. Let's take one-sixth of the money we're going to hand to the oil companies and put it there.

This is something we shouldn't do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. LEE. I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2584, the Interior appropriations bill.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I want to thank Ranking Member MORAN and our full committee ranking member, Congressman DICKS, for leading the fight every step of the way against this Republican assault on the environment.

Sadly, Mr. Chair, this bill is nothing more than a vehicle for bigger profits for Big Oil and other special interest polluters.

This bill and all it contains destroys critical environmental standards established to protect the public's health. By attaching more than 40 extremely dangerous policy riders, the Republicans take direct aim on the water we drink, the air we breathe, and the environment in which we live. This terrible legislation guts the budgets of key Federal agencies charged with protecting our citizens and our national resources. It terminates air quality standards as well as land and water conservation funding that will impact all communities in our country. But these cuts will hit my home State of California especially hard.

Mr. Chair, I'm proud to serve as a Representative of California's Ninth Congressional District, which has long been at the forefront of the environmental movement, including working on critical issues of climate change as well as fighting for renewable energy, green jobs, and environmental justice.

This bill undermines the Clean Air Act's ability to crack down on air pol-

lution, threatening the quality of life for our children, our families, our communities, including my constituents in the East Bay, many of whom suffer unfairly from poor air quality.

Now, let me just tell you this personal story. Many of my childhood friends who grew up with me in my neighborhood, a polluted neighborhood in El Paso, Texas, many of them were dead before they turned 55 years of age, or many of them who are still alive have chronic or debilitating diseases. These tragedies can be directly related to environmental degradation of the neighborhoods in which I lived and grew up in in El Paso, Texas.

Also, let me just say, this bill is unjust because it really does refuse to fund EPA at a level where there can be some justice in terms of the overall programs of environmental administration, where it can implement its core mission of protecting human health and the environment. This means that more women and more children and more people facing or living in poverty and more communities of color are bearing the brunt once again of pollution, environmental degradation, and climate change. Sadly, this is in line with the Republican plan to balance the budget on the backs of the poor.

Rather than Republicans taking actions to create jobs, this bill guts funding to create jobs—especially green jobs. Rather than the Republicans taking action to protect our Nation's clean water supply and open spaces, this bill takes us back to dirty water and closed parks. Rather than taking action to ensure that people across this country can trust our government—and they want to trust us—to protect the water that they drink and the air that they breathe, this bill rolls back the standards and protections aimed at protecting public health.

Mr. Chairman, as a person of faith, I believe that there is a moral and ethical responsibility to protect the natural resources provided by our Creator. This measure before us prohibits us from acting on that very, very serious and important responsibility.

How can we here make decisions that knowingly harm people? How can we make decisions that pollute our environment? How can we make these crass decisions, as Members of Congress, that will increase health hazards leading to diseases such as cancer?

People elect us because they trust us to make decisions that protect and enhance their quality of life. They want us to preserve our beautiful planet. Future generations are counting on us. This bill really does let them down.

We need to defeat this horribly destructive bill and move quickly to matters that the American people expect us to address, like to create jobs, raise our debt ceiling, and to protect the public health.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. While our Nation stumbles toward a potential default, the Republican Party is wasting our time with consideration of a bill that will not move through the Senate and which the President has already threatened to veto. But even though this legislation is a futile effort, it does clearly articulate the philosophy of the Republicans in this House of Representatives. This is a bill that really makes one shake one's head. It is an astonishing effort to destroy hard-won, longstanding, and successful and popular laws. It cuts valuable health and environmental programs. It caps the responsibility of corporate polluters and balances minimal cost savings on the back of our most precious natural resources.

H.R. 2584, the funding bill for the Department of the Interior and Environmental Agencies, completely guts funding for public lands and public health programs that the American people care about and desperately need.

A 64 percent cut to the State and Tribal Wildlife Grants program and a 95 percent cut to the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Funds means we can expect a rapid increase in endangered and extinct species on Federal and non-Federal lands alike.

An 80 percent reduction in the Land and Water Conservation Fund means we should not expect adequate maintenance of landmarks, including Harpers Ferry, West Virginia; Yellowstone National Park; or California's Big Sur coast.

□ 1730

A 40 percent cut to the National Landscape Conservation System means 27 million acres of national monuments, wilderness areas, scenic rivers, and other treasures will be inadequately protected.

A 60 percent cut to the North American Wetlands Conservation Act means our birds, fish and wildlife resources will lose protections that keep these populations viable.

A 55 percent reduction to the Clean Water State Revolving Fund means less protection for water quality improvement projects in the United States.

And a prohibition of funding for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative means my home State of Illinois and the great Lake Michigan will lose millions of dollars in Federal assistance to promote good jobs and clean drinking water for millions of our citizens.

While this bill severely cuts these and other priorities, it provides hand-outs to corporate polluters in the form of policy riders. These riders would threaten the enforcement of the public health and environmental laws which have protected our country for decades.

One rider reverses a moratorium on uranium mining on the rim of the Grand Canyon, and would turn one of

our Nation's most iconic landmarks into an eyesore. Another extends loopholes in the Clean Water Act, jeopardizing drinking water for 117 million Americans; and many others weaken the Clean Air Act and limit regulations against toxic air pollution, which saved an estimated 160,000 lives just last year.

The Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act have protected American health and welfare for 40 years, and have been the catalyst for green energy investment and job creation. More than 80 percent of the American people believe the EPA should not be prevented from performing its duties, and the Gallup Poll reports that four out of five Americans are personally concerned about the water they drink, as well they should.

Although this legislation is dead on arrival at the White House, it poses a fundamental debate about the type of country we want to hand over to our children and grandchildren. Do we want to be a Nation that oversees the disappearance of animal populations, wetlands and national parks because we aren't willing to ask for one penny more from millionaires and billionaires? Do we want to be a Nation that turns away from water treatment and infrastructure in the hopes that no one will notice? Do we want to be a Nation that values the profits of corporate polluters over the health of children?

The Republican majority has clearly stated its position. I oppose this bill. The funding cuts and destructive policy riders that riddle this bill turn back the clock on vital environmental and health policies. We owe it to our children and grandchildren to uphold our commitment to clean air, clean water and preserved natural resources.

This weekend, my granddaughter, who celebrated her 10th birthday, had her party on Lake Michigan and enjoyed the precious clean water. I urge my colleagues to vote against this attack on our American resources and our values.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LEWIS of California. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I've been listening from afar to this discussion on the floor, which is so, so fascinating. The former majority, wanting so desperately to become the majority again, is suggesting that by way of this bill we're taking the heart out of America's infrastructure program.

The fact is, in just recent years, the former majority increased spending in all of these categories at levels that would almost startle the people if they'd ever see the detailed facts. The fact that we are not increasing spending to their wish lists ahead, in some way, becomes a cut in their mind's eye when we're faced with the reality that the covered wagon that took us to California from the East is about to go

over the cliff of bankruptcy if we don't do something about spending. This same voice, or series of voices, is currently doing battle over the debt limitation, and they're suggesting that we're holding this up because of some loopholes in taxes for the so-called "rich."

Conversations taking place by many of the rich of the House indeed reflect the reality that what they really want is more spending and more funding for these programs. While we're attempting to make an effort to cut back spending and to cut the impact of government on the private sector, these same voices will not give up until they have an opportunity to impose more taxes.

One of the two parties having this discussion wants more spending on government programs and wants more taxes. The other side of this discussion would suggest we ought to cut back spending, make sense out of our budget and, indeed, recognize that the private sector, in keeping some money in their jeans in order to invest in the private sector, is really the way to create jobs.

With that, it's fascinating to watch this discussion. I'll be glad to come back three or four more times and have this discussion, Mr. Chairman. In the meantime, I certainly would hope more people would talk about what they really know about the environment or really know about the Interior bill rather than the rhetoric that is part of next year's campaign.

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. What a fortuitous moment to have the opportunity to follow my colleague from California.

Indeed, I do know something about the Interior budget. I was the Deputy Secretary at the Department of the Interior, and I know full good and well what the Department of the Interior means to America.

Early this morning, I left Sacramento. My mind was very much on the debate you just suggested: What are we going to do about the deficit?

But it didn't take long to realize, as I sat by the window, as I moved over the Sierra Nevada mountains into Nevada, then across to the Rockies, and across this entire Nation—for most of the way, it was rather clear—that we have an awesome, unbelievably beautiful country. We're the strongest Nation in the world, and we have great economic strength.

This bill, however, would take this great Nation, the great beauty and the incredible people of America, and put them at risk. It would put this Nation's extraordinary beauty and resources at risk. That's what this is about. This isn't going to solve the budget deficit one way or the other. This is a miniscule part of the overall Federal budget. It is important—important because

it is about this Nation's physical and human health. We're talking about the Environmental Protection Agency.

This bill as written would bring to the people of America poison. It is the poisoning of our rivers and our air. Use whatever word you want about clean-up—use the nice words—but we're talking about poisoning the rivers and the air of America. That's what this bill does. When you take the Environmental Protection Agency and you take away its ability to protect us, then you are allowing poisons to be in our water and in our air and in our land.

You look at this bill, and you're talking about the extraordinary physical nature of America. Do you want the great mountains of the Appalachians to be flattened so you can have more coal to burn and then foul the atmosphere? That's what this bill does.

Do you want to take away the ability of this Nation to protect your precious Mojave Desert? That's what this bill does.

Do you want to allow those who would destroy by grabbing the resources of this Nation without even bothering to pay a decent royalty? That's what this bill does whether it's the oil in the gulf or the copper in a new mine in Arizona.

I've listened to the Republican bills day after day on this floor and in committee, and they would strip away the protections that Americans want for their health and for their land. That's not what we should be doing.

Do you want to know where the money is? My colleague from New Jersey said it very well:

It's in Afghanistan and it's in Baghdad. We're building the bridges. We're cleaning the rivers. We're providing the water and the electrical systems there to the tune of \$150 billion a year.

Bring our troops home. Bring our money back to America. Build America. Rebuild America. There is the answer. Not in this way will you ever solve the deficit.

By the way, this bill lays off people—15,000 people at the EPA alone. This bill will not build infrastructure. This bill will take away the infrastructure for our sanitation systems, for our water systems. That's what this bill does.

□ 1740

My colleague from California knows full good and well what's intended here. It's to give our resources to the polluters. It's to foul our air. It's to remove the ability of the people of America, not some government in Washington but the people of America, who have for the last 40 years demanded clean water, that their resources be protected, that the commons be protected. It is the people of America that want a future that's good for their children, that want a future that's viable, that want a future that does not have poisoned water and air. That's what the people of America want. This bill goes exactly the wrong direction.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the fiscal 2012 Interior and Environmental appropriations bill.

I do want to start on a positive note. The bill would restore the President's proposed cuts to mitigation fish hatcheries. That's a good thing. It would increase funding for the Indian Health Service, and it would largely maintain funding for the National Park Service operations and the Smithsonian. So I commend the subcommittee for those decisions.

But I'm afraid the list of positive things is pretty short. So I want to, in the time I have, list some of the devastating cuts that this bill includes. And while our friend from California has suggested that these really aren't deep cuts, I believe the content of this bill belies that notion.

The bill before us picks up where H.R. 1 left off last spring making numerous and deep cuts to the programs that protect our air, water, public lands, and wildlife. Here are just a couple of the most egregious cuts in this bill:

First to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This funds the acquisition of public lands so they're protected from development and can be enjoyed by future generations. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has a dedicated revenue stream from offshore drilling royalties. It takes nothing from the General Fund. And yet this bill would cut Land and Water Conservation funding by 80 percent—the lowest level for the program in 45 years.

It threatens completion of the acquisition of the Rocky Fork tract in Tennessee and several treasures in North Carolina that need protection. Every Member of this body should ask: How many acquisition projects would this halt in my State? There is no reassuring answer.

Secondly, the Environmental Protection Agency, the bill continues the Republican majority's assault on the EPA. After imposing a 16 percent cut in the current fiscal year, the majority is now proposing a further 18 percent reduction in the agency's budget. That would push agency staffing to 1991 levels. The goal of a cut so massive is plain and simple: to ensure that the EPA doesn't have the resources it needs to fulfill its core mission, and that mission includes lifesaving and life-enhancing research, largely based in my district, that Research Triangle part.

Third, the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund. The SRFs provide funding directly to the States to fund water infrastructure projects that enable communities to better manage wastewater and polluted runoff and to protect clean and safe drinking

water. This provides one of the most basic services taxpayers expect—clean water. And yet this bill would cut funding for these two programs by nearly a billion dollars combined.

Given how essential water supply is to economic growth, this is ironic at this particular time as our communities struggle to retain and regain jobs. I suggest to colleagues, ask your State and local governments how they're going to make up this difference.

Mr. Chairman, as if these cuts weren't bad enough, the majority has loaded this bill with legislative policy riders and funding limitations that will roll back 40 years of progress towards clean air and clean water.

These anti-environmental riders have no place in an appropriations bill. They will not save the country a penny, and they will cost tens of thousands of lives. They will expose our children, families, and communities to unnecessary illnesses, and they will degrade our irreplaceable natural resources.

The majority claims that these cuts are needed to demonstrate fiscal discipline. Mr. Chairman, this book is a textbook case in false economies. In gutting critical environmental protection programs, it piles up frightful economic and human costs for the future.

Our constituents and our environment today and in future generations deserve better than what this bill is offering. I urge my colleagues to oppose this shortsighted appropriations bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Well, congratulations. This is probably the most radical anti-environment bill that the House of Representatives has ever considered. It cuts open space funding to the lowest level in a half a century. It opens the Grand Canyon to uranium mining. It denies the existence of climate change and eliminates funding for Federal agencies to monitor and adapt to it. It contains more than three dozen anti-environment policy riders that eviscerate the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, and other landmark environmental statutes.

The bill desecrates the legacy of Teddy Roosevelt and a long line of bipartisan conservation leaders while it also endangers public health.

The Republican majority claims to be concerned about spending, but this reckless bill will impose billions of dollars, Mr. Chairman, of health care costs on Americans by increasing the incidence of asthma, emphysema, heart attacks, and even premature death. This anti-environmental bill will increase health care costs by up to \$539 billion according to the Congressional Research Service. Since Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP are responsible for 33.9 percent of total health care costs,

this Republican bill will cost taxpayers some \$179 billion more.

In addition, it will cause more than 60,000 premature deaths, 20 million lost days of work, and 36,800 additional heart attacks in America.

This bill eliminates funding for critical and conservation priorities, completely defunding the Forest Legacy program. It defunds the Chesapeake Bay Restoration program. It blocks Environmental Protection Agency implementation of public health standards for particulate, lead, greenhouse gas and other pollutants. It allows the unregulated destruction of one of America's two most biodiverse regions, southern Appalachia, by repealing Clean Water Act standards to protect streams from mountaintop removal.

It imperils the cleanliness of public drinking water by allowing unregulated disposal of coal, waste, and pesticides, and casts into regulatory purgatory developers and others seeking clarity of Clean Water Act regulations.

The Republican majority seems to be living in an alternative reality. As Americans face unprecedented drought in the Southwest, record floods in the Mississippi basin, record heat here in eastern and midwestern cities, accelerating sea level rises, and other symptoms of global warming, this bill blocks funding even to monitor global warming. Not only do the Republicans deny the existence of global warming, apparently, they have even blocked funding to monitor its impacts.

This reckless policy rider doesn't just endanger polar bears, coral reefs, and countless other species and ecosystems; it endangers American infrastructure from the Norfolk Naval Base to the Jefferson Memorial.

It endangers public health by increasing smog pollution and heat-related deaths, as we've seen from the recent heat wave that swept across the east and midwest United States, setting record temperatures here in Washington, D.C., Newark, and other cities across this eastern seaboard.

I urge my colleagues to reject this reckless legislation that defunds critical public lands programs, eviscerates 40 years of bipartisan environmental standards, and desecrates the memory of Teddy Roosevelt.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1750

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, our country is facing an incredibly important moment as critical decisions need to be made regarding the national debt and our long-term deficit and how to constrain spending. Members on both sides of this aisle recognize the reality that we need to restore fiscal responsibility in our budget.

However, Mr. Chairman, in times of national importance, we need to stay

focused on what our country needs and what's best for the American people and avoid the temptation to play politics, as this bill does.

Far too much has been carried out by the majority party under the guise of cutting the deficit and fiscal responsibility when it's actually policy-making to implement a hard right, radical, anti-environmental agenda which can actually cost more money in the short, medium, and long term.

Mr. Chairman, the cuts proposed by the majority in this bill have nothing to do with fiscal responsibility. They have everything to do with implementing radical anti-environmental ideology. The bill makes sweeping cuts to critical programs that protect the public's health, reduce our expenditures for health care, protect our environment, and keep industry from running over the public and consumer rights.

Yet at the same time it does that, Mr. Chairman, this bill actually increases spending on programs that are little more than handouts and subsidies to oil and gas companies and mining companies, in particular, one that the government waste watchdog group Taxpayers for Common Sense has called "the granddaddy of Federal subsidies." This isn't about saving taxpayer money in this bill; it's about slashing environmental protections while giving handouts and subsidizing the dirtiest, most influential industries.

There's more pork in this bill than in an Iowa hog lot. This is supposed to be a spending bill that attempts to balance various budget priorities against one another. It's not supposed to be a grab bag of provisions demanded by the Nation's worst polluters, energy companies, and other special interests who receive handouts under this bill.

Yes, this bill would do away with the Clean Water Act, putting the rest of us in danger because mountaintop coal mining companies and factory farms want it. This bill does away with key provisions of the Clean Air Act, undermines protections of our public lands, and repeals the Endangered Species Act to satisfy a few at the expense of the many.

The bill will put more toxic mercury, arsenic, and lead into our air and put our children's health at risk by blocking standards to cut toxic air pollution from cement kilns, allow more soot pollution in our air, block EPA from moving forward with carbon pollution standards for new vehicles after 2016, jeopardizing a process projected to create up to 700,000 new jobs and save 2.4 million barrels of oil every day by 2030.

States would also be blocked from moving ahead with their own clean car standards, threatening the health of America's children, elderly citizens, and other vulnerable populations by blocking EPA's ability to limit dangerous carbon pollution from power plants and other large stationary sources.

This bill also expedites uranium mining in the Grand Canyon, gives special legal exemption to grazing on public lands, eliminates endangered species protections for animals from big horned sheep to grey wolves, and more. Yet it increases spending for the 1879 mining law and other elements that actually threaten to endanger our environment and are an additional handout to Big Oil.

Mr. Chairman, this bill isn't a serious funding proposal. It's a polluter's wish list of subsidies, handouts, and pork. The majority can call it what they will, but don't say that this bill serves the cause of cut-cutting while it lards up programs that are little more than a subsidy to wealthy mining and drilling interests.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RICHMOND

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(decreased by \$6,000,000)".

Page 19, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is increase the funding for our Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement by \$5 million. And what it would do is it would allow BOEMRE to quicken the pace of permit approval and, in turn, promote the rate of oil and gas investment in the gulf region. To accomplish this, we will reduce the Rangeland Management Fund by \$6 million, which still leaves that fund above its fiscal year 2011 funding level.

Let me point out to you why this is the wise thing to do. In response to the Deepwater Horizon explosion and the resulting oil spill last year, in May, the administration issued a temporary moratorium, halting permits of oil and gas production on the Outer Continental Shelf. The moratorium was lifted in October of last year; but since then, the issuance of permits has been slow. President Obama directed BOEMRE to reorganize itself into two independent groups: one that handles revenue from oil and gas leasing, and the other that regulates the oil and gas industry. This is all a change that most of us believe is necessary and wise.

However, the speed of permitting activity has not returned to pre-Deepwater Horizon levels. There is a significant and growing backlog of drilling plans pending approval. The number of pending deepwater exploration and development plans has increased by more than 250 percent. This is up from a historical average of 18 plans pending to now nearly 65 pending approval.

Also there's a drastic decline in drilling permit approvals. Deepwater exploration and development drilling permit

approvals have also declined by approximately 80 percent, down from an average of nearly 160 per year to a pace of only 30 per year. Shallow water exploration and development drilling permits approvals have also dropped by nearly 50 percent from an average of 390 per year to a pace of fewer than 180 a year.

Mr. Chairman, I will tell you that there was a recent study that showed that increasing the pace of permitting and, subsequently, the pace and scale of investment in the gulf would create 230,000 domestic jobs in 2012 as well as more than \$44 billion in U.S. gross domestic product.

I just want to focus on that number for a second, Mr. Chairman, because as we have been here for the 112th Congress, the American people have been demanding that we use the money we have efficiently so that we can invest in the American people and get a return on our investment. So here we are asking the American people for \$5 million and are asking our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who earlier this year proposed legislation that was purported to increase drilling and to lower gas prices. Well, now they have the opportunity to take \$5 million, invest it in BOEMRE, and have the opportunity to create 230,000 jobs.

There are 14.1 million people in this country who are actively seeking employment and cannot find it. Here we have a chance to help 230,000 of them in fiscal year 2012 alone, and we have the ability to increase our gross domestic product by \$44 million.

Mr. Chairman, I think that's what the American people are demanding. They want us to use our money wisely. That's what this amendment does. And I will just ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this. It's a job creation amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. LATOURETTE. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CHAFFETZ). The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The amendment would take \$6 million from BLM's Lands and Resources and transfer it to BOEMRE. The BLM's management account has already been cut \$43.5 million below fiscal year 11, \$15.5 million below the President's request. This fund allows the BLM to take care of more than 245 million surface acres and 700 million subsurface acres; further cuts to this account would not be warranted.

I want to commend the gentleman for the location where he wants to send the money. I have no big opposition to the increase in the BOEMRE spending. But we did the best we could to balance this particular piece of legislation. BOEMRE has already been increased by \$37 million above fiscal year 2011. It's also been increased significantly in several continuing resolutions. Therefore, because of the location of the off-

set, I urge our colleagues to oppose 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. RICHMOND).

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

Mr. RICHMOND. 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 OFFERED BY MR. RICHMOND

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 20, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$10,617,000)".

Page 10, line 21, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$10,617,000)".

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

□ 1800

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, again I rise to talk about what I consider to be wise investments into the future and the stability of this great country.

For the last 21 years, the North American Wetlands Conservation Act has created jobs and served as an important investment tool in our Nation's economy and for wetlands in every single State. NAWCA has been responsible for restoring over 26 million acres of wetlands, equivalent to the size of the State of Ohio. Not only did it restore over 26 million acres, it also creates nearly 7,500 jobs annually and hundreds of millions in worker earnings every year.

If we look at the fiscal year 2011 appropriations with \$37.5 million, it is down from \$47.6 million for fiscal year 2010. This bill allocates only \$20 million for fiscal year '12, a cut of 47 percent from fiscal year '11 levels and 58 percent from fiscal year '10 levels.

Here is the important point, Mr. Chairman: The law requires that each Federal dollar put into the program be matched by \$1 in non-Federal funds. Because the competition for these dollars is so great, on average, each Federal dollar is matched 3 to 1.

Mr. Chairman, over and over again I keep saying that the American people are looking for us to spend money in this great country, where we get a return on our investment. Now we have another program where, for every dollar we spend on this program, the American people get \$3. That's what we should be doing in this time of great economic hardship.

I am asking my colleagues on the other side to look at where we're spending money in this bill and put money where we're going to get a good

return on our investment, we're going to create jobs, and at the same time we're going to preserve and restore our wetlands.

That, Mr. Chairman, I think, is the responsible thing to do, the wise thing to do, and I would encourage all of my colleagues to support it.

I would now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding.

I rise in support of the Richmond amendment and in opposition to H.R. 2584, the Interior and Environment appropriations, and I do so because we cannot afford to make such drastic cuts to programs that benefit our Nation's drinking water, deplete our air pollution standards, and reduce the beautiful landscape.

For example, in Illinois, where I live, the drinking water systems face a required investment of \$13.5 billion over the next 20 years to replace aging facilities and comply with safe drinking regulations. In 2009, total Federal funding for drinking water was less than \$3 billion, which included a one-time \$2 billion infusion of funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

Within Cook County, a large portion of my district, we can take only half an inch of rainwater before flooding takes place. This means sewer water and other contaminants flood both the streets and homes. We cannot afford to reduce the health and safety of our citizens, and we cannot disrupt our environment.

Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding, urge support of his amendment, and urge that we defeat the overall appropriation bill.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would just say that this is another one of my small attempts to make an awful bill just a little bit better, and I would encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the Chair.

Again, I want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana for his amendment, but he again targets the account that we talked about in the last amendment, and that is the Bureau of Land Management's land and resources account which, as I indicated during the last amendment, is already cut by \$43½ million below the fiscal year '11 level and \$15½ million below the President's request.

In addition, this time the gentleman attempts to reach the Secretary's account and wants to reduce it by \$6.8 million. Nobody likes to stand up for bureaucrats or the Secretaries around here, but that account has already

been cut by \$33½ million. Any further reductions could impede the new Office of Natural Resource Revenue, which collects royalties for on- and offshore oil and gas production, which I know is so important to our friends in the minority.

For those reasons, again not because of the place where the gentleman wants to put the additional funds but because of where they come from, I urge opposition to 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. RICHMOND).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HOCHUL

Ms. HOCHUL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 3, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$4,452,000)”.

Page 3, line 17, after the first dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$4,452,000)”.

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

Ms. HOCHUL. Mr. Chairman, I believe my amendment is going to have appeal for both sides of the aisle. I have sat here and listened for some time, particularly on the Republican side, about the need to be cutting our expenses. Well, my amendment does just that.

My amendment actually removes \$4.4 million in spending increases and returns those very funds to deficit reduction. Those of us who also believe that the taxpayers should not hand over an additional \$4.4 million just to help out the oil and gas industry would also support this amendment.

What my amendment does is remove a \$4.4 million increase in funding for oil and gas management. I just cannot stand here and support an additional increase in taxpayer spending at a time when the other parts of this budget are being slashed.

Forgive me today if I don't have a lot of sympathy for Big Oil. Last quarter, Exxon posted \$11.4 billion in profits, in one quarter alone, Mr. Chairman. Royal Dutch Shell posted over \$6 billion profit in one quarter alone. The additional \$4.4 million added to help out the oil and gas companies to cover their permit application processing is literally pocket change for these big companies.

We live in tough economic times, and we all came to Congress to make tough decisions. We need to cut spending. That's why I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment and cut this spending increase.

My amendment, I assure you, does not address the merits of drilling whatsoever. This is simply an issue of fairness for the taxpayers. In times of government austerity and record profits for oil companies, this amendment is a

simple statement that these companies should pay for the administrative expenses associated with processing their applications.

Some people don't have a problem asking our seniors, our families, and our small businesses to pay more during these tough times. Well, I do. I think it is fundamentally unfair to increase spending in their areas while at the same time we are hurting our seniors. Almost every other area of this bill is being slashed, but the one that greases the skids for oil companies to get their approval is being increased over last year's budget. Something is just not right with our national priorities, and I believe that reasonable Democrats and Republicans will agree.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I move to strike the last word in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's concern for the budget deficit and reducing the budget deficit, but I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This amendment would limit the BLM from spending \$4.5 million of offsetting collections for the processing of application of permits to drill. The BLM still collects the fees, they just wouldn't be able to spend the funds.

Mr. Chairman, this makes little sense as those fees offset the cost to administer the oil and gas permitting program. In other words, these programs are paid for by the industry, not by taxpayers. In other words, the BLM will have the cost of these programs but won't be allowed to spend the fees it has collected.

So I have a problem with this amendment, and I would urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HOCHUL).

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

Ms. HOCHUL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1810

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. MORAN of Virginia.

An amendment by Mr. HUELSKAMP of Kansas.

An amendment by Mr. CLEAVER of Missouri.

An amendment by Mr. RICHMOND of Louisiana.

An amendment by Ms. HOCHUL of New York.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) 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 175, noes 237, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 632]

AYES—175

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

NOES—237

Table listing names of members who voted 'No' (NOES—237), including Adams, Aderholt, Akin, Alexander, Altmire, Amash, Austria, Bachus, Bachus, Barletta, Bartlett, Barton (TX), Bass (NH), Benishek, Biggert, Bilbray, Billirakis, Bishop (UT), Black, Blackburn, Bonner, Bono Mack, Boswell, Boustany, Brady (TX), Brooks, Broun (GA), Bucshon, Buerkle, Burgess, Burton (IN), Calvert, Camp, Campbell, Canseco, Cantor, Capito, Cardoza, Carter, Cassidy, Chabot, Chaffetz, Coble, Coffman (CO), Conaway, Costa, Cravaack, Crawford, Crenshaw, Cuellar, Culberson, Davis (KY), Denham, Dent, DesJarlais, Diaz-Balart, Dold, Dreier, Duffy, Duncan (SC), Duncan (TN), Ellmers, Emerson, Farenthold, Fincher, Fitzpatrick, Flake, Fleischmann, Fleming, Flores, Forbes, Fortenberry, Foss, Franks (AZ), Frelinghuysen, Gallegly, Gardner, Garrett, Gerlach, Gibbs, Gibson, Gingrey (GA), Gohmert, Goodlatte, Gowdy, Granger, Graves (GA), 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, Johnson (IL), Johnson (OH), Johnson, Sam, Jordan, Kelly, King (NY), Kingston, Kinzinger (IL), Kissell, Kline, Labrador, Lamborn, Lance, Landry, Lankford, Latham, LaTourette, Latta, Lewis (CA), LoBiondo, Long, Lucas, Luetkemeyer, Lummis, Lungren, Daniel E., Manzullo, Marchant, Marino, Matheson, McCarthy (CA), McCaul, McClintock, McCotter, McHenry, McKeon, McKinley, McMorris, Rodgers, Meehan, Mica, Miller (FL), Miller (MI), Miller, Gary, Mulvaney, Murphy (PA), Myrick, Neugebauer, Noem, Nugent, Nunes, Nunnelee, Owens, Palazzo, Paul, Paulsen, Pearce, Pence, Peterson, Petri, Pitts, Platts, Poe (TX), Pompeo, Price (GA), Quayle, Reed, Rehberg, Reichert, Renacci, Ribble, Rigell, Rivera, Roby, Roe (TN), Rogers (AL), Rogers (KY), Rogers (MI), Rohrabacher, Rokita, Rooney, Ros-Lehtinen, Roskam, Ross (AR), Ross (FL), Royce, Runyan, Ryan (WI), Scalise, Schilling, Schmidt, Schock, Schweikert, Scott (SC), Scott, Austin, Sensenbrenner, Sessions, Shimkus, Shuster, Simpson, Smith (NE), Smith (NJ), Smith (TX), Southerland, Stearns, Stivers, Stutzman, Sullivan, Terry, Thompson (PA), Thornberry, Tiberi, McCotter, McHenry, Turner, Upton, Walberg, Walden, Walsh (IL), Webster, West, Westmoreland, Whitfield, Wilson (SC), Wittman, Wolf, Womack, Woodall, Yoder, Young (AK), Young (FL), Young (IN)

DER, DONNELLY of Indiana, and PAYNE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. 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 noes prevailed by voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 126, noes 284, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 633]

AYES—126

Table listing names of members who voted 'Yes' (AYES—126), including Adams, Akin, Amash, Bachus, Bartlett, Benishek, Bishop (UT), Black, Blackburn, Boustany, Brady (TX), Brooks, Broun (GA), Buerkle, Burgess, Burton (IN), Campbell, Canseco, Cassidy, Chabot, Chaffetz, Coffman (CO), Conaway, Culberson, DesJarlais, Duncan (SC), Duncan (TN), Long, Luetkemeyer, Fincher, Flake, Fleischmann, Fleming, Flores, Forbes, Fortenberry, Foss, Franks (AZ), Garrett, Gibbs, Gingrey (GA), Gohmert, Goodlatte, Gowdy, Graves (GA), Griffith (VA), Guinta, Hall, Harper, Harris, Hartzler, Hensarling, Herger, Huelskamp, Huizenga (MI), Hultgren, Hunter, Hurt, Issa, Jenkins, Johnson (OH), Johnson, Sam, Jordan, Kingston, Kline, Labrador, Lamborn, Landry, Lankford, Latta, Long, Luetkemeyer, Manzullo, Marchant, McCarthy (CA), McCaul, McHenry, Miller (FL), Miller (MI), Miller, Gary, Mulvaney, Myrick, Neugebauer, Nugent, Nunes, Nunnelee, Olson, Palazzo, Paul, Pearce, Pence, Pitts, Poe (TX), Pompeo, Posey, Price (GA), Quayle, Renacci, Ribble, Rigell, Roe (TN), Rogers (AL), Rohrabacher, Rokita, Rooney, Roskam, Ross (FL), Royce, Ryan (WI), Scalise, Scott (SC), Scott, Austin, Sensenbrenner, Sessions, Smith (NE), Southerland, Stearns, Stutzman, Sullivan, Miller (FL), Miller (MI), Miller, Gary, Mulvaney, Myrick, Neugebauer, Nugent, Nunes, Nunnelee

NOES—284

Table listing names of members who voted 'No' (NOES—284), including Ackerman, Aderholt, Alexander, Altmire, Andrews, Austria, Baca, Baldwin, Barletta, Barrow, Barton (TX), Bass (CA), Bass (NH), Becerra, Berkley, Berman, Biggert, Bilbray, Billirakis, Bishop (GA), Bishop (NY), Blumenauer, Bonner, Bono Mack, Boswell, Chandler, Brady (PA), Brown (FL), Bucshon, Butterfield, Calvert, Camp, Cantor, Capito, Capps, Capuano, Cardoza, Carnahan, Carney, Carson (IN), Carter, Castor (FL), Chandler, Chu, Cicilline, Clarke (MI), Clarke (NY), Clay, Cleaver, Clyburn, Coble, Cole

Table listing names of members who voted 'Yes' (AYES—126) and 'No' (NOES—284), including Connolly (VA), Conyers, Cooper, Costa, Courtney, Cravaack, Crawford, Crenshaw, Critz, Crowley, Cuellar, Cummings, Davis (CA), Davis (IL), Davis (KY), DeGette, DeLauro, Denham, Dent, Deutch, Diaz-Balart, Dicks, Doggett, Dold, Donnelly (IN), Doyle, Dreier, Duffy, Edwards, Ellison, Ellmers, Emerson, Engel, Eshoo, Farr, Fattah, Filner, Fitzpatrick, Fortenberry, Frank (MA), Frelinghuysen, Fudge, Gallegly, Garamendi, Gardner, Gerlach, Gibson, Gonzalez, Gosar, Granger, Green, Al, Green, Gene, Griffin (AR), Grijalva, Grimm, Guthrie, Gutierrez, Hahn, Hanabusa, Hanna, Hastings (FL), Hastings (WA), Hayworth, Heck, Heinrich, Herrera Beutler, Higgins, Himes, Hinojosa, Hirono, Hochul, Holden, Holt, Honda, Hoyer, Inslee, Israel, Jackson (IL), Jackson Lee (TX), Johnson (GA), Johnson (IL), Johnson, E. B., Jones, Kaptur, Keating, Kelly, Kildee, Kind, King (NY), Kinzinger (IL), Kissell, Kucinich, Lance, Langevin, Larsen (WA), Larson (CT), Latham, Lee (CA), Levin, Lewis (CA), Lewis (GA), Lipinski, LoBiondo, Loebsock, Lofgren, Zoe, Lowey, Lucas, Lujan, Lummis, Lungren, Daniel E., Lynch, Maloney, Marino, Markey, Matheson, Matsui, McCarthy (NY), McClintock, McCollum, McCotter, McGovern, McIntyre, McKeon, McKinley, McMorris, Rodgers, McNeerney, Meehan, Meeks, Mica, Michaud, Miller (NC), Miller, George, Moran, Murphy (CT), Murphy (PA), Nadler, Napolitano, Neal, Noem, Owens, Pallone, Pascrell, Pastor (AZ), Paulsen, Payne, Pelosi, Perlmutter, Peters, Peterson, Petri, Pingree (ME), Price (NC), Quigley, Rahall, Rangel, Reed, Rehberg, Reichert, Reyes, Richmond, Rivera, Roby, Rogers (KY), Rogers (MI), Ros-Lehtinen, Ross (AR), Rothman (NJ), Roybal-Allard, Runyan, Ruppersberger, Rush, Ryan (OH), Sanchez, Linda T., Sanchez, Loretta, Sarbanes, Schakowsky, Schiff, Schilling, Schmidt, Schock, Schrader, Schwartz, Schweikert, Scott (VA), Scott, David, Serrano, Sewell, Sherman, Shimkus, Simpson, Sires, Slaughter, Smith (NJ), Smith (TX), Smith (WA), Speier, Stark, Stivers, Sutton, Terry, Thompson (CA), Thompson (MS), Thompson (PA), Tiberi, Tierney, Tipton, Tonko, Towns, Tsongas, Turner, Upton, Van Hollen, Velazquez, Vislosky, Walden, Walz (MN), Wasserman, Schultz, Watt, Waxman, Payne, Welch, West, Whitfield, Wilson (FL), Wittman, Wolf, Womack, Woolsey, Wu, Yarmuth, Young (AK), Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Table listing names of members who did not vote (NOT VOTING—22), including Bachmann, Berg, Boren, Braley (IA), Buchanan, Cohen, Costello, DeFazio, Dingell, Giffords, Graves (MO), Hinchey, King (IA), LaTourette, Mack, McDermott, Moore, Oliver, Richardson, Shuler, Shuster, Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

NOT VOTING—20

Table listing names of members who did not vote (NOT VOTING—20), including Bachmann, Berg, Boren, Braley (IA), Buchanan, Cohen, Costello, DeFazio, Dingell, Giffords, Graves (MO), Hinchey, King (IA), Lynch, Mack, McDermott, Oliver, Richardson, Shuler, Waters

□ 1837

Messrs. CASSIDY, BOSWELL, and SOUTHERLAND changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. COLE, Ms. JENKINS, Messrs. PERLMUTTER, HOLDEN, SCHRA-

□ 1844

Mr. GUTIERREZ changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEAVER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 248, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 634]

AYES—165

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

NOES—248

Adams	Akin	Altmire
Aderholt	Alexander	Amash

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

NOT VOTING—19

Bachmann	DeFazio	McDermott
Berg	Dingell	Olver
Boren	Giffords	Richardson
Braley (IA)	Graves (MO)	Shuler
Buchanan	Hinchey	Waters
Cohen	King (IA)	
Costello	Mack	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1850

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RICHMOND

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 192, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 635]

AYES—221

Ackerman	Filner	Matsui
Alexander	Fitzpatrick	McCarthy (NY)
Altmire	Fleming	McCaul
Andrews	Flores	McCollum
Baca	Frank (MA)	McGovern
Bachus	Fudge	McHenry
Baldwin	Garamendi	McIntyre
Barrow	Gerlach	McNerney
Bartlett	Gibbs	Meehan
Barton (TX)	Gibson	Meeks
Bass (CA)	Gohmert	Mica
Becerra	Gonzalez	Michaud
Berkley	Green, Al	Miller (NC)
Berman	Green, Gene	Miller, George
Bishop (GA)	Grimm	Moore
Bishop (NY)	Gutierrez	Moran
Blumenauer	Hahn	Mulvaney
Boswell	Hall	Murphy (CT)
Boustany	Hanabusa	Murphy (PA)
Brady (PA)	Hanna	Nadler
Brady (TX)	Harper	Napolitano
Brooks	Hastings (FL)	Neal
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Nugent
Butterfield	Himes	Nunnelee
Capps	Hinojosa	Owens
Capuano	Hirono	Palazzo
Carnahan	Hochul	Pallone
Carney	Holden	Pascrell
Carson (IN)	Holt	Paul
Castor (FL)	Honda	Payne
Chandler	Hoyer	Pelosi
Cicilline	Insee	Peters
Clarke (MI)	Israel	Peterson
Clarke (NY)	Jackson (IL)	Petri
Clay	Jackson Lee	Pingree (ME)
Cleaver	(TX)	Pitts
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Poe (TX)
Connolly (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Posey
Conyers	Jones	Price (NC)
Cooper	Jordan	Rangel
Courtney	Kaptur	Renacci
Crowley	Keating	Richmond
Cummings	Kildee	Rooney
Davis (CA)	Kind	Ross (AR)
Davis (IL)	King (NY)	Ross (FL)
DeLauro	Kucinich	Rothman (NJ)
Dent	Lance	Roybal-Allard
Deutch	Landry	Ruppersberger
Dicks	Langevin	Rush
Doggett	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Dold	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Doyle	Lee (CA)	T.
Edwards	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Ellison	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes
Engel	Lipinski	Scalise
Eshoo	LoBiondo	Schakowsky
Farr	Loeb sack	Schiff
Fattah	Lofgren, Zoe	Schilling
Filner	Lynch	Lowey
Frank (MA)	Maloney	Scott (VA)
Fudge	Markey	Scott, David
Garamendi	Matheson	Sensenbrenner
Gonzalez		Serrano
Green, Al		

Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stark
Sullivan

Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)

Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—192

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Amash
Austria
Barletta
Bass (NH)
Benishkek
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte

Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guinta
Guthrie
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Henger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCotter
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Olson

Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reichart
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Webster
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—19

Bachmann
Berg
Boren
Braley (IA)
Buchanan
Cohen
Costello

DeFazio
Dingell
Giffords
Graves (MO)
Hinchev
King (IA)
Mack

McDermott
Olver
Richardson
Shuler
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1856

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HOCHUL
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HOCHUL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 141, noes 271, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 636]

AYES—141

Ackerman
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuan
Carnahan
Carney
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeLauro
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gutierrez
Hahn

Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Insee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildeer
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowe
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCormack
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeke
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi

Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinojosa
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)

Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)

Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—20

Bachmann
Berg
Boren
Braley (IA)
Buchanan
Cohen
Costello

Crowley
DeFazio
Dingell
Giffords
Graves (MO)
Hinchev
King (IA)

Mack
McDermott
Oliver
Richardson
Shuler
Waters

□ 1903

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SIMPSON. 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. NUGENT) having assumed the chair, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state

of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1938, NORTH AMERICAN-MADE ENERGY SECURITY ACT

Mr. WEBSTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-181) on the resolution (H. Res. 370) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1938) to direct the President to expedite the consideration and approval of the construction and operation of the Keystone XL oil pipeline, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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.

FBI DIRECTOR EXTENSION ACT, 2011

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1103) to extend the term of the incumbent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1103

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) on May 12, 2011, the President requested that Congress extend the term of Robert S. Mueller III as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation by 2 years, citing the critical need for continuity and stability at the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the face of ongoing threats to national security, and leadership transitions at the Federal agencies charged with protecting national security;

(2) in light of the May 1, 2011, successful operation against Osama bin Laden, the continuing threat to national security, and the approaching 10th anniversary of the attacks of September 11, 2001, the President's request for a limited, 1-time exception to the term limit of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in these exceptional circumstances, is appropriate; and

(3) this Act is intended to provide a 1-time exception to the 10-year statutory limit on the term of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in light of the President's request and existing exceptional cir-

cumstances, and is not intended to create a precedent.

SEC. 2. CREATION OF NEW TERM OF SERVICE FOR THE OFFICE OF DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.

Section 1101 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (28 U.S.C. 532 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c)(1) Effective on the date of enactment of this subsection, a new term of service for the office of Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be created, which shall begin on or after August 3, 2011, and continue until September 4, 2013. Notwithstanding the second sentence of subsection (b) of this section, the incumbent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the date of enactment of this subsection shall be eligible to be appointed to the new term of service provided for by this subsection, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and only for that new term of service. Nothing in this subsection shall prevent the President, by and with the advice of the Senate, from appointing an individual, other than the incumbent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to a 10-year term of service subject to the provisions of subsection (b) after the date of enactment of this subsection.

“(2) The individual who is the incumbent in the office of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the date of enactment of this subsection may not serve as Director after September 4, 2013.

“(3) With regard to the individual who is the incumbent in the office of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the date of enactment of this subsection, the second sentence of subsection (b) shall not apply.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 1103, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this September 11 marks the 10-year anniversary of the worst terrorist attack in U.S. history. America is fortunate not to have suffered another attack of such magnitude and devastation in the past decade. America has remained safe but not because those who are determined to deny us our freedoms and destroy our way of life have given up. We are safe because of the men and women who serve our country with devotion and distinction—those who serve in our Armed Forces, our intelligence community, and our law enforcement agencies.

These public servants and their families make tremendous sacrifices to

keep us safe and to keep terrorists on the run. Their work is often unrecognized and underappreciated. In addition to ensuring that terrorists are denied victory, some of our public servants also protect us from crime and ensure that justice is served.

The agency that is charged with this unique duty is the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The FBI director is limited to a 10-year nonrenewable term. Congress imposed this restriction to ensure political independence and to act as a restraint on unbridled power and the potential for misuse of that power.

In just a few weeks, the current FBI director, Robert S. Mueller, III, will conclude his 10-year term. The President has asked for a one-time 2-year extension for Mr. Mueller to ensure continuity in America's national security team. The killing of Osama bin Laden and personnel changes in key national security posts make these unusual times that justify a short-term extension.

Director Mueller has shown himself a dedicated public servant who has kept terrorists at bay and reduced crime.

Mr. Mueller assumed leadership of the FBI on September 4, 2001, just 1 week prior to the attacks of September 11, 2001. During his tenure, he has reformed the FBI to ensure that it is able to address not only terrorist threats, but also threats posed by traditional criminals. This request for an extension was made not by Mr. Mueller but by the President of the United States.

Mr. Mueller has agreed to accept this extension if it is approved by Congress. It's not every day that the House, the Senate, and the White House can agree, but this is something we all can agree is essential.

This bill creates a new, one time only 2-year term of service for the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Mueller will be eligible to be appointed to this new term of service with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Senate will hold a confirmation vote after the President signs this bill.

This new term would expire on September 4, 2013, after which, Mr. Mueller would no longer serve as director. This bill does not prevent the President from appointing a different individual to a new tenured term by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

If the President wants to continue the services of the incumbent, this bill allows that to happen for a limited time and in a constitutional manner. I urge my colleagues to support this bill to continue the service of FBI Director Robert S. Mueller, III, for an additional 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

□ 1910

I am pleased to join with the chairman of the committee in support of the

Senate bill that would allow for the extension of the term of FBI Director Robert Mueller whose 10-year term expires on August 2.

On May 12 of this year, President Obama announced his desire to extend that term by 2 years. At the time, the President said, "In his 10 years at the FBI, Bob Mueller has set the gold standard for leading the bureau. Given the ongoing threats facing the United States, as well as the leadership transitions at other agencies like the Defense Department and Central Intelligence Agency, I believe continuity and stability at the FBI is critical at this time."

I agree with the President's remarks, and I am confident that Director Mueller will continue to work with integrity and respect for Americans' rights as he ensures the safety of the American people. The Nation needs, now as much as at any time in our history, an FBI that is capable of a multifaceted mission to best protect us from a variety of criminal threats, which has been proven under Mueller's leadership. I congratulate him on his noteworthy 10-year term and look forward to continuing to work with him and with the Committee on the Judiciary.

The job of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is critical, and that agency must have experienced and capable leadership. There are many threats which the FBI must concentrate its limited resources on, ranging from interstate violent crime, organized crime, human trafficking, exploitation of children, corporate fraud, mortgage fraud, cybercrime, and domestic terrorism.

As time advances, so do the demands we place on the FBI and its agents across the country. We appreciate the difficulty the Director must face when determining how to allocate resources. As these demands grow and the nature of the threats evolve, I hope the FBI will maintain an appropriate degree of focus on the types of crime that impact average Americans every day, whether it be fraud against seniors, corporate officers defrauding investors, civil rights violations by those who abuse power, theft of individual identities, or electronic intrusions into people's privacy.

Director Mueller is the right person to continue to lead the Federal Bureau of Investigation in confronting these challenges at this time. He has proven himself to be honest, frank, and committed to the rule of law.

While this extension is unusual, it is important that we grant it so that we have continuity in the leadership of the FBI at this critical time. I urge support of this important measure.

I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished Member from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I want to join my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, on which I also serve, to note the uniqueness of our times. There's a

point that I think is very important about the continuity of existing FBI Director Mueller; and that is that we live not only in dangerous times, but we also live in times where resources are being strained. Questions are being raised about the resources necessary for law enforcement; and certainly a leader who understands the broad needs of the American public and the collaborative needs, collaborating with other law enforcement because of past experiences, is very important.

Mr. Mueller, in his 10 years, has had collaborative efforts with all of the Federal law enforcement agencies and has opened up a dialogue between local and State law enforcement agencies. Just ask New York to tell you how important that is; ask Texas or a number of our other large States with assets that are in the eye of the storm of potential terrorist acts.

So I join with my colleagues and acknowledge the leadership of the President for asking the FBI Director to stay for 2 extra years and that this does not undermine the 10-year term that is by law. I ask colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1103, a bill to extend the term of the incumbent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Director Robert Mueller has shown extraordinary leadership, and made fundamental changes to the FBI for the better protection of the American people.

Director Mueller has a long and distinguished history of public service. After completing college, he joined the United States Marine Corps, and is a decorated Vietnam veteran. Director Mueller served as the Chief of the Criminal Division in the U.S. Attorney's office in San Francisco, and prosecuted cases of financial fraud, corruption and terrorism as the Assistant U.S. Attorney in Boston, before being named U.S. Attorney in San Francisco.

President Bush nominated Mr. Mueller as the sixth FBI Director on September 4, 2001, just one week prior to the attacks of September 11. Director Mueller has since led the Bureau in modernizing its approach to law enforcement, and developed an intelligence driven organization with a focus on prevention. By centralizing intelligence management, and coordinating intelligence and counterterrorism efforts, Director Mueller has improved the effectiveness of his agency.

Over the last ten years, Director Mueller has overseen the transformation of the FBI, from a reactive investigatory agency, to a far more proactive bureau that uses intelligence to seek out threats before they materialize. His visionary leadership has increased collaboration between the FBI and other intelligence gathering agencies, including foreign partners, established partnerships between the bureau, businesses, private industry stakeholders, and the general public, and greatly increased communication between FBI field offices and state and local law enforcement bodies.

During his tenure leading the agency, Director Mueller has increased resources to combat the threat of terrorism, without neglecting its other duties. Just last week, the FBI arrested 16 individuals for engaging in cyber attacks. Last Thursday, the FBI, along with the Drug Enforcement Agency, and other Federal law

enforcement bodies, arrested over 70 individuals connected with La Familia Michoacana, one of the most violent drug trafficking organizations in Mexico. Additionally, in the past week, FBI efforts led to indictments on charges of drug trafficking, international kidnapping and coercion, and human trafficking.

Under Director Mueller's leadership, the FBI has made unprecedented improvements to face the challenges of hatred and global terrorism; the agency has thwarted a plot to detonate a bomb in the Sears Tower, arrested individuals engaged in a massive recruiting effort to attract young people to jihadist groups, and stopped an attack on Fort Dix. Director Mueller and his agency have achieved these, and a litany of other accomplishments, without asking for applause or recognition.

The FBI is America's primary federal agency responsible for investigating and preventing acts of terrorism. Now, more than ever, when we are faced with aggression from an enemy intent on destroying our way of life, the leader of the FBI must be able to meet the challenges ahead. The future of our nation is not entirely of our choosing; we are faced with an assault on our principles and freedoms we did not seek to galvanize, and a confrontation with intolerance and evil we did not expect. With strategic and forward looking leaders like Director Mueller, we will overcome these challenges.

As a senior Member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I agree with the President's recommendation that extending Director Mueller's term for two additional years will greatly benefit our national security. I am pleased at the bipartisan support that this legislation has received.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1103.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTORING GI BILL FAIRNESS ACT OF 2011

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1383) to temporarily preserve higher rates for tuition and fees for programs of education at non-public institutions of higher learning pursued by individuals enrolled in the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs before the enactment of the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Improvements Act of 2010, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the Senate amendments is as follows:

On page 3, strike lines 10 and 11 and insert the following:

Code, who, since January 4, 2011, has been enrolled in the same non-public institution of higher learning in a State in

Beginning on page 4, strike line 12 and all that follows through page 5, line 3, and insert the following:

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 3729(b)(2)(B) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking “January 1, 2004” and inserting “October 1, 2011”; and

(B) by striking “3.00” both places it appears and inserting “3.30”;

(2) in clause (ii)—

(A) by striking “January 1, 2004, and before October 1, 2011” and inserting “October 1, 2011, and before October 1, 2012”; and

(B) by striking “3.30” both places it appears and inserting “2.80”; and

(3) in clause (iii), by striking “October 1, 2011” and inserting “October 1, 2012”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the later of October 1, 2011, or the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of the Senate amendments to H.R. 1383, as amended, the Restoring GI Bill Fairness Act of 2011. The bill would temporarily restore the Post-9/11 GI Bill program’s original method of paying tuition and fees to veterans attending private schools in several States.

When the original Post-9/11 GI Bill was enacted, veterans were promised that the VA would pay 100 percent of tuition and fees up to a State’s most expensive in-state undergraduate tuition and fee charges at a public institution of higher learning. The State-based cap applied to veterans who chose both public and private schools. What this meant to some veterans attending schools in certain States was tuition and fee payments could be well in excess of \$20,000 annually. Veterans applied and enrolled in these schools based on that original promise.

However, in an effort to “fix” some elements of the original GI Bill, Congress left those veterans in a bind. The Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Improvements Act of 2010, which was enacted on January 4, 2011, made several changes. And one of those changes included a national cap of \$17,500 on tuition and fee payments for veterans attending private schools, a change that will go into effect 1 week from today. For veterans that were enrolled in certain private schools in several States, including New York, Texas, Arizona, Michigan, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina, this change has real consequences. They will see their tuition and fee payments reduced by thousands of dollars. And, Mr. Speaker, I just don’t think that’s fair.

We shouldn’t change the rules on these veterans when they had already

decided to attend the school of their choice and made financial decisions based on those rules. On May 23, the House unanimously voted to keep the original promise made to these veterans in H.R. 1383. The Senate has now acted on that bill, and we’re ready to finish the job and send the bill to the President before these cuts can take place.

□ 1920

Similar to the original House measure, the Senate amendment would temporarily restore the cap on tuition and fees to the State-based method effective on August 1, 2011. This increase would apply only to veterans who were enrolled in nonpublic institutions of higher learning in the seven States that I mentioned previously before the 4th of January of 2011—in other words, they had to have already been enrolled on the 4th of January of this year—a change from the House-passed version which was actually April 1 of 2011. Veterans who initially enrolled after January 4, 2011, would be subject to the new cap.

Mr. Speaker, it has come to our attention that some veterans are concerned about the January 4 eligibility date. We have talked with VA. They have assured us that any veteran who has applied and was accepted to a school on or before the 4th of January of 2011 will be covered under this particular bill we are considering on the floor today. Veterans who applied or were accepted after that date will be grandfathered under H.R. 1383.

I believe VA’s interpretation of the bill accurately reflects the House’s intent. I would note that this bill, as amended, passed the Senate unanimously, and, of course, it passed this body unanimously as well.

I reserve the balance of my time and would encourage a positive vote by all my colleagues.

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

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 1383, as amended. I thank Chairman MILLER for the work he has done on the bill to make sure it was palatable in both the House and the Senate.

Let me just say, though, for the record, the GI Bill updates which we passed last Congress were passed with the full support of virtually every veterans service organization in the Nation, the majority of which submitted letters of support and strongly advocated for the bill, which included this tuition cap which we have been talking about. Everyone was well aware of the effect of the tuition cap, so I was sort of surprised when these same folks started talking about what they called “unintended consequences.” I think everybody knew the consequences.

I know that many of our veterans made plans about their education based on the laws in effect before they started. And while most States ended up getting an increase with the new national average, a few States also saw a

decrease. It is in these States that H.R. 1383, as amended, seeks to hold harmless our veterans from the so-called “unintended consequences” of the tuition cap.

Our veterans have indeed, as Chairman MILLER pointed out, earned their education benefits, and I firmly believe that we should seek to avoid any actions that may interfere with the use of their benefits. I am pleased that we are here today taking action to alleviate this potential burden on a small population of these student veterans. The start of the new school year, of course, is right around the corner, so I hope that with our quick action today we will have this issue solved in time for the new academic year.

We have made quite a few changes to improve the so-called Post-9/11 GI Bill, and more changes are still being contemplated. As a veterans’ committee and as a Congress, we must continue to work hard to ensure future changes do not delay or diminish benefits. Veterans are our priority, and we will protect their interests.

I have no further requests for time, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate amendments to H.R. 1383.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I have no further requests for time.

Once again, I encourage all Members to support my motion to concur in the Senate amendments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 1383.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair’s prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

BLOCKING PROPERTY OF
TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ORGANIZATIONS—MESSAGE FROM
THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112-46)

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:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the "order") declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat that significant transnational criminal organizations pose to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States.

Organized crime is no longer a local or regional problem; it has become a danger to international stability. Significant transnational criminal organizations have become increasingly sophisticated and dangerous to the United States, and their activities have reached such scope and gravity that they destabilize the international system. These groups have taken advantage of globalization and other factors to diversify their geographic scope and range of activities. They have increased and deepened their ties to governments and the international financial system, relying not only on bribery and violence, but also more and more on the ability to exploit differences among countries and to create and maintain legal facades to hide illicit activities.

The specific harms that significant transnational criminal organizations threaten today are many. They corrupt—and in some cases co-opt—governments, thereby destabilizing them and weakening democratic institutions and the rule of law. They threaten U.S. economic interests by subverting, exploiting, and distorting legitimate markets, and could gain influence in strategic sectors of the world economy.

Significant transnational criminal organizations that engage in cybercrime threaten sensitive public and private computer networks, undermine the integrity of the international financial system, and impose costs on the American consumer. Those that engage in the theft of intellectual property not only erode U.S. competitiveness, but also endanger the public health and safety through the distribution of tainted and counterfeit goods. Many of them also engage in drug trafficking.

Finally, significant transnational criminal organizations increasingly support the activities of other dangerous persons. Some of these organizations are involved in arms smuggling, which can facilitate and aggravate violent civil conflicts. Others are involved in human smuggling, exacerbating the problem of forced labor. There is also evidence of growing ties between significant transnational criminal organizations and terrorists.

The Executive Order I have issued today is one part of a comprehensive strategy to address the growing threat of transnational organized crime. The order targets significant transnational criminal organizations and the networks that support them, striking at the core of those networks—their abil-

ity and need to move money. It does this by blocking the property and interests in property of four transnational criminal organizations, listed in the Annex to the order, that currently pose significant threats to U.S. domestic and foreign economic interests, as well as to U.S. promotion of transparency and stability in the international political and financial systems. The order provides criteria for the further blocking of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State:

to be a foreign person that constitutes a significant transnational criminal organization;

to have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order; or

to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury the authority, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order.

The order is effective at 12:01 a.m. eastern daylight time on July 25, 2011. All executive agencies of the United States Government are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 24, 2011.

RECOGNIZING BARRY WONENBERG

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, President Kennedy observed that "the life of the arts, far from being an interruption, a distraction, in the life of a nation, is very close to the center of a nation's purpose—and is a test of the quality of a nation's civilization."

I ask you to join me today in recognizing Barry Wonenberg, an artist in the Northern Mariana Islands, who very much embodies the ideal of which the President spoke, and who, through his avocations as both artist and educator, has, for more than 20 years, broadened our community's appreciation of art, creativity, and culture—and encouraged others to explore, and achieve in, artistic endeavors as well.

Today, Barry is representing the United States at the 12th International

Sculpture Symposium in Changchun, China. Artists from 96 different countries are creating sculptures there which will be added to some 500 sculptures already exhibited in that city from previous symposia. We all watch the progress on the massive clay sculpture Barry is creating, wish him well, and thank him for representing the Northern Marianas and America with such distinction.

Fifty years ago, President Kennedy observed that "the life of the arts, far from being an interruption, a distraction, in the life of a nation, is very close to the center of a nation's purpose—and is a test of the quality of a nation's civilization." I ask you to join me today in recognizing Barry Wonenberg, an artist in the Northern Mariana Islands who very much embodies the ideal of which the president spoke, and who, through his avocations as both artist and educator has, for more than 20 years, broadened our community's appreciation of art, creativity, and culture—and encouraged others to explore, and achieve in, artistic endeavors as well.

Barry came to the Commonwealth in 1989 under an artist-in-residence contract and he initially aided in the design of lesson plans and textbooks for the local public school system, including the first-ever Northern Marianas History textbook. Not long thereafter, Barry accepted a teaching position at Northern Marianas College, where he developed a ceramics program and has assisted in the development of other arts-related curricula.

Barry's true passion as an artist, and the area in which he has inspired most students, though, remains sculpture and pottery—which he has been crafting for 35 years. As in most cultures around the world, these arts represent a tangible link to our local historical past. The mediums also inspire exploration, consideration, and interpretation of the natural beauty that abounds in our contemporary island environment.

Barry's passion for pottery has led to local and international distinction. In 2003, Barry was a recipient of the Governor's Humanities Award in the CNMI. He was celebrated for bringing local cultural elements of design into the vision of the contemporary artist, which has aided the preservation of a primary indigenous cultural art.

In 2008, Barry was one of 31 sculptors worldwide invited to participate in the International Sculpture Symposium in Changchun, China. His ten-foot-high bronze and stainless steel sculpture has a permanent place in the Changchun World Sculpture Park, which is home to hundreds of sculptures from artists around the world. In 2010 he was again chosen to represent the Northern Mariana Islands at the Symposium. Out of 1,060 submissions from around the world, 29 artists were selected to attend the Symposium. Of those 29 artists, four were chosen to create two works of art each. Barry was one of those four.

Barry's artistic talents have also benefited our island community in some very real and significant ways. For example, he joined with others to transform a underutilized area of our local hospital into a calming therapeutic garden for psychiatric patients. He also served as an advisor to a group that worked to apply for, and receive, funding through NOAA's Prescott Grant Program to engage in a regional study

of marine mammal stranding, which will include the development of an interpretive display of the skeletons of marine mammals recovered from the waters around our islands. In aid of local charitable fundraising efforts, Barry also regularly contributes his work for auction or raffle by social service organizations in the Commonwealth.

Today, as a nation, we face challenges to the arts—for both financial and ideological reasons. I hope that we all consider the nexus between the arts and our civilization, globally and locally, as we debate the issues. And I also hope that you will join me in paying tribute to Barry Wonenberg—who has spent much of his life, to the benefit of the Northern Mariana Islands, practicing what President Kennedy preached.

TRIBUTE TO TERRY R. GORSUCH

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an American hero. Not a hero in our typical sense of the word but in a context of heroism that we have seen replicated across the face of this great Nation. Today, Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to Terry R. Gorsuch.

He was a man who embodied the characteristics that we rightly honor in our country. He worked hard, overcame adversity, and in business he innovated. He risked all and, by the grace of God and through perseverance, was rewarded with his successful company, Triad Western Constructors.

The story could stop there, but he believed his greatest accomplishment and blessing in life was his family—married to his loving wife, Rita, for 45 years, raising their two children, Traci and Terry D., and then seeing their children grow to adulthood, marry, and blessed the family with two grandchildren, Gracine and Jaydine.

Terry R. Gorsuch lived the American Dream. He worked hard, played by the rules, loved his family, and always extended a helping hand to others. He could not win his final battle as he succumbed to Lou Gehrig's disease, but his admirable moral fiber held firm even as the final sands of his time slipped from beneath his feet.

We don't often reflect on the heroes who make this country work and help make this country what it is, but today, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor an American hero, Terry R. Gorsuch.

□ 1930

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, this evening the Congressional Black

Caucus is pleased that our Democratic leadership has given us the opportunity to once again come to the floor for the first Democratic hour this evening.

I want to just talk a little bit about some of the people who came and visited me in my office in my district this morning. I had a visit from AARP leadership and some of their advocates and volunteers this morning in my St. Croix office. They came to bring this petition to the office, signed by hundreds of people just on one of my islands. And it says:

"Dear Members of Congress,

"Seniors and future retirees earned their benefits after a lifetime of hard work and paying into the system. Yet some Members of Congress from both parties are considering harmful cuts to Medicare and Social Security"—I know nobody in the Congressional Black Caucus is considering those kinds of cuts—"as a part of a deal to pay the Nation's bills. A deal like that could dramatically increase health care costs for seniors and future retirees, threaten their access to doctors, hospitals and nursing homes, and reduce benefit checks they rely on to pay the bills.

"Instead of cutting the benefits of seniors and future retirees, Congress should be reducing wasteful spending and closing tax loopholes. Instead of shifting more health care costs to seniors, Congress should be working to hold down health care costs for everyone," as the Democrats worked very hard to do last year when we passed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

So these undersigned are calling on us to oppose any deal that would make harmful cuts to the Medicare and Social Security benefits Americans have been working on for all these years. And this is just the beginning, Mr. Speaker and colleagues. There will be more of these petitions to come.

Some of the participants that came to my office this morning are: Aloma Peters, Lucie Rodriguez, Elizabeth Torruela, Nicolas Encarnacion, Luz D. Sierra, Theodora Moorehead, Ann Thomas, Ellarine Batiste, Joan Sackey, Miguel Ramos, Ramomta Cagnes, Doris Brown, Paul Simmonds, Denyce Singleton, Genny Dargan, and Lumoz Ayala, but representing the hundreds of people that sent this petition to the Congress of the United States.

In my district, and they talked about this this morning, we have one of the highest utility bills in our country, and they're just trying to figure out what they would do if their Social Security checks were not coming to them next month.

But a default is not just catastrophic for individuals on Social Security. It would be catastrophic for everyone. It's catastrophic for our Nation and our economy. The poor, of course, would lose their safety net and the ability to pull themselves out of poverty, the help that they need.

And the middle class will also pay a price. It would be so catastrophic that

mortgage payments would increase by over \$1,000 for the average family. Credit card interest would increase by \$250 for the average family. Families could pay an additional \$182 per year on utilities. I'm sure our utilities in the Virgin Islands would be much higher than that. And families could pay an additional \$318 per year on food. They could lose thousands of dollars in their retirement savings.

We are so proud and honored to have a leader like Leader NANCY PELOSI, who has represented us in all of the discussions at the White House, and has stood strong for Democratic priorities and kept the voices of House Democrats and the interests of the American people on the table.

We have heard of two different proposals that are coming forth this evening. It's interesting that Speaker BOEHNER has brought forth a proposal with, still, no tax hikes. We were never talking about tax hikes, Mr. Speaker. We were talking about letting the temporary Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans expire, as they were always intended to expire.

His proposal speaks about entitlement reforms and savings. I just read the letter from the AARP, the petition, at least in part, which calls on us to save Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Yet the Republican proposal would include entitlement reforms and savings.

And again, here comes the balanced budget amendment, a budget amendment that would be required before the end of the year. And then a short-term lifting of the debt ceiling, something that will not bring the stability to our economy and that would still put our credit in the world at risk.

He says it's a two-step approach to hold President Obama accountable. Is that what this is all about? Or is it that we're trying to restore the good faith and credit of this Nation?

Their two-step approach to hold President Obama accountable, I don't think he needs to be held accountable. He's been a good President, and he doesn't need us to help him be accountable.

They have cuts. They want cuts that exceed the debt hike, the hike in the debt ceiling. I think that's a new one. I thought that originally we talked about having a balance between the lifting of the debt ceiling and the cuts.

Caps to control future spending. Well, we know what that would mean. All the programs that our communities, the communities that we represent, would lose funding for programs that they need. Again, here comes the balanced budget amendment and entitlement reforms and, of course, no tax hikes.

Now, I've been joined by several of my colleagues, and I'd like them to join in this Special Order if they are ready at this point in time. And I'm always pleased to be joined on these Monday evenings by the gentlelady from Houston, Texas, Congresswoman

SHEILA JACKSON LEE, and we're glad to yield to her such time as she might consume.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands. And let me thank you for persisting in discussing these issues with our colleagues. You have been determined, and your leadership has caused us to have this, I think, very thoughtful discussion more often than not.

I'm also pleased to be joined by my friend and colleague from Virginia, who has developed tenure on these issues dealing with the budget and has always been helpful. Mr. SCOTT, on really sort of getting us through the weeds.

And in an hour or two, or approximately an hour and a half maybe, the President will speak to the Nation. And I believe that this President truly appreciates democracy and, frankly, has no problem with coming to the American people in a straightforward and honest manner.

□ 1940

But it really is important I think to educate ourselves, to educate our colleagues, because with all the chatter, it seems as if they've lost their way.

Soon after the President speaks tonight—I believe around 9 o'clock—Mr. BOEHNER will come forward. But if our Republican friends come forward, are they coming forward with facts? Will they educate the American people to inform them that the debt ceiling has been raised 100 times before? Will they educate the American people that probably for the first time in 2011 they have actually put “debt ceiling” in your vocabulary. Now it's going to be highlighted in Webster's dictionary. Most Americans did not know that terminology, but I think those of us who remember our history and those who studied the Constitution—even those of us who are lawyers remember the importance of studying the Constitution, and will always remember the words the “full faith and credit of the United States.” Even in difficult days that keeps the country going. Why? Because the world buys America's Treasury notes. They buy it willingly and openly and excitedly, which means that our dollar is strong and that people are happily holding on to the Treasury note, again, because they believe that America will never default on her debt.

Now if you wanted to get more detailed, I'd refer you to the 14th Amendment, section 4. There's a lot of chatter about what it means, but the clear language says that the public debt shall not be questioned. Of course it lists wars and other issues that occurred in the historical perspective of that amendment, but scholars have not formed opposition to the thought—hardcore opposition—that it also lives today and really means that we must recognize the public debt and pay our bills. So full faith and credit and a constitutional premise for doing what we should do.

So why don't we just move forward so that on August 2, or even before that, we will not have to face our seniors looking for their Social Security check, or maybe even visit a nursing home, as I have done over the last 2 weeks and before, and see seniors who are able to pay their way, but others who are on Medicaid. So I don't think that we should suggest that this is a drama and a dramatization to say that some seniors will be put out on the curb because they depend upon Medicaid. Even those who worked but had jobs that did not allow them to have a 401(k) or long-term care, they depend upon Medicaid.

And as we look at the plan that we will hear tonight, it's been put on the Web site by Speaker BOEHNER, there is a great deal of fear that Social Security—or apprehension might be the word that we want to use—that really the Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security safety net are in the eye of the storm. And so when you look at no tax hikes—which we have heard a number of people raise their voices on that, and I think it should be noted that the Obama administration and this Democratic leadership in the last Congress gave tax cuts over and over again, and particularly gave tax cuts to the working and middle class. The stimulus package, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, gave tax cuts. But how do you truly say to the American people that we're trying to do what you do, which is to tighten your belts, that is, looking realistically at the right kinds of cuts—and most economists will tell you that the cuts should be long range. They tell you it makes no sense to talk about cuts overnight. In fact, it's unrealistic. The family sits at the kitchen table trying to balance their books. It is almost impossible for them, in the next 24 hours, to have a total change. They have to, over a measured period of time—maybe someone gets another job, maybe someone finds an increased amount of wages, and then they, over time, cut their budget and begin to pay bills. America has to pay its bills right now. But over the timeframe, we need to look for ways to raise revenue.

So let me just share with you: A friend of ours, a colleague, Congressman BISHOP has shared this very potent poster that is very easy to understand. We need to allow those tax cuts for a small percentage of the American public—and this is not a class warfare situation. I believe it is important for people to enjoy their wealth, to create wealth, to create jobs, but this is what we call equal sacrifice, accepting the burden of being an American, rising to the cause when you're called upon to serve. No one can compare to the men and women right now as we stand here that are on the front lines of Iraq and Afghanistan. No one can compare to families who are welcoming flag-draped coffins home right now because their soldiers died on the battlefield. We can't compare to that. But right now

America needs all of us, and she needs us to stand up and be counted.

And so there are wealthy persons like Warren Buffett and Bill Gates who for a long period of time indicated that these tax cuts need to expire. Here is the revenue right here. There are 30,000 households that report incomes of more than \$1 million. One day of the Bush tax cuts for millionaires expiring gives us \$120 million. That may provide the resources for our national parks and wildlife. It may as well shore up hospitals that really depend upon Medicare reimbursement. It might help in a military family's pay increase. Then of course if you take one week of allowing those tax cuts to expire, here is revenue to the Federal Government—here you get \$857 million. That is one week. Just a reminder, in terms of moneys that were spent, we created 3 million jobs—and I'll get to that. I think I'm going to hold that point because I want you to see the difference—\$857 million comes in for one week. That's Pell grants for our students; that's allowing research at the NIH for cancer, cures for cancer and as well for heart disease, stroke, neurological disease; payments for those suffering from mental health needs.

And then if you just go 1 month of the expiration of the Bush cuts, you have \$3.43 billion. Now in the Recovery and Reinvestment, the President, because of the crisis he faced—which was none of the Clinton surplus was left; it was all gone because of two unpaid wars—he had to come in and save us. So about \$800 billion in the Recovery Act put 3 million jobs on the table. It created 3 million jobs. Just imagine what would happen if those tax cuts expired. We would have \$3.43 billion, and we would have the opportunity to multiply that, which I think goes in about six times—math on the floor of the House—a little less than that, four times. It would create 4 times 3 million: 12 million jobs—real quick math here.

So the question is, and let me reverse that math because I see BOBBY SCOTT looking up. I thought it was 343; it's only 3. So I won't do any math on the floor of the House, but I will say that it will create jobs. Because we had \$800 billion—I was reading that as \$343 billion. So it was \$3.43, and then if we do 1 year of Bush cuts, it will be \$41 billion. And so we can take a portion of the \$800 billion and we can see the jobs that will be created by \$3 billion and \$41 billion.

What I will say to you, my friends, is that the announcement that is going to be made by the Speaker doesn't give us that flexibility. It truly undermines the safety network of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, but it also puts in some elements that clearly undermine the running of this country.

A balanced budget amendment is not realistic for the United States because the Federal Government takes care of 50 States, not just one. And our friends will tell us that these States have balanced budgets. It's okay when you're

taking care of one household, but if you're taking care of 300 million households plus, when that particular State that needs the Federal Government—like Missouri during the horrible tornados, or Alabama, or the floods, or any other manmade or natural disaster—they want us to be able to help them. A balanced budget amendment would not allow that.

□ 1950

And then the caps to control spending do not allow the discretion to be able to make priorities when priorities are necessary.

The last point I want to make about what our Speaker will be announcing tonight to calm the markets is that this is going to be a bifurcated process. Let me say to my colleagues, if you are having fun now, just think about 4 months from now or 6 months. We will have to go through this again. Another debate about the debt ceiling. And I remind you, we have raised it 100 times before. Most Americans have never heard of it because we worked with the Presidents, like President Reagan who in 1983 wrote his own Republican Senate majority leader, Senator Baker, and said you cannot not pass the debt ceiling. It is incalculable to think of America defaulting on her bills.

So here we go with a proposal that would cause us to have to vote twice in a 6-month period. What does that mean? It means that a young couple trying to buy a house sees a surge in their interest rate. It means if you have a credit card, it may be defunct only because you cannot afford to pay the surging interest rate. Fees for you to buy a house might skyrocket. Housing costs might go up. Houses might stop being built.

So I would simply ask my colleagues today: let's be Americans. Let's look at what we can do together. Just allow these tax cuts to expire and allow us to be able to calculate this amount of money. And, again, \$3.43 billion and \$41 billion makes a difference in the lives of Americans.

So I thank the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands for allowing me to share some thoughts and to hopefully dispel some myths, and also some fears. It is \$14.3 trillion. It is a big number, but economists will tell you that America is not broke. It's not broken, either. It is at a stage when we need to come together to raise this debt ceiling and go back into regular order.

Whether I agree or disagree with what the House Republicans bring forward in the appropriation process, we can hassle that out on the floor of the House. But we will allow America to pay her bills. And soldiers on the battlefield will not fear that grandparents are not getting their Social Security, or worrying about their family members getting compensation that they are truly due because of the sacrifice that their loved ones are making on behalf this Nation. I believe America is going to stand up and be counted.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank you, and I thank you for bringing the charts so we can see very clearly how much money is lost from just not taking the tax cuts back to the Clinton tax rates. You can imagine, and I'm not doing any math on the floor, either, but how much money we have lost during the time those cuts have been in place and will continue to lose through next year.

The Republican proposal that is being brought to us now, I don't see any investment for the future. No investment in education, no investment in relieving ourselves of our dependence on foreign fuel or continuing to invest in health care or creating jobs. There is nothing like that. It is just cut, cut, cut; and the economists also tell us that this is not the time to be cutting spending.

We have a budget guru here with us this evening, the person who leads us every year in putting together a fantastic Congressional Black Caucus budget, one that not only invests in the future and in all of those things that I talked about, but also has every year, has found a way while investing to also reduce the deficit.

I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. If we are going to talk about how bad the budget situation is now, I think it makes sense to explain how we got here.

First, in the early 1990s, the budget had gone totally out of whack. The first President Bush got together with the Democratic leadership of the House and Senate. Unfortunately, we had to break his pledge on "read my lips, no new taxes," and they came to an agreement and did a little bit to fix the budget.

In 1993 after President Clinton came in, we did some serious work about the budget. We raised some taxes and got the budget under control in the 1993 budget. When you vote on budgets, they are tough budgets. President Bush to a large extent can credit his decision to address the budget with new taxes as part of the reason for his defeat.

And when the Democrats, without a single Republican vote in the House, and not a single Republican vote in the Senate, passed the 1993 budget, 50 Democrats lost their seats. It was a tough vote. You lose your seats when you have very serious deficit reduction. But as a result of that 1993 budget, we not only balanced the budget in just a few short years, but we went into significant surplus and created a record number of jobs. The Dow Jones Industrial Average almost quadrupled.

In 1995, when the Republicans got in control by demagoguing the votes that we cast fixing the budget, they came in and tried to undermine everything in the entire budget. President Clinton let the government get shut down rather than sign those irresponsible budgets that the Republicans passed.

As a result of his tenacity and holding on to his original plan, the budget

was balanced in a few short years. Now, there are some in Congress who talk about the historic balanced budget amendment in the mid-90s. Well, if they hadn't come to such agreement, the balance would have balanced itself. We didn't know when we voted on that, as a matter of fact, whether the budget had already gone into surplus. They hadn't finished counting the money. It went from a 290 deficit, we got down to \$10 billion, and the agreement slowed down the progress a little bit. But we still went into surplus.

In 2001, Chairman Greenspan was answering questions like, what's going to happen when we pay off the entire national debt held by the public? What's going to happen to interest rates? What's going to happen to the bond market when there are no government bonds? How do you calculate investment strategy when you don't have government bonds setting the no-risk limit, and you have increased rate of return after that, how do you calculate investment strategies if there are no government bonds because you have paid them all off?

By 2008, it was projected we would owe no money to China, Japan, and Saudi Arabia. We would have paid off our entire national debt. So people are thinking this is hard. We had done it. In 2001, by August of 2001, after the first round of tax cuts, we had already gone broke. Instead of the surplus, Social Security surplus, they were talking about the lock box, put that away for Social Security, Medicare surplus, put that in the lock box for Medicare. We had a surplus over that.

By August of President Bush's first year, we had gone through all of the surplus, and we were into Social Security and Medicare by August. You cannot blame September 11 for the fact that we had already gone broke a month before. And so after two tax cuts, not paid for, after prescription drug benefit not paid for, a couple of wars not paid for, we are in the ditch.

Now, during the Clinton administration, we had PAYGO. You wanted to spend some more money, you had to come up with the money to pay for it. You wanted to cut taxes, you had to cut some programs, you had to pay for it. Everything you did, you had to pay for it. When President Bush came in, they did away with PAYGO and put us in the ditch.

Now we're so far in the ditch that most experts suggest we need \$4 trillion in deficit reduction to get back to a point where we are fiscally responsible. About \$4 trillion. The Simpson-Bowles committee came up with one plan with a lot of this and a little of that—\$4 trillion. But there is one interesting thing that you could do to come up with almost \$4 trillion: let all of the Bush tax cuts expire. Done. That is all you have to do.

As a matter of fact, in the Congressional Black Caucus budget this year, we started off with that premise. Let them all expire. But we wanted to extend some, and so we paid for them. We

cut the oil loopholes and extended some, and we cut some other loopholes, and added this tax and cut this. We got to a point where we could extend a lot of the tax cuts because we paid for them.

□ 2000

If you want to know what deficit reduction looks like without revenue, you can look at the continuing resolution earlier this year. It started out at \$66 billion, which annualized, was about a hundred billion. And 10 years, that would be about a trillion. If you look at what was in that first trillion dollars that they wanted to cut, it was so bad that they couldn't get it passed. They ended up having to compromise. We had cuts in the safety net like community health centers, cuts in energy assistance for low-income seniors, cuts in community action agencies, and we had cuts in investments in the future. Head Start, Pell Grants got cut. Scientific research and NASA all got cut.

And then just perfunctory parts of government. FBI agents got cut. We're sitting up in the Judiciary Committee trying to figure out how to deal with many of the problems we've got, and half of it is we don't need new criminal laws. We need new FBI agents to investigate the cases. FBI agents were cut; 4,000 fewer. Clean Water Grants, Environmental Protection, all cut. Air traffic controllers. There are so few. They're working so hard that they're falling asleep on the job. They were cut.

The next round of cuts would be, obviously, Medicare and housing and other programs were next on the chopping block. We could not get—they could not get that passed. As a matter of fact, by the time they finished, now they're going to a program suggesting that we need to cut not \$1 trillion but \$2 trillion or \$3 trillion. If you couldn't get the first trillion passed because you're so deep into the things that people believe in, things that—Clean Water Grants, food inspectors. There are so few food inspectors in that budget that some meatpacking plants would have to close because they are obligated to have a Federal meat inspector on site. And if you can't be on site, you can't operate. They had so few meat inspectors that they anticipated many of the companies would have to close down or at least close temporarily because there were so few.

Now they're trying to figure out how you can do \$2 trillion or \$3 trillion worth of cuts. They came up with this idea of the debt ceiling. The debt ceiling is something that recognizes the fact that we've already spent the money. So you raise the debt ceiling not because you're spending any money but because you have already spent the money. It's a perfunctory kind of thing. Dozens of times, almost once a year over the last 50 years, we've had to increase the debt ceiling. Democrats and Republicans all have had to vote for the debt ceiling.

The charade about the thing is usually the majority party has to cast the tough votes and the minority party gets to talk about fiscal irresponsibility and grandstand a little bit, but it's never in the context that there's any question about whether the debt ceiling is going to be increased. Speeches are made, but it's in the context it's going to pass. And you can make a speech about it.

Now they're saying, Maybe we won't increase the debt ceiling. Nobody knows what would happen if the debt ceiling were not increased, if we defaulted on our bonds, if we didn't send out Social Security checks. Nobody knows what would happen—what would happen to the investments, what would happen to the interest rates. We had a temporary technical glitch a few years ago where checks were a day or two—couple of days late going out and they calculate that as a result of that little glitch we paid about half a percent higher interest rate for many years.

Now, a 1 percent interest rate on the national debt now is about in the range of \$100 billion. So if you're looking at what would happen if you defaulted on the debt and people charged more interest, well, that's the order of magnitude that we would be talking about. We shouldn't have to even discuss what would happen "if," because it could be anything. And who would want to find out? We ought to just go ahead and increase the debt ceiling and not use it as a threat that unless you do this, we'll blow up the economy. I would hope that our leadership would not capitulate to those kind of threats because if you capitulate this time, in October they can shut down October by not passing appropriations bills. Don't get "my way or the highway" to close down the government. In a year or so you would have to do the debt ceiling again. Same thing.

So if you capitulate to these kinds of childish threats, there will be no end to it and you will certainly invite them back. As a matter of fact, what is going on now is they're kind of slow-walking us through some cuts that never could have been made in the normal legislative process. Last year, in December, we extended the Bush tax cuts. That cost \$400 billion a year. Now we're broke, and we need to come up with about \$400 billion a year, as if we had forgotten what we did last December.

Now, when we extended those tax cuts, there's no mention of how it would be paid for. It would have been nice to know what the plan was, whether we're going to have to cut Social Security or Medicare in order to afford the tax cuts that were extended in December. Now they're going to try to get some cuts that they couldn't otherwise get if you're making rational choices. And legislative process is about choices. If you want a program, you ought to pay for it. If you're willing to pay the taxes, then you can have your program. Not willing to pay the taxes, can't have your program.

Last year we passed health care reform. It cost a trillion dollars. We raised more than a trillion dollars in taxes. That's a balanced approach. If we didn't want to pay the taxes, we couldn't have the program. And so that's the balanced approach that we're not making as we go along now because the next step in this process will be not cuts but caps.

No program will be cut if any deal comes on. These \$2 trillion or \$3 trillion deals come back. Not a single program will be cut. There will just be caps. Three months from now, when you try to appropriate under those caps, you'll wonder why you can't afford Head Start, why you can't afford any food inspectors, why you can't afford any FBI agents, because the caps are so low.

If you put them all together, if you had made your choices, if you had known you were going to have to cut Head Start and FBI agents and Clean Water Grants when you cut taxes, maybe you wouldn't have cut the taxes. You should have made the choices all at once.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield to the gentlelady from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I think you said playing politics. Is that the same as a schoolyard game of playing chicken? And in the course of what you just said, is there any light for creating jobs in this approach that is being taken, where you have no revenue and you have cuts, with no plan? I see no opportunity for creating jobs.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. In terms of jobs, much has been said about the reason why you would not want to increase taxes in an economic downturn. Because you would adversely affect the economy. That's true. But if you have spending cuts, the effect on the economy is not only larger but more direct and more immediate. Increases in taxes don't hit until the following year. As soon as you cut spending, somebody is getting fired. Jobs get lost immediately when you have spending cuts.

So for the same reason that they say you can't increase taxes during an economic downturn, the stronger argument could be made that you should not have any spending cuts. The estimates on some of the Republican plans are that hundreds of thousands of jobs would be lost if those plans had been enacted.

Now, one of the real tragedies about all this discussion is sometimes—talk about rhetoric in politics—some people are talking about this so-called balanced budget amendment as a condition of moving forward. Well, one of the things about the legislation that we'll consider called the balanced budget amendment is a bill that has a misleading title. It says: Proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. Guess what that legislation does not require?

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield to the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Does it require a balanced budget?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. It does not require a balanced budget. What it does is require a three-fifths vote to pass a budget that is not unbalanced. Every budget we consider this year was not in balance the first year. So the Ryan budget that passed would have required a three-fifths vote. The Republican Study Committee plan that was not balanced the first year that in the fullness of time would cut discretionary spending 50, 60, or 70 percent was not in balance the first year. It would require a three-fifths vote.

Now, as I said, when you cast those tough votes, the first President Bush lost his Presidency trying to balance the budget. Fifty Democrats lost their seats in 1993 trying to balance the budget.

□ 2010

I will guarantee you that there will be Republicans who will lose their seats for voting for the Ryan plan because it included, essentially, a repeal of Medicare and replacing it with an inadequate voucher, and they're going to lose their seats over it. We already picked up one seat in upstate New York where that Ryan plan was an issue, but when you vote on real deficit reduction, people will lose their seats.

If you were to move the threshold up to three-fifths and if you were the chief sponsor of a severe deficit reduction plan, common sense will let you know that it will be harder to pass if you move that thing up to three-fifths. So the enactment will make it harder to pass deficit reduction. Once you need three-fifths, there is no limit to how irresponsible you can get. The tax cut extensions of \$400 billion in December, that got three-fifths. You could have more tax cuts and more additional spending totally out of control, and all you'd need is three-fifths.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. But the caps would be in place.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. The caps are another part.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. They would be in place as part of the bill, but you couldn't raise any revenue.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. There are four provisions.

The first is you need three-fifths to pass a budget. That's going to make it harder to pass a budget. The second provision is a two-thirds vote to raise taxes. So, if you're trying to balance a budget, having a two-thirds vote to raise taxes will obviously make it harder to balance the budget. This thing is called a "balanced budget amendment." The first two provisions obviously make it harder to balance the budget.

The third provision is you need a two-thirds vote to pass a budget that spends more than 18 percent of the

gross national product, a two-thirds vote to pass if it's more than 18 percent of GDP. We haven't been that low since we passed Medicare, so that's going to put a lot of pressure on the Medicare program. Guess what? If you put all these things together with the pressure on Medicare, we know we can cut the benefits with a simple majority, but to save the program with new taxes: two-thirds in the House and two-thirds in the Senate.

There is another little insulting provision at the end. It's a three-fifths vote to raise the debt ceiling, and raising the debt ceiling this year has been enough of a spectacle that they want it to be an annual, everyday occurrence.

You have this thing called the "balanced budget amendment," which will make it harder to balance the budget, and it would certainly put pressure on Social Security and Medicare by allowing those programs to be cut with a simple majority. Yet to save them with new revenues like increasing the amount right now with Social Security a little over \$100,000—no more Social Security tax—and if we were to extend that like Medicare to all of your income, we could pretty much solve the problem, but you couldn't do that without a two-thirds vote. You couldn't close an oil loophole to save Social Security without a two-thirds vote—but to cut the benefits, a simple majority. They want to inflict the balanced budget amendment in there to preserve their oil company millionaire loopholes and jeopardize Social Security and Medicare and put us in a budget situation where it will be virtually impossible to ever balance the budget.

People should read the bill past the title. Most people, when they hear the title, they start debating whether it's a good idea or a bad idea to have a balanced budget or whether it's a good idea or a bad idea to balance the budget every year without exception, which would not allow countercyclical spending in times of downturn.

Now, interestingly enough, the gentlelady from Texas and I serve on the Judiciary Committee, and we heard one of the Representatives from Arizona talk about the Arizona balanced budget amendment and how that works on the State level. Then we did a little research to find out: How did Arizona balance its budget?

We found out, first of all, they got billions of dollars of stimulus money to help them balance the budget, but that wasn't enough. Do you know, in the last couple of years, the Arizona State government has sold—sold—their State capitol and sold their Supreme Court building and leased it back? They got hundreds of millions of dollars in the kitty that helped them balance the budget by selling the State capitol and by selling the Supreme Court. That's what a balanced budget amendment does for you, I guess.

We need to make sure that we don't get lost in the rhetoric about the misleading titles of legislation, and we

need to actually read past the title in the balanced budget amendment.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. That happened so often with some of these bills.

I thank you for taking us through the history of how we got to where we are, because there is a lot of rhetoric that tries to hide how we got here: the fact that hard votes were taken in '93, that President Clinton did leave a large surplus and that, by the end of President Bush's term, we were in a deep deficit and then in a recession—a recession that was not created by this President but inherited by this President. When they talk about, yes, President Obama has increased the deficit, what should he do—allow us to fall deeper into a recession?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. What would he do? What would the Republicans have supported him doing to reduce the deficit? Would they have supported increased taxes? What spending are they talking about with specificity?

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. They have never accepted increased taxes, not in any crisis.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Legislation is about choices. I mean, if you want a Head Start program, you've got to pay for it. If you want clean water grants, you've got to pay for them. We need to be making these choices, not in the context of threats about blowing up the economy, but by making the rational choices about what kind of vision and what kind of future we think we want. Some of us think that education is important. You have to pay taxes to get a good education. Some people think that clean water grants are important. Some people think that scientific research, food inspectors, FBI agents, air traffic controllers are important. There are a lot of things we like in government, and you've got to pay for them.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you again for joining us and for laying out that history.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. To add to what my colleague just said, we are also in a climate of fighting against terrorism, and in order to secure the homeland, you have to make choices about how you invest, so I have a different opinion. I think, if you invest money, you get innovation and you get jobs; and none of what has been said by Speaker BOEHNER says anything about innovation, jobs, and he has no, seemingly, understanding of the importance of securing the homeland.

Mr. Speaker, I am joined this evening by Members of the Congressional Black Caucus to call upon Congress to pass a bill that increases the debt ceiling so that we can avoid economic disaster and continue to work for the American people in repairing our economy and creating jobs.

While I support bipartisan efforts to increase the debt limit and to resolve our differences over budgetary revenue and spending issues, I cannot support any measure that unduly constrains the ability of Congress to deal effectively with America's economic, fiscal, and job creation troubles.

Since the debt limit was first put in place, Congress has increased it over 100 times; in fact, it was raised 10 times within the past decade. Congress last came together and raised the debt ceiling in February 2010. Today, the debt ceiling currently stands at \$14.3 trillion. In reality, that limit has already been eclipsed, but due to accounting procedures by Treasury Secretary Geithner, the debt limit can be avoided until August 2nd.

Congress must act now in order to avert a crisis. Never in the history of America has the United States defaulted on its debt obligations.

We must be clear on what this issue means for our country. United States Treasury bonds have traditionally been one of the safest investments another country or investor could make. For foreign nations and investors, purchasing a U.S. Treasury bond meant that they held something virtually as safe as cash, backed by the full faith and credit of the United States government.

As we continue to discuss the necessity of increasing out debt ceiling, I have heard the concerns of many of my constituents and the American people regarding the size of our national debt and the care with which taxpayer money is spent. I, too, am concerned about these issues; for to burden future generations of Americans with tremendous amounts of debt should not be a way to avoid our fiscal responsibilities to the American people. However, the task of resolving our debt ceiling crisis must take precedence over other concerns, including political ideology.

Prior to the existence of the debt ceiling, Congress had to approve borrowing each time the federal government wished to borrow money in order to carry out its functions. With the onset of World War I, more flexibility was needed to expand the government's capability to borrow money expeditiously in order to meet the rapidly changing requirements of funding a major war in the modern era.

To address this need, the first debt ceiling was established in 1917, allowing the federal government to borrow money to meet its obligations without prior Congressional approval, so long as in the aggregate, the amount borrowed did not eclipse a specified limit.

In turn, with the proceeds from the bonds, the federal government of the world's largest economy is able to finance its operations. If the United States defaults on its debt obligations, the financial crisis that began in 2008 would pale in comparison, according to economic experts. The ensuing economic catastrophe would not only place the U.S. economy in a tailspin, but the world economy as well.

The fact that Congress, a body that typically has its fair share of political battles, has never played political chicken when it came to raising the debt ceiling should give us all pause, and is a testament to the seriousness with which we must approach this issue. However, this time around, some of my Republican colleagues have created an impasse based upon an ideological commitment to spending cuts.

While I understand and share the concern of my Republican colleagues with respect to deficit spending, and will continue to work with them in order to find reductions, now is not the time to put ideology over pragmatism. The reality is that, on August 3rd, the United States will begin to default on its debt obligations if the debt ceiling is not raised.

This detour into a spending debate is as unnecessary as it is perilous, as increasing the

debt ceiling does not obligate the undertaking of any new spending by the federal government. Rather, raising the debt limit simply allows the government to pay existing legal obligations promised to debt holders that were already agreed to by Presidents and Congresses, both past and present. Raising the debt limit simply matches the amount the United States is allowed to borrow to the amount it already owes.

Moreover, the impending crisis would have already occurred were it not for the extraordinary measures taken by Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner, including the suspension of the investment in securities to finance the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, as well as the redemption of a portion of those securities already held by that fund.

If the United States defaults on its obligations on August 3rd, the stock market will react violently to the news that for the first time in history, America is unable to keep its promises to pay. Not once in American history has the country's full faith and credit been called into question. Credit rating agencies like Moody's and Standard & Poors stand ready to downgrade the triple A rating that America currently enjoys.

Once America defaults, investors who purchase U.S. bonds and finance our government will be less likely to lend to America in the future. Just as a person who defaults on a loan will find it harder to convince banks to lend them money in the future, a country that defaults on its debt obligations will find it harder to convince investors to lend money to a government that did not pay them back. Showing the world that the United States does not pay its debts makes the purchasing of that debt less desirable because it requires the assumption of more risk on the part of the investors.

Furthermore, any investors who continue to purchase U.S. Treasury bonds will demand much higher interest rates in order to cover the increased risk. Once a default occurs, investors figure that the chance of the United States defaulting again is much greater, and will require the government to pay higher rates of interest in order to make the loan worth the risk for investors to take on.

Imagine the impact on our stock market if we do not pay our debts. As we have seen throughout the recent financial crisis, a bad stock market hurts not only big businesses and large investors on Wall Street, but small businesses and small investors as well. Families with investments tied to the stock market, such as 401(k)s, pension plans, and savings, will once again see the value of their investments drop. The American people are tired of the uncertainty of the value of their retirement accounts. With uncertainty still lingering in the markets and in the minds of citizens, we must not allow another wild fluctuation in the markets to occur due to default.

One of the major reasons that the job market continues to remain so stagnant is the fact that the flow of credit to small businesses that enables them to hire and expand has slowed.

Increasing the debt ceiling is the responsible thing to do. Congress has already debated and approved the debt that an increased ceiling makes room for. However, my Republican colleagues have chosen to use this as an opportunity to hold the American people hostage to their extreme agenda. They knew that the "Cut, Cap, and Balance Act" was not a realistic proposal and that it was not going to pass the Senate. They just wanted to waste time.

Mr. Speaker, along with the Congressional Black Caucus, I believe that Congress should increase the debt ceiling to meet the obligations the United States has already promised to undertake. By refusing to do so, it endangers our economy and the recovery of our jobs.

Last week Republicans introduced the "Cut, Cap and Balance Act" which I aptly named the "Tap Dance, Loser Club, and Bust Bill." Because it tap danced around raising our debt ceiling and acting in a responsible manner to pay our nation's debt obligations. That bill would have forced our nation to join a losers club as it would have eliminated important social programs such as Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, and Pell grants. The theme for the Republicans seems to be a focus on cutting programs for the most at need and ignoring the need to focus on Job creation. This bill busts the hopes and dreams of our children, seniors, and military families. It busts the hopes to grow our nation in the future. The "Tap Dance, Loser Club, and Bust Bill" was just a distraction and now we have the opportunity to once again get serious about raising our debt. We can not continue to waste a tremendous amount of time. The Deadline is right around the corner. The American people cannot have a government that is the embodiment of living check to check. We must do something NOW!

For a moment think about the American people. Step back and envision the faces of those who will be impacted if we are not successful in finding common ground. They are the faces of the the elderly who will not receive their social security payments. They are the faces of children and infants who will not receive their WIC benefits. They are the faces of hardworking every day Americans, including the multitudes of poor working families who will not be able to receive the benefits they need from government run programs that are keeping them from falling into homelessness. When you think of our future, also see our present. Without raising this debt limit we are putting the present and the future of Americans at risk.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank you for adding that again.

At this time, I would like to yield to the former chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE from Oakland, who is also chair of the Out of Poverty Caucus. A lot of times—well, even up to this weekend—nobody is talking about the poor.

I thank you for starting the Out of Poverty Caucus and for leading us through an agenda that continues even today of pathways out of poverty and for bringing us to the floor every day for the last couple of weeks to talk about how the Republican policies, the bills that they are proposing and the way they're holding the debt ceiling hostage are hurting the poor in our country.

Ms. LEE. Let me thank Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN for leading this Special Order tonight.

I also thank you for your leadership on behalf of, really, my constituents and on behalf of the entire country because it is so important that you as first vice chair of the Congressional

Black Caucus—and chairman CLEAVER, who chairs the Congressional Black Caucus—continue to be the conscience of the Congress and to speak out and sound the alarm about the consequences of possible bad political and policy decisions. So thank you very much for what you're doing. It's so important that these issues be swept from under the rug and discussed in an open forum.

The debate and the discussion with Congressman BOBBY SCOTT and Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE were very important to have because I think that the public, who is listening to this discussion, will understand the history and the background and the technical aspects about this budget and deficit reduction plan that the Speaker is bringing forward, which really do, once again, put the American people as pawns, I think, in a game that they are not responsible for playing. People cannot wait any longer. They are tired of having their futures threatened by Republican politicians who are playing games that put the entire Nation and our economy at risk.

As for the Ryan budget and now this debt ceiling plan put forth by the Republicans, I'll tell you that what comes to mind is, when you look at it and when you listen to what's in it, it's a "you're on your own" kind of plan. For those who are wealthy and those who are beholden to special interests and hedge fund billionaires and millionaires and all of those who have benefitted from the tax cuts, they'll be fine; but for those, as you mentioned earlier, who are poor or who could possibly fall from middle income into the ranks of the poor, this debt ceiling plan put forth by the Republicans is morally wrong and is fiscally unsound. We don't want to see the majority of the American people on their own once again, so I'm glad we're here tonight discussing this.

A Republican default on our debt, this would devastate the retirement savings of millions of American seniors—just devastate. We know that Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid—these government safety net programs—have provided for millions of our seniors to live a decent life in their golden years and to not fall into the ranks of poverty. Now all of these programs are on the chopping block. It makes no sense. A Republican default on our debts, it would weaken our entire economy and weaken our national security, and we heard earlier that hundreds of thousands of jobs could be lost, that even more jobs would be lost. We should be about creating jobs, not putting forth measures that would take us further down the road into a recession and, for some, a depression.

□ 2020

In fact, it's very simple. America must pay our bills on time, and we must do this in a way that does not devastate the safety net for our senior citizens and our children's future.

Either you are on the side of the American people and want to safeguard vital human needs programs like Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, critical food benefits for families and children—or you're on the side of the billionaires and the bankers, financial services industries, subsidies for massive oil company profits. You're on one side or the other in this debate.

The Congressional Black Caucus continues to be on the side of our Nation's most vulnerable populations, who, in these very hard economic times, depend on these vital safety net programs for their survival day-in and day-out. Meanwhile, we keep hearing claims from the other side of the aisle that only misdirect attention.

America really is not broke. We're the richest and we're the strongest country in the world, and we still have the best ideas, the best workers, the best schools, and the largest economy in the world. But we won't be for long if the Republicans have their way.

You know, you often wonder for those who say that default will not wreak havoc on the country. There are some who I think could care less if we went into default because if you listen to what they're saying, it doesn't really bother a lot of Members here. And that, to me, is tragic.

Some tell us that the future is bleak and that the government cannot afford to invest in a prosperous and growing America. But the truth is that raising the debt ceiling should be very simple. It should be a simple vote by all of us to allow the United States Treasury to fund all of its programs and obligations and debts of the entire Federal Government that are already in the law.

Republicans in the House have already voted to support and pass a \$9 trillion increase in the national debt. And now again, instead of working to create jobs and help our Nation rise out of this great recession, and depression for many, the Republicans are really playing a high-stakes game of chicken with the safety net and with the security of every single American so that they can protect the massive—and Congressman SCOTT and yourself talked about this—\$400 billion tax cut that Congressman SCOTT warned us we would have to pay for some time soon. It came sooner rather than later, Congressman SCOTT. And we listened to you, and those of us who voted "no," we tried. But here we are with your prediction coming true.

Here we're asking once again those who have been hurt, the most vulnerable, to pay once again. And that is just downright wrong.

A failure to raise the debt limit would mean an immediate stop to over 40 percent of the entire Federal Government. Our soldiers would not get paid, Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid payments would be delayed. And the health and safety of every single American would be threatened, along with the health of our very fragile economy.

The incredibly irresponsible position that the Republicans have taken protecting tax breaks for the super rich, Wall Street corporations, Big Oil, that seems to be more important than preventing the United States government from defaulting on our debts.

And let me just remind those who want to cut Medicare and dismantle Medicare. That's basically what they want to do. Medicare recipients did not create the national debt. And that is unconscionable to even talk about balancing the budget or paying down the debt on the backs of our most vulnerable populations, including those who are facing living in poverty.

And let me remind our Republican colleagues again that the Congressional Black Caucus, under the leadership of Chairman CLEAVER, Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, already offered a budget—and he mentioned it earlier—that would have saved \$5.7 trillion from the deficit, protected our most vulnerable communities, and would have ensured the stability of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. And our budget was balanced.

So the country is not broke. We know how we got here—two wars, these massive tax cuts for the very wealthy, Wall Street going amok. So it's time to be real, and it's time to be truthful. It's time to be honest, and it's time to make sure that the decisions we make here will not dig us deeper into the hole. America really doesn't have any more time for these Republican games.

Let me also conclude by talking about those who are unemployed because if we don't do something quickly, the ranks of the unemployed are going to grow even greater. And unemployment compensation is really survival funds, survival compensation, until we figure out how we're going to create jobs. And incidentally, the Republicans haven't put forth any job plan since they've been in power.

But these long-term unemployed Americans who have run out of their unemployment compensation, known as the 99ers, they continue to face uncertainty and hardships, and the House must act now to stand with these individuals.

H.R. 589, which my colleague, Congressman SCOTT, and I introduced earlier this year, Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN and many members of the Congressional Black Caucus are co-sponsors. This would add 14 weeks of unemployment emergency compensation. It would make these benefits retroactively available to people who have exhausted all of their benefits and are still unemployed. Extending these benefits for long-term unemployed individuals will stimulate our economy, empower more consumers, and create more jobs.

So this extension should be in any deficit reduction plan because we know that not only is it the right thing to do, the morally correct thing to do, this is the economically prudent thing

to do in terms of passing an emergency extension. It really should be the first step in taking bold steps to create millions of jobs for Americans.

So we should be working to pass a jobs bill that would help people find this pathway out of poverty. We should help keep middle-income individuals from falling into poverty. We should be looking at a budget and a plan that, yes, will help pay down our debt. Yes, it is part of deficit reduction—that incorporates deficit reduction as part of it. But no, that does not cut Medicare, Social Security, or Medicaid. And we should really be trying to figure out a way to create some jobs for people. I mean, that's the bottom line. That's what we need to do.

Thank you again, Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN, for calling this Special Order today. We should make sure that the world knows that the Congressional Black Caucus continues to call attention to the games that Republicans are playing that will threaten our national security interests as well as our economic interests. And the fact that we're here working to try to create some jobs and to help ensure that this debt ceiling is raised, that's the bottom line.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE.

I just want to mention that when we had our job summit about a week and a half ago, we passed out some information to those in attendance that added up about 30 job-creating pieces of legislation that just the CBC has introduced in this year. I don't believe that the Republican majority has brought any job-creating bills to the floor, and in this recovery, that's what we need, jobs.

I know sometimes we were accused of class warfare, but we're not pitting the poor against the rich or the middle class against the rich. We just think that everyone needs to be on the side of our country. We are calling for shared sacrifice and for fairness.

And really, this ought to be a clean raising of the debt ceiling. The cuts we're talking about that are going to hurt the people of this country are too important for us to be rushing through and using to hold the debt ceiling hostage.

□ 2030

So let's not hold such a critical thing as our ability to pay our bills and take care of our seniors, our children, our people with disabilities, and preserving our creditworthiness not only for Americans but the whole world depends on us, and we cannot let them down. We cannot let the American public down, including my constituents. We cannot let our country down and all of the countries in the world who depend on us.

With that, I thank my colleagues for joining me. I want to, once again, thank the AARP for their petitions and for their strong advocacy on behalf of not only seniors but all Americans and our country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Unifit States has reached the current debt ceiling, which is set by law at \$14.294 trillion, and Congress must act by August 2, 2011 to avoid defaulting on its loans. If Congress fails to reach an agreement on raising the debt ceiling, it will cripple our economy, halt our recovery and end up costing taxpayers more in the long-run. For those reasons, I agree with financial analysts and experts who say that raising the debt ceiling is necessary to ensure our fiscal stability and continued economic recovery.

Although the bill to raise the debt limit did not pass in the U.S. House of Representatives in May, I voted in favor of the measure because the consequences would have been disastrous for our economy.

The Republican leadership brought this bill to the floor, but ironically urged their Members not to vote for it. The national debt limit is not a joke and needs to be taken very seriously. Normally, the periodic raising of the national debt limit is a noncontroversial legal necessity to ensure that the U.S. does not default on its debt obligations to foreign creditors and maintains its credit rating.

Raising the debt limit does not authorize new spending—it simply allows the government to finance existing legal obligations that Congresses and presidents of both parties have made in the past. The United States Congress has acted 78 times to raise, extend, or revise the debt limit; 49 times under Republican presidents and 29 times under Democratic presidents.

While no one is more frustrated than I am about our current fiscal state of affairs, I support responsible efforts to bring down our national debt. I firmly believe that it is a mistake to compound past irresponsibility with further irresponsibility on this issue. If Congress fails to increase the debt limit, the government would start to default on its foreign owned debts, which would have "calamitous" consequences for the U. S. economy. Not to mention it would be unprecedented in American history.

In addition, if the United States defaulted:

Investors would be less likely to lend to this country; borrowing costs, not only for the federal government, but for families, businesses and local governments would increase; and so would interest rates for municipal bonds, mortgages, car loans, and student and business loans.

Mr. Speaker, America's debt is a non-partisan concern. Both parties share responsibility for ensuring that this nation's bills are paid. I stand ready to work with all of my colleagues to meet our obligations and put forward a productive plan to reduce the deficit.

GOP DOCTORS CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my leadership, the majority leader on the Republican side, the Speaker of the House, and our conference chairman, Representative JEB HENSARLING, for giving us the oppor-

tunity—us, the House GOP Doctors Caucus—to have the Special Order hour this evening.

It's kind of convenient, Mr. Speaker; my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the well-respected Members, my friends from the Congressional Black Caucus, were talking about the budget and what we're trying to do with regard to moving forward, talking, of course, about safety net programs and entitlement programs, such as Social Security and Medicare. And that's a great segue into the topic of our discussion this evening because it's going to be about the Medicare program.

We, on our side of the aisle in the Republican-passed House budget, take a responsible approach to solving the Medicare crisis, which the trustees have said to all Members of Congress—not Republicans, not Democrats, not House Members, not Senate Members, but all of us—that according to the trustee report, by the year 2024, if we don't do something about the Medicare program as it currently exists, as it's currently funded, the amount of spending that occurs year after year—and will only increase as more and more of our baby boomers are reaching age 65—if we don't do something about that, then that Medicare part A hospital trust fund is not supported by any constituent premiums, it's going to go broke. It absolutely is going to go broke.

So I say to my Democratic colleagues who just spoke, the compassionate thing—and I know they have great compassion for those who, maybe through no fault of their own, can't help themselves; but the compassionate thing, Mr. Speaker, is to save the program, to guarantee, preserve it for current Medicare recipients. Indeed, even for folks that are only 55 years old today, Medicare, as we know it, would be protected, would be strengthened for all of those individuals. And by the time those who are 55 years old today become 65, in 10 years, around 2024, there would be something like 65 million seniors and a smaller number of disabled individuals in the Medicare program as we know it. They would be in that Medicare program as we know it for the rest of their natural lives. And thank God, because of good health care in this country, women, I think, are living on average to age 82 and men maybe to age 78. So these 65 million people will be on Medicare for a long time. Medicare as we know it.

My colleagues didn't mention this in their hour; but what we do in our budget is go forward with a plan for younger folks—indeed, even for my grandchildren, my 10 grandchildren, the oldest two are 13-year-old twins—but let's say them, or 25-year-olds, 35-year-olds, 45-year-olds, indeed, we create the adult approach, the mature approach to solving the Medicare problem so that it will be there for them instead of nothing come 2024. And maybe some of us have paid for 25 years that FICA tax that's taken out of our paychecks every week or every month.

So I say to my friends, this idea that President Obama has and the leadership of your party of just simply kicking the can down the road doesn't get the job done. It's what we call sometimes—and I know all of us know the expression “whistling past the graveyard,” in other words, pretending that a problem doesn't exist. And that's an unconscionable approach.

I am very pleased tonight, Mr. Speaker, to have a number of my colleagues who have joined with us. Some of them are a part of the House GOP Doctors Caucus. We are mostly medical doctors. There are a number of registered nurses in our caucus. We have a lot of health care providers. There are dentists. But in the aggregate, the members of the House GOP Doctors Caucus are medical professionals who spent a lot of their lives practicing medicine and providing care, indeed, under Medicaid and the Medicare programs, seeing those patients mostly at a financial loss, but still very willing to try to help those folks who need us to be there for them in these safety net programs.

I think in the aggregate, the membership of the House GOP Doctors Caucus may have over 350 years of clinical experience. Some of us are getting a little long in the tooth and a little gray by the sideburns. But we are now Members of Congress, and we are trying to do things for our constituents and the seniors of this great country of ours to make sure that we preserve and protect programs like Medicare and Medicaid. And that's what this is all about tonight.

I want to first yield to my friend from Tennessee, my co-OB/GYN doctor. Dr. PHIL ROE has been a Member of this body now for 4 years and has been a great asset. And I know that Dr. ROE has a bill that he wants to address concerning some problems that were enacted under ObamaCare.

I would gladly yield to Dr. ROE from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding. It's a pleasure to be here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I go back to when Medicare first began. In 1965, there was a problem identified in America where we had a group of our citizens, as they became 65 years of age and older, that didn't have access to quality health care. So a plan was put in place, along with Medicaid for our poor citizens at that point, to access quality care.

In 1965, the Medicare program was a \$3 billion program. There was no Congressional Budget Office at that time. The estimates were in 25 years that this would be a \$15 billion program. It actually turned out to be over a \$100 billion program in 1990. In 2010, it will be somewhere about \$550 billion.

We also have, as has been pointed out in our previous hour by our friends from the Congressional Black Caucus, that we have a tremendous deficit. We're borrowing 42, 43 cents of every dollar that we spend in this country.

So that's why the discussion was started.

I came to Washington—really, I practiced medicine, as Dr. GINGREY said, for over 30 years and realized that we had a serious problem not just in Medicare but in health care. So we came to work on health care reform. In the Physicians Caucus in the previous Congress, there were nine of us in the caucus. Not one of us was consulted on the Affordable Health Care Act. I mean, decades worth of experience, over 200 years of experience in the Congress at that time, and no one—not one of us—was actually consulted.

□ 2040

The way I looked at the problem in our health care system was we had three problems:

One is we had a problem where the system was too expensive. When you go to the doctor, it cost too much money to go see a physician. Number two, we had a group of people out there who didn't have affordable health care coverage. Maybe the husband is a carpenter, as in our area, maybe the wife worked at a local diner or somewhere else that didn't provide insurance coverage. Thirdly, we had a liability problem in this country.

So what did we do? We had an over 2,000-page bill that got through the House and got to the Senate and failed. The Senate dusted a bill off that was 2,500-plus pages, that never went through a committee hearing, that nobody on the House had a chance to do, and I know that the three physicians that are here tonight all read that bill. When I read that bill, Mr. Speaker, I found some things in there, as did my colleagues, which greatly worried us.

How do they fund this bill? Only Washington could fund anything like this. Dr. GINGREY has pointed out that we're trying to save Medicare. Medicare is a system that the Congressional Budget Office says by 2020 will be out of money; 2024, by the actuaries at CMS say will be broke.

There are four parts of Medicare:

Medicare part A, which is paid for by your premiums. That's your hospitalization.

Medicare part B, that's doctor services and some lab services. That's only funded 25 percent from your premiums. The other 75 percent comes from the general fund, the taxpayers.

Medicare Advantage, which was cut drastically by the Affordable Care Act.

And Medicare part D, which is a prescription drug plan, also is only funded 25 percent by our premiums. I'm a Medicare recipient myself, as of last year.

So what did the administration do and the Senate do to fund this Affordable Health Care Act? They took out of an already underfunded program, as I just pointed out, \$500 billion, and Dr. GINGREY just pointed out moments ago that we're adding about 3 million baby boomers per year, so 10,000 per day or more. We're adding millions of new re-

ipients while pulling out of that over \$500 billion, and we call this “saving Medicare.”

We're not talking about tonight, on our hour, the budget impasse. We're talking about what's already been passed. And one of the things I found in there, Mr. Speaker, was a very little known board called the Independent Payment Advisory Board. Before, Medicare has had this board in there, which was strictly that, MedPAC. It was an advisory board to Congress, to say, hey, we've got some problems here with funding; maybe we should look over here. Congress would then have the ability to make those decisions.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to this poster, because this is exactly what Dr. ROE, Mr. Speaker, is talking about now, this IPAB, Independent Payment Advisory Board. I want all my colleagues to see this poster because this is what Dr. ROE is taking us through at this point.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, what I did when I read this, I looked at it and thought, how was this created and why was it created?

This board has 15 members that are appointed by the administration, by the President, and, quite frankly, I don't want a Republican President or a Democratic President doing this. These people are then approved by the Senate for a 6-year term. They're paid about \$165,000 a year.

And what is their charge? Well, their charge is, is if Medicare spending hits certain targeted limits, that cuts occur first to providers and for prescription drugs and then later to hospitals. What worries me about this is right now we have a problem—and Dr. PAUL BROWN is here tonight, who's a primary care physician—with our patients with their Medicare, finding a physician to take care of them.

What happens is if you hit these targeted limits and physician payments are cut, access to care is going to be cut, quality of care is going to be cut, and, thirdly, the cost to our seniors is going to go up. What also worries me is that this board very much mimics the board that's in England called NICE, the National Institute of Clinical Excellence. This board makes recommendations to their health board there about what care is provided to patients. President Obama has taken this board, he's going to use this, and he actually wants to increase the power of it to help hold Medicare costs down. Ultimately what will happen, when you have more demand for services than you have money to pay for it, is your care will be rationed. That's the fear that we have.

Our concern is, and I've gone to seniors in my district and been very clear and pointed this out at town hall meetings and have held town hall meetings with seniors and said, We want to provide you quality access of care. That's what I do as a doctor. I want to be able to see those patients and have them

help us solve this problem. I think that's the issue that we have, Mr. Speaker, is how do we provide the care for the money we have and provide quality of care and access for our patients? I am extremely concerned that the IPAB will do just the opposite of that.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman very much for his presentation on the IPAB, that board which Dr. ROE describes, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues. Again, I'm going to refer back to a previous poster that I wanted to present as Dr. ROE got into talking about the Democrats' solution to so-called "save Medicare."

They wanted initially to ignore the problem, the fact that Medicare is going broke. As I pointed out in my opening remarks, Medicare today will be broke in less than 10 years. Without action, the Social Security trustees report that Medicare seniors will either see a 22 percent benefit cut or workers will see a 22 percent hike in payroll taxes. So basically, not really completely ignoring the problem, but what the Democrats want to do is create this so-called IPAB board, which Dr. ROE describes. They say there will be no rationing, yet they're restricted in the recommendations that they can make in regard to cuts, and those cuts will be to providers; they will be to pharmaceutical companies that provide the drugs that so greatly keep people alive today that in the past were ending up in the emergency room with strokes because of uncontrolled high blood pressure, needing amputations because of uncontrolled diabetes or needing to be on a dialysis machine because of uncontrolled renal disease. All of these have been helped by Medicare part D. So, clearly, the plan that the Obama administration and our Democratic colleagues have is not for saving Medicare.

At this time, let me yield the floor to my colleague from Georgia, fellow physician and member of the House GOP Doctors Caucus, Dr. PAUL BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Dr. GINGREY. I appreciate you yielding a few minutes.

I wanted to kind of break all this down so that the American people could understand very clearly what we're talking about tonight. I've got a little poster here that shows President Obama's and the Democrats' Medicare solution.

This is their Medicare plan. They deny the problem. They deny the problem that the gentleman from Georgia was just talking about with this huge, huge problem, where Medicare is going to go broke in a matter of just a decade. They want to delay any fixes. In fact, Medicare as we know it today exists no longer. ObamaCare took care of that. And they want to destroy it. They will destroy it by letting it go broke.

So this is the Democrat Party's health care plan: Deny It, Delay It, and Destroy It by letting it go broke.

Just recently, one of the government accounting groups released something that should scare every senior, every taxpayer, and every American.

□ 2050

They said that Medicare, within the next couple of decades—that's a lot of zeroes in this; 63 and a lot of zeros. This is the unfunded liability of Medicare over just the next several decades.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield, that would be \$63 trillion, if I'm not mistaken.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Well, I just tried to make it so that the zeroes didn't confuse folks. The unfunded liability for Medicare is \$63 trillion. This is unsustainable. There's no way to take care of this.

We need to shore up Medicare. We need to make sure that it's strengthened so that our future generations, not only the senior citizens today, can continue to get Medicare, but the future generations also.

Now, what does \$63 trillion of unfunded liabilities mean to everybody in this country? I mean, that's too big a number for everybody to really consider. So I broke it down to every family in the United States. Every family's part of this \$63 trillion of unfunded liabilities for Medicare, as it exists today, is over \$500,000 per family, \$500,000 per family of unfunded liabilities for Medicare just in the next several decades.

Now, I don't know about most families, but my family can't afford to pay \$500,000 and neither can the government.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I've got a poster that points out just exactly what the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. BROUN, is saying.

If you look, colleagues, at the bottom of this poster, CBO estimates individual and corporate income tax rates would have to rise by 90 percent through the year 2050 to finance Medicare and Medicaid. And if Medicare is not fixed, millions of workers today will lose the money that they have invested. And, indeed, they have invested with that payroll tax over those many years of their employment.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Dr. GINGREY. What the American people need to understand is that we need to strengthen Medicare and Social Security for future generations.

This picture right here is a picture of my two grandchildren, Tillman and Cile Surratt. I love these two kids greatly. They won't see Medicare, and they're going to see an America that's quite different from the one that we see today if we don't make some major changes, major changes in Medicare and Social Security. If we don't shrink them and make them economically viable for my grandchildren, that are 6 and 7, my grandchildren won't see Medicare. They won't see Social Security. And, in fact, people who are 45 or 50 today won't see Social Security or Medicare if we don't strengthen them,

if we don't do the necessary hard work of bringing about those changes to strengthening Medicare and Social Security to make them economically viable.

I hear our Democrat colleagues all the time talk about it's the children. I've heard our former Speaker talk about it's about the children so much that I wanted to throw up.

But the thing is, when you talk about it's the children and their future, we've got to deal with this debt. We've got to deal with Social Security and Medicare and make them economically viable by strengthening them, by making them so that they're still available when my kids get grown.

And we're going down a road right now—this President and the Democrats in the Senate and the Democrats here in the House have a three-word plan. Their plan is a three-word plan for Social Security and Medicare: deny the problem. They're denying it. They're delaying doing anything about it. And they're going to destroy it, because both Medicare and Social Security are going broke if we don't strengthen it, if we don't make it economically viable, if we don't do the necessary hard work that this Congress and Republicans are trying to do.

But what do we hear from our colleagues on the other side? Demagoguery and trying to play politics. It's time to stop the politics. It's time to stop playing games.

The American people deserve the truth. No more accounting gimmicks. No more playing with numbers. No more double talk, political speak.

This is the Democrats' plan—deny it, delay it, destroy it—for Medicare, Social Security and this country economically. We've got to change it, and that's what Republicans are working very hard to do.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. And while we're on the "D" word, if you will, deny, delay, demagogue, I'll use another, D word, and it's really the softest thing I can say about the Democrats' plan, and that is disingenuous.

For them to stand up, or for the President to stand up and say that he's going to fix Medicare, at the same time, Dr. ROE talked about this earlier in the evening, I'm going to refer back to him in just a few minutes, but at the same time, in the creation of a whole new entitlement program in March of last year, we know it as ObamaCare. Officially, I guess I should say, it's called the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. I think it's the unaffordable care act in that it cost \$1 trillion.

But where did the money come from to pay for this new entitlement program that really has nothing to do with seniors?

Well, my colleagues, look at this poster to my left, your right. Here's where at least half of the money came from. Cutting Medicare, cutting Medicare by \$575 billion. I mean, right out

of the Medicare program. That included home health care; it included Hospice. But the biggest cut was \$130 billion, that's bullet point No. 2, \$130 billion from the Medicare Advantage plans. And my colleagues know this, and I'm sure they'll want to comment on it, of the 47 million people, 45, 47 million people today who are on Medicare, about seven to 10 million of them receive their medical care on the Medicare Advantage option, which gives them more benefits, more bang for the buck; and it covers a lot of preventive services that are not given, not offered in traditional Medicare as we know it.

So that cut, \$130 billion, that's something like a 14 percent cut out of that program. That means that at least half of these seniors are going to have to go back into Medicare as we know it and get a lesser benefit.

In fact, it's been said by the actuary of Medicare, Richard Foster, on April 22, 2010, that 15 percent of hospitals, nursing homes, and home health care providers will close because Medicare pays less under ObamaCare.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I want to yield just briefly again to the gentleman from Georgia before I yield some additional time to my colleague, our cochair of the House GOP Doctors Caucus, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank you for yielding just a moment to me because I want to add to that statistic; 15 percent of hospitals, nursing homes, and home health care will close because Medicare pays less under ObamaCare. That's absolutely true. A lot of those hospitals are going to be in rural communities because rural communities are going to be hit the hardest.

Right now I'm a primary care doctor. As the gentleman knows, I'm a family doctor. I've done general medicine for almost 40 years now.

The American Academy of Family Physicians said right now, today, one in eight family docs will not accept Medicare at all. Only one in three doctors, according to the American Medical Association limits how many Medicare patients that they take.

□ 2100

That is a marked rise. Back in 2004, only 6 percent of all doctors limited their Medicare patients. In 2008, it went up to 8 percent. Now it's almost one-third limit the amount of Medicare patients that they see. And one in eight family docs don't take Medicare at all; they can't afford to because of the low reimbursement rates. And IPAB is going to hit those folks that much harder.

During our Special Order when we were discussing ObamaCare I made a comment that somebody may have a free health care card in their pocket, but it's going to be as worthless as a Confederate dollar after the War Be-

tween the States because nobody will take it, and that's exactly where we are headed. So I just wanted to add that.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

I now yield to my cochair of the House GOP Doctors Caucus, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. TIM MURPHY.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Dr. GINGREY.

I want to talk for about 5 minutes here on an issue that you brought up, Dr. GINGREY, about the \$575 billion from the Medicare program that also cuts \$135 billion from Medicare Advantage plans, forcing over 7 million seniors out of their current Medicare plan unless they pay more.

I wanted to help point out that while the President and others are out there saying we're trying to cut Medicare and what it does, nothing could be further from the truth. What we're trying to do here is show how if Medicare is handled differently—not by IPAB or a board of bureaucrats, but by letting the plans work and letting doctors work, they can drive down cost by improving quality.

Let me explain what happened in the Medicare Advantage program that was gutted in the health care bill that was passed out of the House. Well, seniors are able to make choices right now—with Medicare, they can get Medicare part D drug coverage and supplemental Medigap policies with the Medicare Advantage plan. What the Medicare Advantage plan does is allows some management of diseases that are chronic illnesses, which is very different from the current fee-for-service where somebody would get paid based upon the number of procedures they do. Under the regular Medicare fee-for-service plan, hospital readmission rates—that's 30 days post-discharge for the country—in 2007 was over 18 percent, but the average readmission rate across Medicare Advantage was 13.5 percent. Why? Because it allowed physicians and nurses to talk to the patient, to follow the patient, to work with the disease, to make sure whatever complication they had—an infection or heart disease or lung disease or an orthopedic problem—to pay that physician and staff to work for them.

Here is another interesting thing: The Medicare fee-for-service rate of preventable emergency department visits was 15.5 visits per 100 beneficiary months in 2007. But the average rate across Medicare Advantage plans and study was two visits per 100 beneficiary months—86 percent lower than Medicare's national average.

Here's another point: Actual cost for the drug plan we know, Medicare part D, comes out 40 percent under budget because insurers are forced to compete with each other. Now imagine this: Seniors can choose Medicare supplemental plans, and those plans compete for seniors' coverage. The drug plans compete for seniors' coverage. What

happens if seniors are allowed to also choose their main Medicare plan? Well, listen to this additional issue about drugs: The Intercontinental Marketing Services, IMS—I should say this comes from the Deloitte & Touche Web site—the Institute for Healthcare Informatics study concluded: The average cost for drugs frequently used by Medicare prescription drug part D beneficiaries declined since the implementation of the program in 2006. Between January, 2006, and December, 2010, for the top ten therapeutic classes, part D drugs decreased by over one-third, from \$1.50 to \$1. The study projected that costs will continue to decline by 57 percent from 2006 to 2015, reaching 65 cents by the end of 2015. That's a massive decline. Why? Because plans are competing against each other. Plans innovate, they try and do things better and smarter, with better quality, and they ask seniors to choose their plan. Seniors then, by signing their name, can choose a plan that works for them.

Why not allow seniors to have Medicare choice with their major Medicare plan? Why not allow seniors to have Medicare Advantage instead of gutting the program? This is the very thing we're saying; by improving efficiencies and qualities within the program, a lot of cost can be reduced. It can't be reduced, however, by the status quo. As you pointed out, Dr. GINGREY, and my colleagues, keeping the status quo means there won't be Medicare. There will be Medicare for those currently on it. It won't be there for their children and certainly not for their grandchildren. We want to save Medicare, but you can't save it by the continued way it's being done now.

Quite frankly, the system that's being done out there now to frighten seniors, to say that if we don't simply pass this debt limit increase without strings attached, that seniors won't have Social Security or Medicare, this is such a falsehood. And it's a serious problem in two ways: One, it's serious because it's telling a falsehood to seniors; and two, it looks down upon seniors thinking that they're susceptible, not smart enough to figure out that this is false.

It is so important, and we want the American public to understand: We are trying to save Medicare because we do want it to be there for the future, but it means making it more efficient. And what's wrong with letting doctors be the ones who call the shots on improving care?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate so much the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has spent his professional life providing medical services to his patients, just as so many of the doctors in the caucus.

Talking about this cut to Medicare Advantage, as Dr. MURPHY described that method of getting care, Mr. Speaker, it is exactly what we continue to talk about today of wanting to reward health care based on quality and

not necessarily quantity. Just strictly fee-for-service—the number of times you go to see a provider and that provider getting paid, albeit a small amount—is not a very efficient way. And certainly a much more efficient way—and we continue to talk about this—is to provide quality of care. And Dr. MURPHY correctly pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what Medicare Advantage does; it offers a quality of care and a wellness provision. Were we paying these plans a little too much for those services? I don't know, maybe, possibly. But if you're going to cut any amount, certainly 14 percent, \$130 billion, is too much because that guts those plans.

But whatever savings you get out of Medicare, shouldn't they stay in the Medicare program, if you believe the Medicare actuary and the trustees that say that if we don't do something by 2024, the trust fund, the hospital trust fund is depleted, there is no more Medicare as we know it or any other way. So if you're going to find savings in the Medicare program, you don't take that money, \$575 billion, and use it to create a whole new entitlement program so that everybody in the whole country has health insurance whether they need it or not, whether they want it or not. I can think of a lot of things in the Medicare program where this money could be well spent. How about long-term care, extended care facility coverage to keep that money in Medicare? Instead, what ObamaCare comes up with is something called the CLASS Act—which is a classless act, Mr. Speaker, because it is a misleading program that can't fund itself, that absolutely can't fund itself.

So there are so many things about ObamaCare and Obama's plan to save Medicare—which really, as Dr. BROWN pointed out, is no plan at all, other than what Dr. ROE has pointed out in regard to this Independent Payment Advisory Board that is going to cut spending for the most vulnerable seniors, those that are the sickest, those that incur the highest cost. And they say there is no rationing, but it will indeed, as my colleagues have pointed out, Mr. Speaker, be denial of care.

At this point, I would like to yield back to the gentleman from Tennessee to talk a little bit more about that.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to point out one thing that Dr. GINGREY just pointed out, which was one of the reasons that the American people don't trust politicians. The CLASS Act may be a good idea. The CLASS Act began this year where you have some money taken out of your paycheck and put in a savings account over here. It's supposed to be about \$87 billion in 5 years, and we can't get it out until that 5-year period of time occurs and this money has accumulated. At that time it's supposed to pay for long-term care, about \$50 per day. But guess what happens, Mr. Speaker? What happens is

that we borrow the money out and spend it on current health care and call this an asset.

□ 2110

We have counted that money twice; two times. We have done that with Social Security already. I find this absolutely offensive, on August 2, 10 days, about a week from now, we have had the audacity to tell people who have paid into Social Security for 40 or 50 years they will not be able to get their check. Why? Because the Federal Government has spent that money. We are doing the same thing again with the CLASS Act. There has already been legislation to perhaps overturn that.

I want to get back to something a little more basic, and that is to the examining room with the patient. The people who should be making health care decisions should be a family, the patient and their physician, sitting around and talking about what their options are, not some 15 people appointed bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

By the way, Dr. GINGREY and Mr. Speaker, we have over 190 cosponsors, including a bipartisan cosponsorship to the repeal of IPAB, including every physician, every health care provider on the Republican side and Dr. CHRISTENSEN, who was down here just a moment ago on the Democratic side. It is a bipartisan agreement that we should overturn this. The American Medical Association believes it should be overturned. Over 270 major medical organizations see through this as a very bad thing for patients.

The reason we are worried about it, we have heard Dr. BROWN speak about it, and we have heard you speak about it, Mr. Speaker. Ultimately it will affect the quality of care. Why? Because if you don't have access to your doctor, the quality of your care will go down.

The other thing I want to mention is we talk about changing Medicare. Quite frankly, I'm going to go through just a few of the things that already have been changed in this Affordable Care Act. Beginning in 2010, there were Medicare cuts to hospitals, long-term care and inpatient rehabilitation services.

In 2011, it has been pointed out that the Medicare Advantage plans, the seniors did get a \$250 check to fill the doughnut hole. The wealthier seniors began paying higher premiums for Medicare part D; that's in 2011. Medicare imaging cuts, Medicare reimbursement cuts: when seniors get a CT scan or an MRI, Medicare cuts for durable medical equipment began, ambulance services, ambulatory service centers, diagnostic labs, durable medical equipment, wheelchairs. Seniors prohibited from purchasing power wheelchairs unless they rent for 13 months.

In 2012, elimination of the deduction for the employer expenses for Medicare drug subsidies, that is how they raised \$4.5 billion. And that is not to improve our current underfunded Medicare

plan. That is to create another entitlement. Medical expense deduction, you raise the threshold for deducting medical expenses from 7½ to 10 percent. That raises \$15 billion to be spent elsewhere. That is a tax right there.

Hospice care is being cut. Dialysis, Medicare cuts to dialysis treatment will be cut in 2012.

In 2014, this Independent Payment Advisory Board begins. And, by the way, they are getting, I believe it's \$12 million a year to fund this right now. If there is any way we can cut off funding to that board right now, it should be done.

In 2015, a permanent cut to the payment rate to home health agencies. On and on. We have felt these cuts because they haven't come to fruition yet. What we are trying to do with Medicare is to salvage the program for future generations.

A promise made is a promise kept. If you are 55 years and older, with Social Security and Medicare, nothing happens. I hear all the time about a voucher. This is a voucher system and so forth. Here is what a voucher is. A voucher is when I go to my mailbox, something comes that says this has so much value. You take this piece of paper and purchase something with it. Premium support is where the Federal Government, through its massive ability to go out and negotiate prices, exactly like they do for you and me, Mr. Speaker, in our health care plan here in Congress, they negotiate with numerous companies through the Federal exchange. Our plan is called the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan, and they negotiate the best price. And what happens is all during the campaign, the last 2 years I have heard seniors and others say, Congressman, I want exactly what you have. That is exactly what we are trying to do.

A higher income senior like myself, and you and the others in this room, will pay a higher premium. And folks with preexisting conditions and lower income will pay much lower. And they will have those choices. As Dr. MURPHY pointed out, why do we think that will save money and why are we doing it. It has been pointed out that it is a catastrophe waiting to happen if we do not do something.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. ROE. What he was describing, if I can elaborate a little more on that point to our colleagues because I think some still are confused, possibly on both sides of the aisle, but clearly this plan that is put forth in the House budget, and it's the Republican budget because we are in the majority. It is sometimes referred to as the Paul Ryan budget because he is chairman of the Budget Committee. It is sometimes referred to as the Path to Prosperity.

But in that budget which we sent to the Senate; and, unfortunately, the Senate majority leader has deep-sixed it, if you will, but in that budget plan that Dr. ROE was referring to, it has

taken the responsible approach based on the trustees' estimate of the Medicare program going totally broke by the year 2024, and that information is bipartisan. That's the Medicare board of trustees.

To ignore that, as my colleague from Georgia said in his remarks, the "D" words, to defund, to deny, what were some of the others, Dr. BROWN? To deny, delay, destroy, demagogue, and I added to those "D" words their plan is rather disingenuous, but what Dr. ROE was describing is to protect and preserve Medicare as we know.

Whether it is traditional Medicare, maybe we can salvage Medicare Advantage, and hold harmless anybody that is over age 55, 55 through 65. They were 10 years away from being eligible for a Medicare benefit. So they will be in those plans as we know it. But this approach that Dr. ROE so adequately describes, Mr. Speaker, this premium support program, not a voucher, as he pointed out, the premium support program, which by the way would be administered by the Office of Personnel Management, the same folks that talk to us and find out what kind of health care benefit we want, those Members who are under 65, that you pick and choose and you negotiate. They will do the same thing for future, those under age 55 today, future Medicare beneficiaries. They will get the best bang for the buck, the best care for their individual needs.

Now, it is estimated that in 2022 that premium support amount on average will be \$8,000 a year. Now, our Democratic friends, Mr. Speaker, want to say, Well, that's not enough. That's not enough. Seniors are going to have to reach in their pocket.

But what they don't tell you, Mr. Speaker, is that premium will be higher for anybody who comes into the Medicare program who is already sick, who already has several things wrong with them; and that certainly is possible.

When I got Medicare eligible, I had already had open heart surgery. So these people will have a higher premium than the average of \$8,000 a year. And as they age, even if their health is perfect the day they come into Medicare, they become Medicare eligible—they may have the Methuselah gene and have wonderful health. They may jog 3 miles a day, don't smoke, don't drink excessively, don't skydive—but as they get older, that premium support will automatically go up because we know statistically that as you get older the chances of something happening are greater.

And last but not least, the higher your income, the lower your premium support.

□ 2120

So our seniors, who need it the most, will get a higher—they won't get the average \$8,000. They will get a higher premium support. I think it is a wonderful plan, Mr. Speaker. I absolutely

do. It shows the responsibility of the majority party in this House of Representatives.

Of course, as my colleagues have pointed out, what is the plan from the Democrats, the Democrat majority in the Senate and from this President: deny it, delay it, destroy it, demagogue it. Or, as my colleague from Tennessee has pointed out, kill it by creating this Independent Payment Advisory Board, IPAB, which will, without question, lead to denial of care and rationing.

I yield to my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One of the things, Mr. Speaker, that I want to emphasize is having no plan is a prescription for disaster for our country. We have a solemn obligation to provide health care for our seniors. We have made that promise. And how do we do it? Again, back to what I said, I do not want a board that is appointed by a Democrat or Republican or any bureaucrat. What I want is I want health care decisions made by physicians, the patient, and their family. The way that is going to happen is through this plan where we use premium support to allow people choice and to have them make those choices, not insurance companies and certainly not the Federal Government.

From what I have seen up here in my two terms is I don't want a bunch of Federal bureaucrats in charge of my bypass operation or my gallbladder operation—or my bunion operation, for that matter. I want my doctor in charge of it. That is who I want making those decisions, along with my family.

I think this is one of the biggest discussions we will have in this Congress is how we do this right. Not only does it affect the budget. Forget the budget. Forget all that right now. We are talking about people's lives. We are talking about the care that they get. And right now, as I mentioned, these changes are already made. This is already in the current law that I talked about just a minute ago.

When you talk about Medicare as it is, folks, it's been changed, big time. When this board kicks in—and there's a very good article if you are sort of a wonk like I am and want to go back to the New England Journal of Medicine, one of our major journals, in, I believe it was, May of 2010. Their estimate was—this is one of our major scientific journals—that this IPAB board would have kicked in 21 of the last 25 years if it had been in place. So it's not some idle threat that this will happen. If you look retrospectively at what's happened, it would have happened 21 out of 25 times.

What would that mean? That would mean, as Dr. BROWN, Mr. Speaker, pointed out just a moment ago, as these payments for physicians go down and down and down below their cost of providing the care, they no longer can see you. You lose access to your doctors, like Dr. BROWN.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. What Dr. ROE is talking about, Mr. Speaker, is on top of these cuts that our medical providers are currently facing under this so-called flawed formula sustainable growth rate, which I'm sure I'm correct on this, in the past 9 years every calculation has been a cut to provider reimbursement to the point now that while we in Congress have had the ability to mitigate that, that if these cuts finally in the aggregate come due December 31 of this year, it is a 30 percent cut. So we haven't solved that problem yet for our providers but yet we are adding on top of that this IPAB board that can make additional cuts to provider reimbursement without any ability of the Congress, we the Members of Congress, to stop that injustice.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. A good point. Peter Orszag, who was the previous OMB Director here, said this is one of the biggest losses of power the Congress has given up since the Federal Reserve. That's been almost a hundred years ago. What we're doing is the Congress takes two-thirds to overturn what they recommend in this IPAB. We could do it if we get a two-thirds vote. And it is not appealable. You don't have any appeal to a court system to do anything about this.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield, still, we can overrule with a two-thirds vote. But we still have to find cuts in the Medicare program somewhere else for the same dollar amount.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

What would happen is we could make those cuts, but they have to be made somewhere else. The cuts have to be made. Nowhere should Congress give up its ability to do that. We are, our House, the House side, we're the representatives of the people. We are the closest to them. We have 700,000 constituents that we go talk to every time we get home. And we ought to be beholden to those folks in our districts across this country and not to some board up here in Congress that is not accountable to anybody.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from Georgia is kind enough to have stayed with us throughout the hour, and I would like to yield additional time to him, if he would like.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Thank you, Dr. GINGREY. I would certainly like the time.

The American people need to understand that the purpose of ObamaCare, the bottom line really was expressed by the President himself when he said he wanted everybody in this country in one pool. What's that mean for everybody? It means socialized medicine. That's what all IPAB and all these cuts and everything is geared to do is to force doctors out of private practice, make them employees of the Federal Government, make patients subject to some bureaucrat here in Washington

and tell them what kind of health care they can get.

And the Democrats' plan is to deny, to delay, and to destroy Medicare by letting it go broke. But I want to just add, Dr. GINGREY, to your other "d," the demagoguery that we see. I want to give three examples because the facts have really been, by and large, hidden from the American people.

AARP did an ad, a new one, talking about all the places where the Feds could cut spending, like treadmills for shrimp—well, I certainly want to cut that out—but instead, Republicans insist on cutting seniors' Medicare. Well, that's not true. AARP and the Democrats want to cut Medicare by destroying it, letting it go broke.

An ad put out by the Gender Project, a liberal nonprofit group, shows an elderly woman being heaved off the side of a cliff, with her being in a wheelchair, and asks: Is America beautiful without Medicare? Ask PAUL RYAN and his friends in Congress.

That is nothing but bald-faced lies, because we are trying to make sure that seniors get, as Dr. ROE said, a promise made, a promise kept. We want to shore up Medicare and Social Security. We want to strengthen Medicare, not destroy it, like the Democrats are going to do.

Let me give you a third example, then I will yield back.

On the Republican budget, President Obama said in his speech at George Washington University just last month: "Instead of guaranteed health care, you will get a voucher. If that voucher isn't worth enough to buy the insurance that is available in the open marketplace, well, tough luck. You're on your own. Put simply, it ends Medicare as we know it." President Obama.

It's demagoguery. It's lies, bald-faced lies designed to try to scare the American people, particularly senior citizens. We are trying to shore up Medicare. We are trying to strengthen Medicare. We are trying to save Medicare from going broke. But the Reid-Pelosi-Obama ObamaCare is to deny it, to delay it, to destroy it, and to demagogue it.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. As I said earlier, the kindest thing I can say is it is disingenuous.

Stop the Democrats' plan to end Medicare. If left alone, the Democrats' Medicare cut plan created in ObamaCare threatens Medicare seniors today as well as those who will come into the program tomorrow.

So, colleagues, how do we stop the Democrats' Medicare cut plan first and foremost? We need to repeal ObamaCare. But we need to vote and support Dr. ROE's bill to repeal this IPAB board and tell President Obama and Democrats that Medicare reform should not rely on restricting benefits and access for sick and disabled seniors in need.

As we conclude tonight, let me just say, colleagues, oppose the Democrats' Medicare cut board. Visit the GOP Doc-

tors Caucus Web site and sign the online petition. Oppose the Democrats' plan to destroy Medicare.

And here are the Web sites: doctorscaucus.gingrey.house.gov or doctorscaucus.murphy.house.gov, the two cochair's of the House Doctors Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our leadership for giving us an opportunity to bring to the American public and to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle the true facts of this case—that we have a plan; the President has no plan.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BERG (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending the funeral of his good friend, former North Dakota State Senate Majority Leader Bob Stenehjem.

Mr. BACA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for July 22 on account of attending a funeral in the district.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel delays.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today until 5 p.m.

Ms. RICHARDSON (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

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. 300. An act to prevent abuse of Government charge cards; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; in addition to the Committee on Armed Services for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 26, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2595. A letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Common Crop Insurance Regulations; Extra Long Staple Cotton Crop Provisions [Docket No.: FCIC-10-0002] (RIN: 0563-AC27) received June 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2596. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, De-

partment of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Successor Entities to the Netherlands Antilles (DFARS Case 2011-D029) (RIN: 0750-AH32) received July 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2597. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-B-1195] received June 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2598. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-B-1199] received June 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2599. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Extension of Temporary Exemptions for Eligible Credit Default Swaps to Facilitate Operation of Central Counterparties to Clear and Settle Credit Default Swaps [Release Nos. 33-9232; 34-64800; 39-2476; File No. S7-02-09] (RIN: 3235-AK26) received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2600. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priority; National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) — Rehabilitation Research and Training Center (RRTCs) — Interventions to Promote Community Living Among Individuals with Disabilities [CFDA Number: 84.133B-1] received June, 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2601. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision to the Validated End-User Authorization for CSMC Technologies Corporation in the People's Republic of China [Docket No.: 1101519290-1298-01] (RIN: 0694-AF25) received June 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2602. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Persons on the Entity List: Addition of Persons Acting Contrary to the National Security for Foreign Policy Interests of the United States [Docket No.: 110128065-1135-01] (RIN: 0694-AF12) received June 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2603. A letter from the Associate Director, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Libyan Sanctions Regulations, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2604. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Native American Graves and Repatriation Act Regulations — Definition of "Indian tribe" (RIN: 1024-AD98) received June 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

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. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2587. A bill to prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from ordering any employer to close, relocate, or transfer employment under any circumstance; with an amendment (Rep. 112-179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2445. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide States and local educational agencies with maximum flexibility in using Federal funds provided under such Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEBSTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 370. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1938) to direct the President to expedite the consideration and approval of the construction and operation of the Keystone XL oil pipeline, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-181). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 2631. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to prohibit the use of certain anti-competitive forward contracts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. DENT, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 2632. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for life sciences research; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2633. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify the time limits for appeals in civil cases to which United States officers or employees are parties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 2634. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to provide assistance for certain individuals affected by exposure to Agent Orange and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enhance the availability of medical care for descendants of veterans of the Vietnam era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2635. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to suspend the Presidential \$1 Coin Program when coin stockpiles are sufficient to meet the needs for one year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 2636. A bill to authorize depository institutions, depository institution holding companies, Fannie Mae, and Freddie Mac to lease foreclosed property held by such enti-

ties for up to 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. CHU (for herself and Mr. LOEBACK):

H.R. 2637. A bill to strengthen student achievement and graduation rates and prepare young people for college, careers, and citizenship through innovative partnerships that meet the comprehensive needs of children and youth; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 2638. A bill to authorize the adjustment of status for immediate family members of individuals who served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Afghanistan and Iraq conflicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. ACK-

ERMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRUJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINCHAY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STARK, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 2639. A bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. OLVER):

H.R. 2640. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at

462 Washington Street in Woburn, Massachusetts, as the "Officer John Maguire Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2641. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey real property, including improvements, of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in Ketchikan, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BIGGERT:

H. Res. 368. A resolution requesting return of official papers on H.R. 1309; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. TERRY:

H. Res. 369. A resolution to state the belief of the House of Representatives that the President and the Secretary of the Treasury have the authority to choose the order in which to pay obligations of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H. Res. 371. A resolution expressing support for designation of a "Hear My Cry Day" in schools across the United States; to the Committee on 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 Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 2631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: [The Congress shall have Power] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 2632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 2633.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 9 and clause 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 2634.

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. POLIS:

H.R. 2635.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5

The Congress shall have Power to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 2636.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).
By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 2637.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States of America, the authority to enact this legislation rests with the Congress.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 2638.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2639.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2640.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2641.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 24: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HARPER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ISSA, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 49: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 87: Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
H.R. 114: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 136: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 176: Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 210: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. HECK.
H.R. 303: Mr. WEST.
H.R. 361: Mr. HALL.
H.R. 371: Mr. HURT, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RIGELL, and Mrs. ADAMS.
H.R. 376: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 402: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 420: Mr. PENCE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 431: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 440: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 451: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 452: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. REED, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 459: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 546: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 574: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 583: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. STARK, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BARROW, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 645: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 664: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 680: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 687: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 688: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 711: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 719: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 721: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 735: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 743: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 835: Mr. WEST.
H.R. 886: Mr. SCALISE, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 959: Mr. HULTGREN and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1041: Mr. BOREN and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1058: Mr. QUAYLE.
H.R. 1154: Mr. ROHRBACHER.
H.R. 1195: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1206: Mr. MARINO and Mr. HALL.
H.R. 1219: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1283: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. WEST.
H.R. 1291: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 1311: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 1331: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1342: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 1348: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 1351: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 1358: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1386: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 1394: Ms. LEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1397: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 1461: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 1464: Mr. MORAN and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1465: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1466: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1479: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1489: Mr. FILNER and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 1505: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1558: Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 1588: Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 1666: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 1681: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1697: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 1754: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 1815: Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 1817: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 1845: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 1852: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. RUNYAN, and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 1855: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1865: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 1897: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 1959: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 1981: Mr. STARK and Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 1995: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2005: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
H.R. 2016: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2025: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 2028: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 2032: Mr. HERGER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 2069: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2086: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 2092: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 2107: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2140: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 2146: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 2164: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 2189: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2210: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr.

DEFAZIO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 2217: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 2247: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2250: Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 2304: Mr. MICA.
H.R. 2310: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 2324: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 2337: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HOLT, Ms. BASS of California, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JONES, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2362: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2397: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2402: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 2407: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2414: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 2429: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 2433: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 2443: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 2449: Ms. MOORE, Mr. STARK, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2453: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 2457: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 2469: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 2492: Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WEST, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2497: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 2524: Mr. HONDA and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2530: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 2534: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 2541: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 2543: Mr. FILNER and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2544: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 2559: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2576: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 2581: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. RIVERA.
H.R. 2587: Mr. HARPER and Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 2594: Mr. FILNER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 2597: Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 2600: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 2605: Mr. HECK and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.J. Res. 8: Ms. NORTON.
H.J. Res. 13: Mr. HALL.
H.J. Res. 41: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.J. Res. 69: Mr. NEAL.
H.J. Res. 73: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
H. Con. Res. 4: Ms. NORTON.
H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H. Res. 60: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H. Res. 134: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H. Res. 207: Mr. PLATTS.
H. Res. 295: Ms. DELAURO.
H. Res. 304: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
H. Res. 361: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FARR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WATERS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H. Res. 364: Mr. WOLF, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WEST, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr.

STARK, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. AMASH

AMENDMENT No. 4: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION FOR NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA PERFORMING ARTS PROGRAM

SEC. _____. None of the amounts made available in the Act may be used for the National Capital Area Performing Arts Program.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. AMASH

AMENDMENT No. 5: Page 14, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$2,206,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,206,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. SULLIVAN

AMENDMENT No. 6: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. No funds made available by this Act may be used to implement—

(1) the decision of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled “Partial Grant and Partial Denial of Clean Air Act Waiver Application Submitted by Growth Energy To Increase the Allowable Ethanol Content of Gasoline to 15 Percent” published in the Federal Register on November 4, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 68093 et seq.); or

(2) the decision of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled “Partial Grant of Clean Air Act Waiver Application Submitted by Growth Energy To Increase the Allowable Ethanol Content of Gasoline to 15 Percent” published in the Federal Register on January 26, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 4662 et seq.).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. HUELSKAMP

AMENDMENT No. 7: Page 2, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$70,000,000)”.

Page 4, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,880,000)”.

Page 8, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$85,000,000)”.

Page 9, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$11,804,000)”.

Page 10, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$15,047,000)”.

Page 10, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,000,000)”.

Page 10, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$120,000)”.

Page 14, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$9,000,000)”.

Page 15, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$32,000,000)”.

Page 32, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$75,000,000)”.

Page 39, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$47,000,000)”.

Page 65, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$150,000,000)”.

Page 65, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$900,000,000)”.

Page 66, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$16,000,000)”.

Page 68, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$771,000,000)”.

Page 76, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$78,000,000)”.

Page 78, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,500,000)”.

Page 88, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$432,000,000)”.

Page 96, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$9,000,000)”.

Page 103, line 14, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,000,000)”.

Page 105, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$135,000,000)”.

Page 105, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$135,000,000)”.

Page 105, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$125,000,000)”.

Page 105, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 105, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$8,000,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,231,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. FLORES

AMENDMENT No. 8: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. BURGESS

AMENDMENT No. 9: 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 Environmental Protection Agency to, pursuant to section 211 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545), register, or consider registration of, a fuel that contains greater than 10 volume percent ethanol.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. BURGESS

AMENDMENT No. 10: 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 Environmental Protection Agency to register, or consider registration of, a fuel pursuant to—

(1) the decision of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled “Partial Grant and Partial Denial of Clean Air Act Waiver Application Submitted by Growth Energy To Increase the Allowable Ethanol Content of Gasoline to 15 Percent” published in the Federal Register on November 4, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 68094 et seq.); or

(2) the decision of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled “Partial Grant of Clean Air Act Waiver Application Submitted by Growth Energy To Increase the Allowable Ethanol Content of Gasoline to 15 Percent” published in the Federal Register on January 26, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 4662 et seq.).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. CARTER

AMENDMENT No. 11: Page 15, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$11,000,000) (increased by \$11,000,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 12: Page 105, line 18, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$2,510,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$2,510,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 13: Page 105, line 18, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$13,500,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$13,500,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 14: Page 101, line 10, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$55,624,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$55,624,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. BERG

AMENDMENT No. 15: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to promulgate, implement, administer, or enforce a Federal implementation plan under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) that imposes any standard or requirement to address regional haze pursuant to subpart P of part 51 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to protection of visibility).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. LATHAM

AMENDMENT No. 16: 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 Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to finalize or implement any rule-making under section 308 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1318) pertaining to a settlement agreement related to the case captioned “National Pork Producers Council v. EPA, No. 08-61093” or “NRDC v. EPA, No. 09-60510”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 17: Page 4, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$4,880,000)”.

Page 10, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$15,047,000)”.

Page 15, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$18,294,000)”.

Page 78, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$12,500,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$_____)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 18: Page 76, line 2, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$20,860,800)”.

Page 158, line 25, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$20,860,800)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. LANDRY

AMENDMENT No. 19: 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 pay the salary of individuals appointed to their current position through, or otherwise carry out, paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 5503(a) of title 5, United States Code.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSAR

AMENDMENT No. 20: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION RELATED TO BORDER PATROL ACTIVITIES

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to enforce any regulation that would impede or obstruct the United States Border Patrol from patrol activities on Federal lands.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSAR

AMENDMENT No. 21: Page 31, line 3, strike “not”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 22: Page 4, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$4,880,000)”.

Page 10, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$15,047,000)”.

Page 15, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$18,294,000)”.

Page 78, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$12,500,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$50,721,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MS. RICHARDSON

AMENDMENT No. 23: Page 66, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 68, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 68, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. FARENTHOLD

AMENDMENT No. 24: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION RELATED TO SPEED LIMIT REDUCTION IN PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used issue a preliminary rule or a final rule, or to take any other action to reduce the legal speed limit in Padre Island National Seashore.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. FARENTHOLD

AMENDMENT No. 25: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. No funds made available by this Act may be used on any activity interfering with States’ efforts to regulate the energy recovery technology known as hydraulic fracturing by making recommendations that apply national solutions to unique State or regional issues, including well construction and disclosure.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. LANDRY

AMENDMENT No. 26: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION RELATED TO REGULATION OF OFFSHORE SERVICE CONTRACTORS

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to regulate non-lease holders under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 331 et seq.).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

AMENDMENT No. 27: 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 Environmental Protection Agency for grants to foreign governments or organizations.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 28: 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 Environmental Protection Agency to prohibit the use of sulfur dioxide for agricultural purposes, including for the control of insect pests in harvested and processed foods and in food handling and processing facilities.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 29: 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 Environmental Protection Agency for grants for programs, projects, or activities outside the United States.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. ROSS OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT No. 30: 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 conduct aerial surveys of any facility in the State of Florida in Polk county or Hillsborough county that is listed in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. AUSTIN SCOTT OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 31: Page 103, line 14, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$1,660,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$1,660,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. AUSTIN SCOTT OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 32: Page 32, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,507,550)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$12,507,550)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. AUSTIN SCOTT OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 33: 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 climate change research, activities, or programs.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. TERRY

AMENDMENT No. 34: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to pay attorneys fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act (5 U.S.C. 504; 28 U.S.C. 2412) that arise out of any administrative proceeding or civil action in which the party commencing the proceeding or action would suffer no economic loss as a result of not prevailing in the proceeding or action.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. HUELSKAMP

AMENDMENT No. 35: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 6XX. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide grants to the People’s Republic of China.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. HUELSKAMP

AMENDMENT No. 36: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION RELATED TO THE HERITAGE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Heritage Partnership Program.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. HUELSKAMP

AMENDMENT No. 37: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 6XX. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide assistance to the Government of the People’s Republic of China.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. POMPEO

AMENDMENT No. 38: Page 127, line 25, strike “from manure management systems”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. POMPEO

AMENDMENT No. 39: Page 65, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$6,246,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$6,246,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. POMPEO

AMENDMENT No. 40: 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 enforce the requirements of section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)) against a refiner (as defined in section 80.1142(a)(1) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations) for operations conducted in 2012 fiscal year.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSAR

AMENDMENT No. 41: Page 76, lines 10 and 13, insert after each dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 80, line 1, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. NUGENT

AMENDMENT No. 42: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION RELATED TO ESTABLISHING A MANATEE REFUGE IN FLORIDA

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or finalize the proposed rule published in the Federal Register on June 22, 2011, at 76 Fed. Reg. 36493 (related to Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Proposed Rule To Establish a Manatee Refuge in Kings Bay, Citrus County, Florida).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. REED

AMENDMENT No. 43: Page 108, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,000,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$12,000,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. REED

AMENDMENT No. 44: Page 32, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$8,291,000)”.

Page 76, line 2, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$8,291,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. POSEY

AMENDMENT No. 45: At the end of the bill (before the short title) add the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior for any oil or gas preleasing, leasing, or related activities for any area of the Outer Continental Shelf located within 25 miles of the State of Florida.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. POSEY

AMENDMENT No. 46: At the end of the bill (before the short title) add the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior for any new oil or gas preleasing, leasing, drilling, or related activities using facilities that are visible from shore for any area of the Outer Continental Shelf located within 25 miles of the State of Florida.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 47: Page 14, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 32, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$2,500,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 48: Page 14, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,500,000)”.

Page 32, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$2,500,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS
AMENDMENT No. 49: Page 14, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 32, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$3,000,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS
AMENDMENT No. 50: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470) or the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-333).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS
AMENDMENT No. 51: Page 32, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 76, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$4,000,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS
AMENDMENT No. 52: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of sections 405(b) or 410(b) of Public Law 101-593.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 25, 2011

No. 112

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, a Senator from the State of Delaware.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O, God, You are our God. Our thirsty souls seek You. Lord, we look to You for help, longing to see Your power and might because Your loving kindness is better than life.

Guide our Senators. Conform their lives more and more to fulfill Your purposes, using them as instruments of good in a challenging world. May they yield themselves to Your Spirit that Your promised kingdom of truth and righteousness may become the kingdom of all humanity.

Lord, today as we remember the 1998 U.S. Capitol shooting tragedy, we pause to thank You for the sacrifice of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable CHRISTOPHER A. COONS 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. INOUE).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 25, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, a Senator from the State of Delaware, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. COONS thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following any leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 4:30 this afternoon. At 3:40 p.m., the Senate will conduct a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson of the U.S. Capital Police who were killed 13 years ago defending this Capitol against an armed intruder.

At 4:30 p.m., the Senate will be in executive session to consider the nomination of Paul Englemayer to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York and Ramona Manglona to be District Judge for the Northern Mariana Islands.

At 5:30 p.m., there will be a rollcall vote on confirmation of the Englemayer nomination. The Manglona nomination is expected to be confirmed by voice vote.

Additional rollcall votes are possible this evening.

OFFICERS JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND JOHN M. GIBSON

Mr. REID. Mr. President, every day people from across this great Nation around the globe come here to visit the Capitol—to see the seat of American democracy. Every day, those of us who are fortunate to have been elected by our home States to serve in Congress

also come here to represent this Nation and the American people in that democracy. Every day a brave and dedicated group of men and women come here to serve as Capitol police officers, to ensure that whether we are here to work or to visit, we are safe from harm. In 1998, two of those dedicated police officers gave their lives protecting this Capitol and the people in this Capitol. They were Special Agent John Gibson and Officer Jacob Chestnut. Thirteen years ago yesterday, a man entered the House side of the Capitol building with a gun, shot officer Chestnut at point-blank range.

Agent Gibson warned tourists and staff to take cover and then confronted the gunman. Although Agent Gibson was also shot, he prevented anyone else from being killed. Both officers died that day. They served a combined 36 years on the force, protecting their fellow men and women.

When I first came to Washington, I worked the night shift—the swing shift—as a Capitol police officer. That is why I feel a particular closeness to the Capitol police. When I worked, I was never in danger. I was never called on to put my life on the line. I only hope I would have shown the bravery Agent Gibson and Officer Chestnut displayed that afternoon they were killed.

I was a Member of the Senate when Agent Gibson and Officer Chestnut gave their lives to save the lives of others. I know nothing can make up for the loss of a cherished loved one. We hope their families and friends take some comfort in knowing those of us who were here that day hold them in our memories and in our hearts. While I know it is little solace to their families, the tragedy of that day made the Capitol a safer place. It led to the construction of the Capitol Visitor Center which prevents a madman such as the one who shot Agent Gibson and Officer Chestnut from entering the Capitol. We are all grateful for their sacrifice, and we are grateful that every day devoted

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4855

men and women like them guard these hallowed halls.

BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, some of those dedicated police officers stood guard Saturday and Sunday as we worked to reach an agreement to avert a default on our national debt. Leaders in both parties were here throughout the weekend. Differences still separate our two sides, but work toward an agreement continues.

This afternoon I will put on the floor a proposal that I hope will break that impasse. This legislation would put to rest the specter of default. It would cut \$2.7 trillion from the deficit over the next decade. It would not raise any new revenue or make any cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, or Social Security. All the cuts included in this package have previously been supported by Republicans. The proposal provides everything the House Republicans have said they needed from an agreement to avert default and cut the deficit. I hope my colleagues on the other side will still know a good deal when they see it. I hope they will remember how to say yes.

The tea-party-led House of Representatives has held up a resolution of these negotiations for weeks because they did not want oil companies, corporations that ship jobs overseas, and millionaires and billionaires in their corporate jets to pay their fair share. If they now oppose an agreement that meets every one of their demands, it will be because they have put politics first and the good of this Nation and the economy last.

I hope they will not continue to insist on the kind of short-term fix they opposed a few short weeks ago, and they know Democrats in the Senate will not pass and President Obama will not sign.

Economists have already said a short-term solution is no solution at all. It will not give the markets the certainty they need. The credit rating agencies have said a short-term Band-Aid could have many of the same effects of default: downgrade of U.S. debt, soaring interest rates, and an effective tax increase for every American family and business.

The financial markets do not trust the rightwing tea-party-led House of Representatives. They do not believe they should hold this process hostage, and they do not want them to do it again in 6 months. We need to make the right decision now, and we need to do it because the economy is on the line.

This is what one market analyst said about a plan to avert for only a few months. "From the markets' point of view, a two-stage plan is a nonstarter because we now know it is amateur hour on Capitol Hill and we don't want to be painted in this corner again."

The markets need certainty; America needs certainty; the world needs cer-

tainty; and an agreement that provides that certainty is within our grasp. Democrats have done more than just meet Republicans in the middle. We have met them all the way. Now we will see whether Republicans are against any agreement at all or whether they remember how to say yes when the compromise on the table gives them everything they have demanded.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATHS OF J.J. CHESTNUT AND JOHN GIBSON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as visitors walk through the Capitol for the first time, they eventually come across a plaque near one of the entrances on the East Front that memorializes an event which took place 13 years ago yesterday.

It was 13 years ago that Officers Jacob Joseph Chestnut and Detective John Michael Gibson made the ultimate sacrifice to protect all who were working and visiting the Capitol on that Friday afternoon.

And every year at this time, we take a moment to step back from our work, put aside our differences, and remember these good men whose sacrifice stands as a permanent reminder of the debt we owe to them, and to all those who continue to put themselves on the front line every day to defend the rest of us—from the Capitol Police force, to local law enforcement officials, to those serving overseas.

America has always been blessed to have men and women rise up in every generation who are willing to put their Nation ahead of their lives. Today, we honor two in particular who did so in this building. Officer Chestnut was a 20-year veteran of the Air Force, a loving husband, and a father of five.

Detective Gibson had served 3 years on Congressman Tom DeLay's protective detail. Both had served 18 years on the Capitol Police force. A friend of Detective Gibson's recalled shortly after the shooting that just a few days before, John told him he had never had to draw his weapon on the job. Yet despite being mortally wounded on the day he died, John did not hesitate to return fire, wounding the intruder. Calling upon his instincts and training, Detective Gibson's actions saved many lives that day.

Officer Chestnut and Detective Gibson exemplify the best America has to

offer. And that is why we honor them here today.

My friend the majority leader is a former Capitol Police officer. He understands more than anyone in this Chamber the honor and dedication, as well as the risks associated with the job. I know he joins me in honoring Jacob Joseph Chestnut and John Michael Gibson, as well as all Capitol Police who put their lives on the line every day to protect us and this institution.

To all members of the Capitol Police force: thank you for your service and your professionalism. Your duties do not go unnoticed. And on this day that we remember Officer Chestnut and Detective Gibson, I would also like to take a moment to remember the families of these good men who have been so deeply affected by this tragedy. Our prayers continue to go out to them. May God continue to protect them as their loved ones protected us.

BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to say a few words now about the ongoing debt ceiling discussions.

I think the American people can be excused for being a little confused at this point as to what is going on here in Washington and a little bit frustrated. I am too, frankly.

There is no reason in the world that the American people should have had to wake up this morning unsure of whether Washington was going to resolve this problem.

Candidly, as of Saturday afternoon, I had no doubt that a solution was at hand.

That is just what we did. We came together in good faith and decided to do the right thing. Everyone agrees default wasn't an option, so we put together a responsible proposal that prevented default while reducing Washington spending.

Republicans and, yes, some Democrats, have been clear for months that tax hikes couldn't be part of the package. We have also been clear that serious cuts would have to be part of any package.

So taking all this into consideration, the responsible path forward was clear to everyone: a plan that avoided default and required additional savings before any further increase in the debt ceiling.

Leaders from both parties in both Houses agreed this was the right path forward legislatively. The only thing to do at that point was to present this bipartisan solution to the President.

What was the President's response? Unfortunately, to demand the largest single debt increase in history, \$½ trillion more than the previous biggest increase Democrats approved 2 years ago when they controlled both Congress and the White House.

This was the President's justification, as he put it on Friday:

The only bottom line I have is that we have to extend the debt ceiling through the next election, into 2013.

That is a direct quote from the President of the United States. There is absolutely no economic justification for insisting on a debt limit increase that brings us through the next election. It is not the beginning of a fiscal year. It is not the beginning of a calendar year. Based on his own words, it is hard to conclude that this request has to do with anything, in fact, other than the President's reelection.

Look, Congress has raised the Federal debt limit 62 times since 1972. The average length of an increase over that period is just over 7 months. But now the President says it has to be nearly 2 years. Why? So he can continue to spend as he pleases.

This weekend, we offered the President a bipartisan proposal to avoid default so we could have the time we need to put together a serious plan for getting our house in order, and he rejected it out of hand—not for economic reasons, understand, but, as he put it, “to extend this debt ceiling through the next election.”

Time is running out. With all due respect to the President, we have more important issues to worry about than getting through the next election.

A bipartisan plan to resolve this crisis was literally within our reach this weekend. The President has to know this approach is the responsible path forward, and we ought to put it back on the table.

Congressional leaders of both parties have shown they are willing to work in good faith. I suggest the President reconsider their offer rather than veto the country into default.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will now be in a period of morning business until 4:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

NORWAY TERRORIST ATTACK

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise to share my deepest sympathies for the people of Norway who, as my colleagues know, experienced a despicable terrorist act this past Friday, July 22.

In the Senate, I represent the State of Minnesota. It is a State that has the largest number of people of Norwegian heritage outside the country of Norway itself.

The influence of Norwegian culture can be found throughout our State, and the bonds between Norway and Minnesota continue to be incredibly strong

to this day. That is why the shock of Friday's violence hit us so close to home.

This past weekend, I joined Minnesotans and the whole world in offering our country's prayers and sympathy to the people of Norway. I attended a memorial service at the Mindekirke Norwegian Lutheran Memorial Church in Minneapolis, where hundreds of people of Norwegian heritage gathered to go to mourn their loss.

It is especially heartbreaking that a mass murder such as this would take place in a country such as Norway. The world knows Norway as a country that is both peaceful and peace-seeking.

After all, Norway is home to the Nobel Peace Prize, and it has offered safe haven to refugees and the politically persecuted from all around the world. It just doesn't make sense.

I am a parent. My daughter is the same age as many of the young people who were at that camp. She was there with our family at the memorial service on Sunday. The kids at this camp were idealistic kids. They were teenagers. They were at the camp because of their interest in their community and in democracy.

It is very hard and very painful even to think about such a cold-blooded attack and the massacre of so many innocent children. It is a kind of terrible tragedy that puts all of us to the test. It tests our resilience, our trust, and our faith.

On Saturday morning, I spoke with Ambassador Strommen, Norway's Ambassador to the United States. I conveyed the deepest sympathies of the people of our State. He assured me that, even though this is a very difficult time, Norway is strong, the Norwegian people are strong, and they will make it through this time of trouble and sorrow.

We will stand by them. But we will also stand against the hate that inspired this action. We are starting to get a sense, over the last 2 days, of what motivated this madman. We know now that while most of the people attacked were native Norwegians, there were also people from other countries, immigrants to Norway, new citizens there.

We all need to remember that my State was originally settled by Norwegians, Swedes, Danes, and Germans, but we also remember there were other waves of immigrants who came too, including Slovenians, such as my relatives, as well as people from Poland, Russia, and most recently in Minnesota the Hmong people have a major presence, as well as people from Somalia. We must remember what made our State, our country, and Norway such vibrant places for democracy is that openness, that freedom, and it is that tolerance.

I reminded my friends at the Norwegian church on Sunday morning of something President Clinton actually said after the Oklahoma City bombing, when he spoke at that memorial. He said this:

Let us let our own children know that we will stand against the forces of fear. When there is talk of hatred, let us stand up and talk against it. When there is talk of violence, let us stand up and talk against it.

I call on my colleagues to stand true to those words. We will continue to confront the forces of fear and hatred with that same spirit of faith, tolerance, and good will. Let us continue to stand strong in support of our allies and friends in Norway. Today, our thoughts and prayers are with them.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, let me associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota. My wife and I traveled to Oslo, Norway, a few years ago and were deeply touched by the hospitality of the people there and the peacefulness of the country. It is almost too much to bear to think about what they have gone through as a result of this recent tragedy. I appreciate her remarks.

REMEMBRANCE OF FALLEN OFFICERS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, the majority and minority leaders talked about the sacrifice of two of our Capitol police officers who died in the line of duty protecting people here at the Capitol and our remembrance of them on this day. The Chaplain also prayed that we remember their sacrifice.

I think it is important for us to pause in circumstances such as this, especially when we are involved in such deeply divided discussions about the issues of the day that confront us.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I also thought it interesting that, regarding the issues we are debating that so deeply divide us, a Wall Street Journal op-ed today appeared, which is one of those rare times when the author puts into a much larger perspective, a more cosmic perspective, what we are talking about and puts it in moral terms—long-term moral terms—rather than just Democrats versus Republicans and the fight of the day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD after my remarks. It is written by Arthur C. Brooks and is called “The Debt Ceiling and the Pursuit of Happiness.”

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KYL. Arthur Brooks is the head of AEI, American Enterprise Institute, and he has written on the subject of happiness in our country and how we get there. His most recent book is called “The Battle: How the Fight Between Free Enterprise and Big Government Will Shape America's Future.”

His theme in this article was similar to the one in the book, which is that

we have the system we have because Americans have found that it is a system which most leads us to the pursuit of happiness, the achievement of success, and things that are important in our lives. He talks about the fight we are engaged in now about extending the debt ceiling as being a fight against 50-year trends toward statism, which he identifies as a state that would be very disappointing to Americans, where we would not have the ability to pursue our dreams or the same opportunity we have today to be successful if we take risks and to utilize the full potential of the free market system.

He says, "Consider a few facts," and this is the one thing I will quote from his article:

The Bureau of Economic Analysis tells us that total government spending at all levels has risen to 37 percent of the gross domestic product today from 27 percent in 1960—and is set to reach 50 percent by 2038. The Tax Foundation reports that between 1986 and 2008, the share of Federal income taxes paid by the top 5 percent of earners has risen to 59 percent from 43 percent. Between 1986 and 2009, the percentage of Americans who paid zero or negative Federal income taxes has increased to 51 percent from 18.5 percent. And all this is accompanied by an increase in our national debt to 100 percent of gross domestic product today from 42 percent in 1980.

All of these, obviously, portend a trend toward statism, toward the funding of the state through increased taxation by fewer and fewer people but at a greater and greater amount of money. In his view and in mine, it will ultimately reduce the kinds of incentives that the free market system provides for Americans to be able to earn and hire others and to assist our economy to grow and, in the process, to increase our standard of living.

This is one of the reasons why Republicans have been so focused on reducing spending as the solution to the problem we face in Washington today. Our problem is not that we don't tax Americans enough; our problem is that we spend too much here in Washington. That is manifested by the statistic that now we are spending almost 25 percent of the GDP. We were up to 25, and we are headed back up there. Yet just 3 short years ago, we were at the average level of spending in our country of about 20 percent of GDP. So spending has skyrocketed in the last 3 years.

If a physician is wanting to treat a patient's condition, the physician diagnoses the patient for what is wrong and then treats that illness. What is wrong with us today is that Washington spending is out of control. That is the diagnosis. What is the treatment? The treatment is not to pile more taxes onto an already sick economy. The treatment is to reduce the amount of government spending.

That is what Republicans have urged us to do. The American people, fortunately, are in the same place.

I will cite three surveys that make the point. One of them is a Rasmussen survey, just reported July 22, of likely voters in the country. It asks the ques-

tion: Would you fear that the debt deal would raise taxes too much or too little? Would you fear that the debt deal will cut spending too little or cut spending too much?

The answer was interesting. Among likely voters, the answer is this: 62 percent of voters believe the deal will raise taxes too much. Only 26 percent think we will raise taxes too little.

On the spending side, 56 percent are afraid it will cut spending too little. Only 25 percent think it will cut spending too much.

We can see the American people are with us here. They understand our problem is spending, not taxes. They are worried we are not going to reduce spending enough and that, in fact, we are going to increase taxes too much. Rasmussen had already done a survey a week before of likely voters. It asked: Do you favor including a tax hike in the deal?

This was interesting. Fifty-five percent of voters said no. Only 34 percent of likely voters said yes. So the majority, by far, is saying don't include a tax hike in the deal. Again, they understand what the problem is: It is not taxes, it is spending.

CNN had a poll a few days before that, and the question—there were several questions in the poll, but the one that struck my eye asked about raising the debt ceiling only if we also cut spending, cap it at certain levels, and pass a balanced budget amendment. That is the so-called cut, cap, and balance proposal that passed the House of Representatives but was tabled by our Democratic colleagues here in the Senate last week. CNN reports that by a 2-to-1 margin the American people thought we should cut, cap, and balance—66 percent favored, only 33 percent opposed.

It is interesting to me the American people have internalized the same thing as we Republicans; and probably the reason Republicans are expressing this is because we have been listening to our constituents who have been telling us this. Our concern is not that we should raise taxes; our concern is that we should cut spending. That is why we have been saying what we have been saying here.

I find it interesting even the President himself—in an earlier time—shared the same sentiment. In August of 2009 he made a similar point. In December of last year, when the tax rates that have been in existence for decades were extended for another 2 years, he said: You don't raise taxes in a recession. He is exactly right. And, by the way, at the time he said that, growth in the quarter was at about 6 percent of GDP. Today, growth is less than 2 percent of GDP. So our economic situation has gotten worse since then. We are up to 9.2 percent unemployment. Obviously, you don't raise taxes in a recession. When you have a bad economic condition, the worst medicine is to raise taxes.

Another point Republicans have been trying to make with regard to this dif-

ference between raising taxes or reducing spending is that usually a couple of things happen when Congress sets out to do this. You get the permanent increases in taxes, but you never get the same dollar for dollar or \$2 or \$3 for \$1 that you are promised in reductions in spending. Moreover, when you aim at hitting the millionaires and billionaires—which is usually the excuse for raising taxes—you end up hitting a lot of other folks.

One of the things we are concerned about is exactly what happened with the alternative minimum tax. We tried to make sure 128 specific millionaires didn't get out of paying taxes because of deductions and credits they could take, and so we put into effect the alternative minimum tax. Today, the alternative minimum tax affects 25 million Americans. So when you aim at the millionaires, you hit everybody else. In fact, that is exactly what would happen under the proposal of the President today.

The President says we need to hit the millionaires and billionaires. Well, there are 319,000 American households that report incomes of over \$1 million a year, but there are 3.6 million other households that would be affected in the same way by the President's tax increase because they are also in the top two income tax brackets. So when you raise the top two brackets, you are not just going to hit the millionaires and billionaires, you are also going to hit a lot of other Americans who don't report incomes of over \$1 million a year.

Probably the primary reason Republicans have argued we should not be raising taxes in this bad economic time is that it is a job killer. This is illustrated by many things, one of which is the President's own Small Business Administration. One of the taxes the President has proposed hiking would hit small businesses especially hard. According to the Office of Advocacy of the Obama Small Business Administration, this tax "could ultimately force many small businesses to close." Why would you impose a tax on small businesses that could ultimately force many of them to close? It is the wrong medicine for a sick economy.

In addition to the fact we always end up hitting a lot more than the millionaires and billionaires, and that taxes are forever but the savings never quite seem to materialize, the most important point here is that raising taxes is a job killer. Two-thirds of all the jobs coming out of a recession are in the small business sector. Fifty-four percent of all jobs in the country are created by small business.

Republicans are going to continue to push for reductions in spending as the way forward here, and I hope during this next week we will be able to get together with our House colleagues, and Republicans and Democrats alike will be able to at least rally around one thing we can all agree on: spending has to be reduced. If later on we need to have discussions about tax reform, that

is a debate I think all of us wish to have. Our Tax Code needs reforming. But let's do that not in the context of raising revenues but rather in the context of making it a Tax Code that would enable us to grow more. At the end of the day, that is what we should all be for. Because a growing pie means there is more for everyone—rich and poor alike—the families of America as well as the governments. I hope my colleagues will focus on what the American people are telling us through these surveys: Let's reduce spending, not increase taxes.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 25, 2011]

THE DEBT CEILING AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS

(By Arthur C. Brooks)

The battle over the debt ceiling is only the latest skirmish in what promises to be an ongoing, exhausting war over budget issues. Americans can be forgiven for seeing the whole business as petty, selfish and tiresome. Conservatives in particular are beginning to worry that public patience will wear thin over their insistence that our nation's government-spending problem must be remedied through spending cuts, not by raising more revenues.

But before they succumb to too much caution, budget reformers need to remember three things. First, this is not a political fight between Republicans and Democrats; it is a fight against 50-year trends toward statism. Second, it is a moral fight, not an economic one. Third, this is not a fight that anyone can win in the 15 months from now to the presidential election. It will take hard work for at least a decade.

Consider a few facts. The Bureau of Economic Analysis tells us that total government spending at all levels has risen to 37% of gross domestic product today from 27% in 1960—and is set to reach 50% by 2038. The Tax Foundation reports that between 1986 and 2008, the share of federal income taxes paid by the top 5% of earners has risen to 59% from 43%. Between 1986 and 2009, the percentage of Americans who pay zero or negative federal income taxes has increased to 51% from 18.5%. And all this is accompanied by an increase in our national debt to 100% of GDP today from 42% in 1980.

Where will it all lead? Some despairing souls have concluded there are really only two scenarios. In one, we finally hit a tipping point where so few people actually pay for their share of the growing government that a majority become completely invested in the social welfare state, which stabilizes at some very high level of taxation and government social spending. (Think Sweden.)

In the other scenario, our welfare state slowly collapses under its weight, and we get some kind of permanent austerity after the rest of the world finally comprehends the depth of our national spending disorder and stops lending us money at low interest rates. (Think Greece.)

In other words: Heads, the statist win; tails, we all lose.

Anyone who seeks to provide serious national political leadership today—those elected in 2010 or who seek national office in 2012—owe Americans a plan to escape having to make this choice. We need tectonic changes, not minor fiddling.

Rep. Paul Ryan's (R., Wis.) budget plan is the kind of model necessary. But structural change will only succeed if it's accompanied by a moral argument—an unabashed cultural defense of the free enterprise system that helps Americans remember why they love their country and its exceptional culture.

America's Founders knew the importance of moral language, which is why they asserted our unalienable right to the pursuit of happiness, not to the possession of property. Similarly, Adam Smith, the father of free-market economics, had a philosophy that transcended the mere wealth of nations. His greatest book was "The Theory of Moral Sentiments," a defense of a culture that could support true freedom and provide the greatest life satisfaction.

Yet today, it is progressives, not free marketeers, who use the language of morality. President Obama was not elected because of his plans about the taxation of repatriated profits, or even his ambition to reform health care. He was elected largely on the basis of language about hope and change, and a "fairer" America.

The irony is that statisticians have a more materialistic philosophy than free-enterprise advocates. Progressive solutions to cultural problems always involve the tools of income redistribution, and call it "social justice."

Free-enterprise advocates, on the other hand, speak privately about freedom and opportunity for everybody—including the poor. Most support a limited safety net, but also believe that succeeding on our merits, doing something meaningful, and having responsibility for our own affairs are what give us the best life. Sadly, in public, they always seem stuck in the language of economic efficiency.

The result is that year after year we slip further down the redistributionist road, dissatisfied with the growing welfare state, but with no morally satisfying arguments to make a change that entails any personal sacrifice.

Examples are all around us. It is hard to find anyone who likes our nation's current health-care policies. But do you seriously expect grandma to sit idly by and let Republicans experiment with her Medicare coverage so her great-grandchildren can get better treatment for carried interest? Not a chance.

If reformers want Americans to embrace real change, every policy proposal must be framed in terms of self-realization, meritocratic fairness and the promise of a better future. Why do we want to lower taxes for entrepreneurs? Because we believe in earned success. Why do we care about economic growth? To make individual opportunity possible, not simply to increase wealth. Why do we need entitlement reform? Because it is wrong to steal from our children.

History shows that big moral struggles can be won, but only when they are seen as decade-long fights and not just as a way to prevail in the next election. Welfare reform was first proposed in 1984 and regarded popularly as a nonstarter. Twelve years of hard work by scholars at my own institution and others helped make it a mainstream idea (signed into law by a Democratic president) and perhaps the best policy for helping the poor to escape poverty in our nation's history. Political consultants would have abandoned welfare reform as unworkably audacious and politically suicidal. Real leaders understood that its moral importance transcended short-term politics.

No one deserves our political support today unless he or she is willing to work for as long as it takes to win the moral fight to steer our nation back toward enterprise and self-governance. This fight will not be easy or politically safe. But it will be a happy one: to share the values that make us proud to be Americans.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. 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.

MOMENT OF SILENCE TO HONOR OFFICER JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson of the U.S. Capitol Police.

(Moment of silence.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for leading the moment of silence we just had for Officer Jacob Chestnut and Detective John Gibson of the U.S. Capitol Police.

It is important to recognize that each and every day the citizens of the United States come to the Capitol. They are able to visit this Chamber and visit the offices of their elected Senators and, across the building, the offices of the Members of the House of Representatives. They are able to do so because the Capitol Police maintain a form of security that gives us this access while at the same time protects the functioning of democracy from the very real threats of a changing world.

So it is appropriate that the east front door was renamed the Memorial Door in honor of Officer Jacob Chestnut and Detective John Gibson and that we take this moment to recognize the service of all of the members of the Capitol Police who not only protect all of those who work here, all of those who legislate here, but all of the citizens of the country who come to advocate for their concerns.

Thank you, Mr. President. I note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF PAUL A. ENGELMAYER TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

NOMINATION OF RAMONA VILLAGOMEZ MANGLONA TO BE JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report:

The bill clerk read the nomination of Paul A. Engelmayer, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York; Ramona Villagomez Manglona, of the Northern Mariana Islands, to be Judge for the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 1 hour for debate on the nominations, equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I understand the vote will be at 5:30; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is debate for 1 hour. If no time is yielded back, the vote will be at 5:36.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will yield back 6 minutes of my time so the vote can begin at 5:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I note the Senate observed a moment of silence for John Gibson and Jacob Chestnut, who were killed in the Capitol in 1998 on July 24. Both were excellent police officers—one uniformed, one plain clothes—in the protective division. My wife and I knew both John Gibson and Jacob Chestnut, and we were at both of their memorial services. Both were fine officers, and I am glad we had a moment of silence.

We sometimes forget that we have a lot of very good police officers, both in the uniform division and the plain clothes division, in this Capitol. They are here to protect us at all times of day or night, no matter what the weather or what the circumstances. It is something we should keep in mind. We often can go home when the session ends, but they are here to make sure everything is still safe. So we owe all of them a debt of gratitude, and I hope all of them will remain safe. It is a tragedy that Officers Gibson and Chestnut were not able to remain safe but died protecting the Capitol.

Today, the Senate is finally going to vote on two judicial nominations reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee in early April.

Let me put that into perspective. Way back when snow was still falling in my State, every single Republican and every single Democrat voted for these two nominees. In past years they would have been confirmed probably in a voice vote that same week in a wrap-up session. For some reason, my friends on the other side think it should be different with a Democratic President than it was for a Republican President, or for that matter, all past Presidents.

Despite the support of every Democrat and every Republican on the Judiciary Committee, the nominations of Paul Engelmayer to fill a judicial emergency vacancy in the Southern District of New York, and Ramona Manglona to fill a 10-year term in the District Court for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, have been stalled for 3½ months on the Senate's Executive Calendar. These are the kinds of qualified, consensus judicial nominations that in past years—whether under President Ford, President Carter, President Reagan, or either of the President Bushes—would have been confirmed promptly rather than being forced to languish for months because of Republican refusal to consent to debate and vote on nominations.

At a time when judicial vacancies remain above 90 throughout this country, these needless delays perpetuate the judicial vacancy crisis that Chief Justice Roberts, a Republican appointee, wrote of last December and that the President, the Attorney General, bar associations and chief judges around the country have urged us to join together to end. Imagine the example we set to litigants by saying: "Well, we can't hear your litigation, no matter how important it is. You are going to have to wait year after year after year because we don't have a judge. We can't get one confirmed." The Senate can do a better job working to ensure the ability of our Federal courts to provide justice to our fellow Americans around the country.

Recently, Chief Judge Moreno of the Southern District of Florida wrote to the Senate leaders urging that they expedite action on two nominations to fill judicial emergency vacancies in that district. Both Kathleen Williams and Robert Scola are among the many judicial nominees who were reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee, yet both are being delayed for no good reason.

Chief Judge Moreno writes:

[T]he judicial shortage with three vacancies in our district is becoming acute. For this reason, I ask your assistance in expediting both confirmations. The Judiciary Committee has found the nominees qualified and the people of South Florida eagerly await their service.

Both of these nominees have the support of their home State Senators—Senator NELSON, a Democrat, and Senator RUBIO, a Republican. The two Senators have set aside partisan actions,

and the Senate Judiciary Committee has set aside partisan actions by voting for the nominees unanimously. Why should they be held up because of partisan actions on this floor?

Kathleen Williams and Robert Scola are among the 27 judicial nominees reviewed by the Judiciary Committee and reported favorably to the Senate for final action who are being stalled. I am glad that we are finally being allowed to consider the 2 nominees who will be confirmed today, but they have been waiting since early April. This is not traditional, and there are still 25 who languish.

This is not how the Senate has acted in years past with other Presidents' judicial nominees. It is not accurate to pretend that real progress is being made in these circumstances. After we have these two votes, we will still have 25 nominees sitting on the calendar who could be disposed of within an hour, yet they are blocked week after week after week. That is not progress. We may be making progress in the committee, but if the nominees are blocked on the floor, it is not progress. Vacancies are being kept high, consensus nominees are being delayed, and it is the American people—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike—that are being made to suffer.

This is another area in which we must come together for the American people. Let us do something for the American people, and not just for our political parties. There is no reason Senators cannot join together to finally bring down the excessive number of vacancies that have persisted in our Federal courts throughout the Nation for far too long. It is not a Republican or Democratic issue, it is an American issue.

Between now and the August recess the Senate should consider all of the judicial nominees ready for a final vote, including those desperately needed in southern Florida backed by Senator NELSON and Senator RUBIO.

I expect the two nominations we are going to consider today will be confirmed overwhelmingly. They are examples of the almost two dozen consensus nominees who are being stalled for no good reason. Mr. Engelmayer is a nominee with unassailable credentials. After receiving his undergraduate and law school degrees with honors from Harvard Law School, Mr. Engelmayer served as a law clerk to Judge Patricia Wald of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and then to Justice Thurgood Marshall on the Supreme Court. He worked as a Federal prosecutor in the Southern District of New York for 9 years, where he climbed the ranks from a young lawyer to become Chief of the Major Crimes Unit. Mr. Engelmayer served for 2 years as an Assistant Solicitor General for the United States. Since 2000, he has been a partner in the law firm WilmerHale, where he practices civil and criminal litigation and regularly dedicates himself to pro bono work. The ABA's

Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary unanimously rated him well qualified to serve, its highest rating. He is supported by his home state Senators.

Ramona Villagomez Manglona is currently an Associate Judge on the Superior Court for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI), having previously served as a Justice Pro Tempore on the Guam Supreme Court and a Judge Pro Tempore on the Guam Superior Court. From 1998 to 2003, she worked in the CNMI Office of the Attorney General in several capacities, including a term as Attorney General. Born in Saipan, Northern Mariana Islands, Judge Manglona earned her B.A. from the University of California, Berkeley and her J.D. from the University of New Mexico. When confirmed, Judge Manglona will be the first indigenous person to serve as a U.S. District Court Judge in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Her confirmation should also save money and help ease the burden on judges who have had to travel to the Pacific from the mainland to provide judicial resources.

I, again, thank Senator GRASSLEY for his cooperation in working with me to make progress in the committee concerning judicial nominations in regular order. We have made progress in the committee, but it goes for naught if we cannot get nominees confirmed on the floor. Our work in the committee has not been matched in the Senate, where agreements to debate and vote on judicial nominations are too few and too far between. These are only the sixth and seventh nominations the Senate has considered in the last 2 months, at a time when vacancies have remained at or above 90, and despite the many consensus nominees that have been voted on in a bipartisan fashion by the committee and are now waiting for a vote on the Senate floor.

These will be only the 13th and 14th nominees confirmed this year who had their hearings this year. The other confirmations were all from the group considered by the Judiciary Committee last year, but were renominated after having had their confirmations delayed unnecessarily last year. Ignoring the words of the Chief Justice and others concerned with the continuing high number of judicial vacancies, Senate Republicans have continued the pattern and practice of delay for virtually all judicial nominees.

In addition to the 2 nominations we consider today, there are currently 25 judicial nominations that have been fully considered by the Judiciary Committee and sent to the Senate for final action. Of them, 20 were unanimously reported, by Republicans and Democrats, without a single negative vote. At the very least, we ought to take up those 20. The two nominations we consider today were reported in April. There remain 13 judicial nominations on the calendar reported favorably by the committee way back in May or ear-

lier, 11 of which were reported unanimously. When I urged the Senate to take up and vote on the many judicial nominations that were on the calendar and ready for action before the Memorial Day recess, Republican Senators would not agree to consider a single one. With almost a score of judicial nominees available to the Senate for final action, only one was considered before the July 4 recess. That is not the way to make real progress.

Regrettably, the Senate has not reduced vacancies as dramatically as we did during the Bush administration. Federal judicial vacancies around the country still number too many, and they have persisted for far too long. Whereas the Democratic majority in the Senate reduced vacancies from 110 to 60 in President Bush's first two years, Senate Republicans' insistence on objections and delays have resulted in judicial vacancies still numbering more than 90 two and a half years into President Obama's term. By now, judicial vacancies should have been reduced to similar levels, but we have barely kept up with attrition.

In fact, the Senate has reversed course during the Obama administration given Republican objections, and the slow pace of confirmations are keeping judicial vacancies at crisis levels. Over the eight years of the Bush administration, from 2001 to 2009, we reduced judicial vacancies from 110 to a low of 34. That has now been reversed, with vacancies staying near or above 90 for the last two years. The vacancy rate—which we reduced from 10 percent to 6 percent by this date in President Bush's third year, and ultimately to less than 4 percent in 2008—is back above 10 percent.

By this time in the third year of the Bush administration, the Senate had confirmed 136 judges. That is over 40 percent more than the number of President Obama's nominees we have been allowed to process to confirmation. We have a long way to go to do as well as we did during President Bush's first term, when we confirmed 205 of his judicial nominations. The Senate confirmed 100 of those judicial nominations during the 17 months I was Chairman during President Bush's first 2 years in office. In the other 31 months, Republicans were able to do another 105. So again, we demonstrated we are ready to work faster with President Bush than even his Republican Senators were—and we certainly worked a lot faster than we have been able to work now. President Obama is now in his 30th month in office and we have only been allowed to consider and confirm 91 of his Federal Circuit and District Court nominees. Compare that to the 100 I did in 17 months for President Bush.

The delays continue, despite the needs of the Federal judiciary, as evidenced by Chief Judge Moreno's recent letter, which I ask unanimous consent to be made part of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEAHY. I would note that the delays in confirmation of President Obama's consensus nominees, nominees agreed to by both Republicans and Democrats, are to the detriment of all Americans. Most people, when they go into court, do not go in as a Republican or Democrat. They are just an American seeking justice. But the courts' doors are now being closed; closed because the Senate will not allow confirmation of the judges who could open those doors. That is wrong. It is a stain on the judiciary, and it is a stain on this body.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA,
Miami, FL, July 21, 2011.

Re Nominations of Kathleen Williams and Robert Scola to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

Senator MITCH MCCONNELL,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: As Chief Judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, I urge you to expedite the Senate's confirmation of Kathleen Williams and Robert Scola to the positions of district judges in our district. I understand that the Judiciary Committee has sent both nominations by unanimous voice vote and is awaiting a vote by the full Senate. Ms. Williams, our district's Federal Public Defender, has been awaiting confirmation for the longest period of any present nominee to the district court in the entire country. State Judge Robert Scola's nomination is of a more recent vintage but the litigants are eagerly awaiting his confirmation.

The judgeship Ms. Williams has been nominated to fill has been vacant for two years! At the present time, our district has three vacancies. Unfilled positions in our Court present an undue hardship on the citizens residing in the Southern District of Florida, particularly those with cases pending in the affected division of the Court. Our district is huge and heavily populated. It includes the most populous counties in Florida, Miami-Dade, Broward (where Fort Lauderdale is located) and Palm Beach Counties. The district also includes Monroe, St. Lucie, Highlands, Okeechobee, Martin, and Indian River Counties.

We have been laboring under a judicial shortage for quite some time. The Judicial Conference of the United States has for the past several years annually recommended to Congress three additional permanent judgeships and to convert one temporary judgeship into a permanent one.

This shortage is exacerbated by the fact that we are one of the busiest district courts in the nation. Our district had 10,556 new filings in both criminal and civil cases in 2010, an increase of 6.7% over the year 2000. The latest national statistics (FY 2010) are attached and show that our district is first in "weighted filings" in the Eleventh Circuit.

In sum, the judicial shortage with three vacancies in our district is becoming acute. For this reason, I ask your assistance in expediting both confirmations. The Judiciary Committee has found the nominees qualified and the people of South Florida eagerly await their service.

Please call me if I can provide any additional information. I thank you in advance

for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

FEDERICO A. MORENO,
Chief U.S. District Judge.

Mr. LEAHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally charged to both parties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote on the nomination of Paul Engelmayer to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York and Ramona Villagomez Manglona to be Judge for the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands. The seat to which Mr. Engelmayer is being considered has been deemed a judicial emergency. With this vote, we will have confirmed 29 article III judicial nominees. Eighteen have been for such judicial emergencies. Ms. Manglona's confirmation vote marks the second article IV judicial confirmation this year. I am pleased we are moving forward with filling two more vacancies.

We continue to make great progress in processing President Obama's judicial nominees. As of today, the Senate has confirmed 60 percent of President Obama's nominees since the beginning of his Presidency. That is not including the two Supreme Court Justices nominated by President Obama. As I am sure my colleagues recall, those nominations consumed a considerable amount of time in the committee and on the Senate floor.

During this Congress, the Judiciary Committee has held hearings on more than 72 percent of the President's nominees. Another hearing is scheduled to take place this Wednesday. During the comparable time period for President Bush, only 64 percent of President Bush's nominees had hearings by this time. We have also reported 64 percent of the judicial nominees, compared to only 56 percent of President Bush's nominees.

Let me say just a few words about Mr. Engelmayer and then Judge Manglona. Mr. Engelmayer graduated summa cum laude from Harvard University in 1983. He then graduated magna cum laude from Harvard Law School in 1987. Following law school, the nominee clerked for Judge Patricia Wald on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and then for Justice Thurgood Marshall of the Supreme Court of the United States.

After his clerkships, Mr. Engelmayer joined the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York as an assistant U.S. attorney. In 1994, he became an assistant to the Solicitor

General of the United States. In 2000, the nominee entered private practice with Wilmer Hale and was later named Partner-in-Charge of the New York office.

The ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary has given Mr. Engelmayer a unanimous "Well Qualified" rating. I support this nomination and congratulate him on his professional accomplishments.

Now I have a few words about Judge Manglona. Judge Manglona received her bachelor of arts degree from the University of California at Berkeley in 1990. In 1996, she graduated from the University of New Mexico School of Law. Following law school, the nominee clerked for the Superior Court of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. She then worked in the Attorney General's Office and in 2002, the Governor appointed her attorney general for the Northern Mariana Islands. In 2003, she was appointed to serve as an associate judge for the Northern Mariana Islands Superior Court. During her time on the superior court, she has also served as a judge pro tem on the Guam Superior Court and the Guam Supreme Court.

The ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary has rated Judge Manglona unanimously "Qualified." I also support this nomination and congratulate her on her professional accomplishments.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. We have an unusual situation. It looks nice outside today. The Sun is shining. But earlier today, if someone looked out the window, we had some violent storms. They are all over the area. We have Senators stuck in airplanes trying to get out of New York. We have one Senator traveling from the Midwest stuck in Richmond, VA, now. I think it would be in everyone's interest—and I apologize to people who worked hard to get back here today—but I think it is in everyone's interest that we not have a vote tonight. We have a lot of people who simply would miss the vote unless we keep it open for a matter of hours. I again apologize to people who came here to vote, but I think this is the best thing to do. I have spoken to the Republican leader and this is what we should do.

I ask unanimous consent the votes scheduled for tonight be vitiated, and that on Tuesday, July 26, at 12:15 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the nominations, Calendar Nos. 83 and 84, that there be 2 minutes for debate, equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on Calendar Nos. 83 and 84, in that order; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the

RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, 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. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each. We will be in morning business until 7 o'clock tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEBT CEILING EXTENSION

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask to speak as in morning business. I certainly will not take 10 minutes that the majority leader has requested because I know the Senator from Alabama is eager to speak. I wish to make sure I understand where we are with regard to the debt ceiling.

I have an article from The Hill, dated yesterday. It points out—it heard the same thing in the speech the rest of the Nation heard when the President spoke—the President said he would be willing to work on any plans lawmakers brought to him over the weekend. The President went on to say:

The only bottom line I have is that we have to extend this debt ceiling through the next election, into 2013.

I ask my colleagues what does the election of 2012 have to do with the debt ceiling? What does it have to do with deciding to pay our obligations after August 2? What does it have to do with avoiding the calamity we have all heard about from both sides of the aisle and certainly from the administration? It strikes me as very odd that most debt ceiling extensions have been about 7 months during a decade-long period, and for some reason because of the election of 2012, the President of the United States wants to extend the deadline past that election into 2013. I think it makes Americans wonder if the President is playing politics with this very important issue.

The President went on to say in the press conference that we all listened to that he wondered if the Republicans were able to say yes to any agreement. That was the President on Friday evening. Now we come to Washington, DC today with the clock ticking, 8 days away from a supposed debacle, and I read in today's Wall Street Journal

this report by Jamie Dupree, President Obama last night rejected a bipartisan deal offered to him by congressional leaders of both parties which would have provided for a short-term extension of the debt limit in order to avoid a U.S. Government default. The agreement involved Speaker BOEHNER, Senate Majority Leader REID, and Senate GOP Leader MCCONNELL. In fact, according to this Wall Street Journal article, staffers from Senator REID and Senator MCCONNELL's offices were working on the legislative language together on Sunday. When REID took the bipartisan, bicameral plan down to the White House, it was rejected by the President.

I ask my colleagues: Who is unable to say yes? The Democratic majority leader of this body said yes to a bipartisan agreement. The Republican Speaker of the House of Representatives, the leader of that majority in the other body, said yes to an agreement. Senator REID's colleague and friend, the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, said yes to a bipartisan agreement, and then Senator REID was given the task of taking it to the President of the United States and the President rejected it.

I think Americans have a right to ask who is unable to say yes to a bipartisan deal that gets us out of this box. Who is playing politics with this issue? The public debt is \$14.2 trillion. We meet the deadline a week from tomorrow. The clock is ticking. The President had an opportunity to say yes to a bipartisan agreement endorsed by the leadership of this Congress and yet he said no. I am calling on this President, on my President, to do the right thing by the American people and to do the right thing for our country and for our economy and ask this bipartisan group of leaders to come back to the White House and say yes to the agreement which they offered him last night.

I thank the President. I thank the Senator from Alabama for allowing me to go in front of him.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I know we have talked about having an opportunity to digest and analyze and score any kind of proposal. I understand this afternoon the majority leader, Senator REID, said he would propose legislation tonight and file cloture tonight, and that would, according to the rules of the Senate, move this vote up to early Wednesday morning. That would give us only tomorrow, 1 day, to digest a bill that would impact our spending trajectory for the next decade. I would ask my experienced colleague, who was a distinguished Member of the House and now in the Senate, does that cause him concern?

Mr. WICKER. I think absolutely it should cause concern and this is something both parties have campaigned on in the past, the lack of transparency, the lack of time, things being rushed through at the last minute. But my larger point is that on Friday after-

noon the President was calling for a plan, any plan. He said there was only one condition: We must be political about it. We must get past the presidential reelection in 2012. Then on Sunday night not just any plan was presented to the President but a bipartisan plan by both leaders in this body on behalf of their membership and the Republican Speaker of the House who said, we believe we can get this through, and the President rejected it out of hand. That is the larger point.

The point of the Senator from Alabama is well taken. The legislative language is important. The agreement in concept is one thing, but as he is pointing out, the legislative language is also important. As ranking member of the Budget Committee, he knows full well Members need time to see if the language actually reduced the concepts into writing that can be enforced and work long term to get us out of this horrendous debt crisis we are in. I appreciate the Senator's point.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator. I appreciate that. The point the Senator made is tremendously important. All year we have conducted Senate business, with regard to the financial future of our country, in the most troubling way. It is unlike anything we have done in our history. I would say from a structural, systemic circumstance, this Nation has never had a more serious debt problem. We are borrowing 40 cents of every dollar we spend. Yes, we do have a war going on that is costing \$150 billion this year. But the deficit this year will be \$1.5 trillion. It is not the war. That is only about 10 percent of our deficit, unfortunately.

Back in World War II, we could see our way out of the war and into our victory, and we saw great growth in the future. But the deficits we are now accruing every day, every week, every month are significant because they are going to be hard to change. We are spending more than we take in and we have got to change. We can change. If we do change we will get this country back on a growth path.

I have repeatedly warned against avoiding the normal budget process this year, a process required by law but that this Senate under the Democratic leadership explicitly refused to do—the majority leader said it would be foolish to produce a budget. We are now about 820 days or so without a budget. For over 2 years we have not had a budget for the United States of America, and they never even attempted to move a budget even though a law says we should pass one by April 15. Well, it doesn't put anybody in jail. Maybe that is what it should have done. Maybe a bunch of people would be in jail today. Maybe we would have a budget if we had some teeth in the axe. It is the statute of the United States that requires we have a budget and we do not have one.

Then we begin to hear the warnings 6 months ago that we would reach a

point where we would need to raise the debt limit, the debt ceiling we have. Congress has said: Mr. President, you can borrow money, but only so much. You cannot borrow more than the amount, \$14-some-odd trillion, that is all. If you need to borrow more, Congress will have to approve it. We have the power of the purse under the Constitution.

This has been brewing for some time. I have been warning about this, since we have not done our job, since the Budget Committee has not met about these issues, the Appropriations Committee has not met about these issues, the Finance Committee has not met about the tax and mandatory entitlement programs that are under their jurisdiction. No work has been done all year. None. We are told not to worry, our leaders are going to meet a few times in secret. This little group failed, and this group with the Vice President met and that didn't work. Then they are going to meet with the President, and that didn't work. Finally, last night, as Senator WICKER said, it did appear an agreement was reached between the Democratic leadership and the Republican leadership on a bill that at least would get us past this debt crisis. They had the leadership agreement. I have not read it. I do not know what is in it. I am going to know what is in the bill. I have a constitutional responsibility, as do the other 99 Senators here, to make a good judgment on it.

It is odd that after all of that a bipartisan agreement was reached, and the President walked away from it. Now he is going to blame Speaker BOEHNER, who produced a budget. The Republican House produced a far-reaching, historic budget that would actually change the debt trajectory of our country and put us on the right path, the path to restoring prosperity and the creation of jobs. This debt is so large it is a wet blanket, as Speaker BOEHNER said. I called it an anchor, a weight that is pulling down the economy, as expert economists have told us. Not just me. Experts tell us that when you have this much debt, you lose 1 million jobs a year that would otherwise be created.

We have a serious problem, and I am not pleased about it. I felt all along that this is exactly what was going to happen. Somewhere in the back of the minds of the President or the leaders or somebody was the idea that they would bring up a plan at the eleventh hour, fiftieth minute, bring it to the floor of the Senate, and say: If you don't vote it, Members of the Senate, if you don't vote for it, Members of the House, we are going to have a debt crisis and it will all be your fault. Well, I am not interested in that. I am not going to vote for any kind of significant legislation, as this is, until I have had a chance to read it and think about it. Majority Leader REID told us of his plan this afternoon and he told us not to worry, he has a 1-page summary. Trust us. He is going to introduce legislation tonight and we will vote

Wednesday morning, and it will be good for America. Just do what I tell you and go along and mind your manners and we will get this thing taken care of. Trust me.

Well, the American people have been trusting Washington too long. The American people know there is no justification whatsoever in this country for spending so much money that 40 percent of every dollar we spend has to be borrowed. They know better. They know we have no business spending \$3,700 billion when we take in only \$2,200 billion. That is what happened in this last election. They said: Oh, these tea party people, they are not good Americans. They are angry. They are mad. That is not good. You are bad people. Well, give me a break. Why shouldn't they be? If we had a recall election, we all ought to be voted out of office, I suppose. There is no way we should ever have been in this situation.

Now under the pressure of the American people and fear of the next election, why did the President reject this bipartisan agreement? Well, it would require us to meet again next year. We will need to talk about more cuts because the cuts they are talking about are clearly insufficient to meet the challenge we are facing today—clearly insufficient. We have to do more.

So if a person runs up their credit card too much and they hit the limit and they want the limit raised, the person who is loaning the money—the American people—would like to know, have you changed your habits? Are you going to do better? Let's see a plan—a budget—a plan that gets us out of this fix. That has been steadfastly rejected by the leadership in this Senate all year, and we knew we were heading to this date. So Senator REID is throwing something out there. Let's talk a little bit about what appears to be in it.

The President has had a friendly press on most of the things he has proposed. He proposed a budget—the Democratic Senate never produced one, but by law the President has to produce one. Every President has to produce one every year. So the President produced one this year. The lowest annual deficit in that budget would be \$740 billion. The highest deficit President Bush ever had was \$450 billion, and he was criticized for that. The lowest he would have in 10 years was \$750 billion, and in the 10th year it was back over \$1 trillion, according to the Congressional Budget Office's analysis of his budget. So that is where we are heading. That is the kind of thing the President has submitted to us.

Do my colleagues know what he said about it? He said: I am proud of my budget. It will have America living within its means.

Can we believe the President of the United States said that—that a budget with a lowest annual deficit of over \$700 billion was living within our means?

He also said, "It would add no more to our debt." And his budget director,

Mr. Jack Lew, said the same thing. He actually testified to that effect before the Budget Committee. It was breathtaking.

So forgive me if I am not buying into a proposal based on one page. It was produced this afternoon. It said we are going to reduce the deficit by \$2.7 trillion. Forgive me if I am not buying into that until I see it and it has been scored. That is what I think ought to happen here today.

By the way, we have heard the debates—and Speaker BOEHNER used this phrase and others have used it: we want to have dollar for dollar spending reduction to debt limit increase. What that means is that if we increase the debt ceiling and allow the government to borrow another \$1 trillion, we should cut spending by \$1 trillion. That is just a rough idea. I don't know how they came up with that. That is what they came up with.

Remember, the debt is still going up every year because we are still spending more than we take in. This is like Wimpy in the old "Popeye" cartoon. Wimpy said: Give me a hamburger today, and I will pay you tomorrow. So we are going to get the immediate ability to borrow \$1 trillion, \$2 trillion more, raising the debt limit that much, on a promise that we will reduce spending by that amount over 10 years—not 1 year but 10 years.

This is a dangerous process. This is the kind of rhetoric that has put us in the position we are in today, which is that 40 cents of every dollar we spend is borrowed. It is what is threatening the financial future of our country, this kind of thinking in Washington, and we have to change that. We have to be honest about our numbers. As the ranking Republican on the Budget Committee, I feel an obligation. And our staff is eager to see the legislative language, not a one-page outline, about what will actually happen with our spending. We want to be sure the promises made with this bill are more accurate than the ones President Obama made when he said his budget would call for us to live within our means when it plainly does not.

I will mention a couple of things at this point that jump out at me from the one-page outline we have seen.

Majority Leader REID says his plan would produce savings of \$2.7 trillion, but really it appears to represent a \$1.2 trillion or so reduction in discretionary spending, and the rest of it is accrued in other ways. Speaker BOEHNER's proposal has discretionary spending reductions of about the same, but what is obvious is that Speaker BOEHNER's commission would reduce spending more and has a target, a goal to reach an additional \$1.8 trillion. The one produced by Senator REID, on the other hand, mentions a commission, but has no reduction in spending as a requirement of that commission. They don't have any obligation to produce a reduction in spending.

What else is in there? Another factor is that we are now drawing down the

cost of our military efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq. Last year, we spent a little over \$150 billion. This year, we will spend a little over \$100 billion. The plan is to at least be down to \$50 billion in 2 or 3 years. So over the 10-year period, there will be about 8 years, nearly, at \$50 billion or so spent on the war instead of \$150 billion. That is part of the plan we have been operating on for a long time. So \$150 billion for the war is not a baseline projection of the United States. It was never projected to continue at that level. So hopefully we can bring it below \$50 billion. Maybe we won't get to \$50 billion; I don't know. But what is the reasonable estimate? I think the House Republicans and the President said it would drop to \$50 billion, so that should be the baseline projection for the rest of the time. That is \$1 trillion total. So if we take \$1 trillion out of the \$2.7 trillion in savings, we are down to \$1.7 trillion in savings.

Another thing is that since the \$1 trillion is war-related spending, as Mr. REID wants it, it is not a real reduction from baseline spending. It is always considered to be extra, war-related emergency spending. And he claims interest savings on this money as another \$200 billion. So now we have about \$1.2 trillion right there, overstating his cuts through the elimination of the war. Speaker BOEHNER does not do that. His numbers are far more accurate and honest and realistic.

I also would like to point out that when we talk about spending and how we measure it, we have to know what the baseline is. One reason this country is broke and is in financial crisis is because we claim we are cutting spending when we are actually increasing spending.

The way it works is the Congressional Budget Office produces an assumption that we will increase spending at the rate of inflation or some other rate over a period of years. Then, if we reduce that rate of spending increase a little bit, politicians claim they have produced savings, that they have cut spending. But spending is not really reduced. Spending is still going up. There are various baselines out there that are used to calculate this, and it is very significant over 10 years and even more so over 20 years. So we hear people saying: We are cutting spending under this plan. So for Speaker BOEHNER or Senator REID, either one of those plans, I am confident will show we are spending a good bit more money in the 10th year than we are spending today.

This is confusing to the American people. I am really convinced the only way we can honestly compare the plans is to go back to basics—the way families do it: Do you increase your spending or not, based on what you spent last year? You take a flat level, and how much do you increase it over the next year, 2 years, 10 years? How much does it go up? That is the way to do it. Then we can compare plans. Then we

can see what Speaker BOEHNER has, what Congressman RYAN has in his budget plan for 10 years. Senator TOOMEY proposed a very thoughtful 10-year budget plan that balanced our budget in 10 years. That was not easy to do, but he did it. We need to be thinking like that and get away from this confusing mishmash, which we use to claim that we are saving \$1 trillion when really nobody plans for us to be spending \$150-plus billion on the war in Iraq and Afghanistan for the next 10 years. That money has never been projected to be spent in that fashion.

So we are in a situation where it is important for the country to reach an agreement and we need to pass something that raises the debt ceiling for America. I hate to say that, but it is a fact. It would be too disruptive not to do that. But, in exchange for that, as a part of that process, we truly need to start bringing our house into financial order. We are in disarray and discord, but if we were to do that, we could leave this a better country for our children and grandchildren.

I know some just want to increase spending and then raise taxes to pay for it. The Defense Department last year got about a 2-percent increase, a 3-percent increase. Next year, there is projected to be a 2-percent increase in some of the budget numbers. It might not happen because we don't have even that much money.

But we know how much nondefense discretionary spending increased during this time of record deficits under President Obama's leadership, not counting the almost \$900 billion in stimulus money. Baseline, nondefense discretionary spending increased 24 percent between 2008 and 2010, and now we are seeing the biggest deficits ever. President Bush never had any increases in baseline spending like that—never. It is just stunning.

There was a huge Democratic majority in the Senate and in the House, and the President wanted his investments, and he got these huge increases, and now they want to raise taxes to pay for it and keep it up there and maintain it. We can't afford to maintain that level. We have to bring it back down to 2009, 2008, 2007 levels. The country is not going to go bankrupt—broke—and people are not going to be thrown into the streets if we return to those levels of spending. If we make some tough choices, the same way cities and counties and families are doing all over America, we can get this house in order. That is what we are going to have to do.

I look forward to studying plans put forward by the majority leader and to studying the plan put forward by Speaker BOEHNER. The American people need time to know what is in them and what they mean to us in terms of taxing and spending, deficits, and interest payments. And then Congress needs to have time to vote on it.

Again, I repeat my deep frustration that we have not conducted this in

open, public debate for months now, utilizing the established Senate procedure of regular order. Instead, we have attempted to solve this big problem in secret, behind closed doors, with just a few people. I believe that is contrary to the historical understanding of the role of Congress, and I am not happy about it. I oppose it, I object to it, and I expect to have an appropriate amount of time to consider whatever plan comes forward.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, this weekend, driving around the Twin Cities, I was listening to public radio. The host of the program introduced a Republican member of the House Budget Committee. The member, whom I will not name to spare him or her a great deal of embarrassment, was asked about the consequences of not raising the debt ceiling.

The member assured the host and listeners that failing to raise the debt ceiling would not create a default for a number of reasons. Among them was, according to this member, we can pay out all the Social Security checks to seniors because—and I quote—"the money is in the trust fund."

Well, of course, there is \$2.6 trillion of assets in the trust fund, but the Social Security trust fund is composed entirely of Treasury notes. Allow me to quote from the Congressional Research Service:

By law, Social Security revenues credited to the trust fund . . . are invested in non-marketable U.S. government obligations. These obligations are physical (paper) documents issued to the trust fund and held by the Social Security Administration. When the obligations are redeemed, the Treasury must issue a check (a physical document) to the Social Security trust fund for the interest earned on the obligations.

CRS continues:

However, unlike a private trust that may hold a variety of assets and obligations of different borrowers, the Social Security trust fund can hold only non-marketable U.S. government obligations. The sale of these obligations by the U.S. government to the Social Security trust fund is federal government borrowing (from itself) and counts against the federal debt limit.

Now, I have no idea what this Republican member of the House Budget Committee believes is in the Social Security trust fund. Stacks of hundred-dollar bills? Gold bricks? Warehouses of freezers with steaks in them?

To me, it is shocking—shocking—that a Member of Congress—let alone a member of the House Budget Committee—can be so wildly ignorant of the basic workings of our government. We come to Washington to work together to solve our Nation's problems. How are we to do that if Members are unwilling or unable to come to even the most rudimentary understanding of our government?

None of us is immune to making mistakes. Yet we find ourselves in this moment of existential crisis, with the full

faith and credit of the United States being held hostage by a menagerie of ideologues who invent their own realities and are only too happy to share these fantasies with an unsuspecting public.

We are playing with disaster. Can we please just stick to the facts? The fact is, if we do not act immediately, we will see a downgrade of our credit rating and possibly even default on our debt. Both would be entirely counterproductive to our goal of shrinking our deficits and growing our economy. We cannot control the fantasies of clueless ideologues, but we must act responsibly and do our jobs. And we must do it now.

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. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 7:21 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BLUMENTHAL).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, thank you very much for your patience and also for being willing to be here when most are doing other things.

SHARED SACRIFICE IN RESOLVING THE BUDGET DEFICIT—Resumed

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1323) to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit.

Pending:

Reid amendment No. 529, to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 530 (to amendment No. 529), of a perfecting nature.

Reid motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Reid amendment No. 531, of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 532 (to the instructions (amendment No. 531) of the motion to commit), of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 533 (to amendment No. 532), of a perfecting nature.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to vitiate the action with respect to the pending amendments and motion to commit relative to S. 1323.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now withdraw the pending motion to commit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now withdraw the pending first-degree amendment No. 529.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 581

(Purpose: To cut spending, maintain existing commitments, and for other purposes)

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk which is a perfecting amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 581.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REID. The yeas and nays are ordered, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 582 TO AMENDMENT NO. 581

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 582 to amendment No. 581.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following new section:

SECTION XXX. EFFECTIVE DATE

The provisions of this Act shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

MOTION TO COMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 583

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit the bill with instructions, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to commit the bill (S. 1323) to the Committee on Finance with instructions to report back forthwith with the following amendment numbered 583.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following new section:

SECTION EFFECTIVE DATE.

The provisions of this Act shall become effective 3 days after enactment.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am sorry. I may not have been listening closely

enough. Did the Chair order the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 584

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 584 to the instructions of the motion to commit.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "3 days" and insert "2 days".

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 585 TO AMENDMENT NO. 584

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 585 to amendment No. 584.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "2 days" and insert "1 day".

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what we have done is put in the process our efforts, sound legislation to end the budget crisis we are in. It, in effect, does everything the Republicans have asked. It is dollar-for-dollar; that is, it increases the amount of spending cuts we make to arrive at \$2.7 trillion, which, in effect, would carry the country into sometime in 2013.

It consists of, as I indicated, what Republicans have agreed upon: discretionary spending, \$1.2 trillion; mandatory, \$100 billion; something called the Overseas Contingency Fund, which is warfighting, that is scored both by CBO and the Office of Management and Budget to the tune of about \$1 trillion. That saves about \$400 billion in interest. That is \$2.7 trillion.

There are other issues in this matter, including it allows us to finish our appropriations bills for the next 2 years. We have a joint committee that will allow us to work to do more for the long term. So it is a sound piece of legislation.

As I indicated, virtually everything we have in there has been suggested by the Republicans, and now they need to take "yes" for an answer. We have given them "yes."

For example, the Overseas Contingency Fund—this passed the House of Representatives with 5 Republicans voting no; 230, approximately, Republicans voted yes. Over here in the Senate, the same thing came up. Forty Republicans voted for it.

So we should move on. But the sad part is it appears my friends in the House of Representatives are being led by a very determined group to have us default on our debt. They are driven by probably 80 Republicans who seem to be calling the shots. It is unfortunate.

We cannot have a short-term extension. That is what their legislation is that the Speaker indicated he was going to send to us today. Every Democrat—not virtually every Democrat—every Democrat will vote against that legislation. The President, if there was some way it passed—which it will not—would veto it. They are wasting the time of the American people. Now is the time to do what legislators must do, and that is compromise. But my friends in the House, they do not even have to compromise. All they have to do is say "yes" because we have given them what they have asked for.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

STAFF SERGEANT LEX LEWIS

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to SSG Lex Lewis and his heroic service to our country. As a cavalry scout in the B Troop, 1st Squadron, 10th Cavalry Regiment, 4th Infantry Division, of Fort Carson, CO, Staff Sergeant Lewis was serving in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. On July 15, 2011, he died of injuries sustained when his dismounted patrol received small arms fire in Farah Province, Afghanistan.

A graduate of Rapid City Central High School, Staff Sergeant Lewis began his military career in the Navy, where he was stationed in Japan. He joined the Army in 1999 and was on his third deployment, having previously served two tours in Iraq. From 2006–2007 Staff Sergeant Lewis served in Rapid City as a member of the South Dakota Army National Guard. During his military career, his awards and decorations included two Army Commendation Medals and five Army Achievement Medals. He was posthumously promoted to the rank of Staff Sergeant and awarded a Bronze Star Medal and a Purple Heart.

Staff Sergeant Lewis will be remembered as a dedicated soldier and a good friend. He demonstrated professionalism in his job and was known as a reliable man who you could count on. Former colleague Sgt. Dwayne Graves recalls, "He was just a real likeable guy. He'd do anything for you. You definitely want him watching your back." As a young man, Staff Sergeant Lewis knew he wanted to serve his country. His mother remembers his childhood spent playing soldier. He will be deeply missed by those who survive him: his wife Molly, step-daughter Ariel, stepbrother Frank, half-sister, Lucy, and his mother, Betty.

Staff Sergeant Lewis gave his all for his soldiers and his country. Our Nation owes him a debt of gratitude, and the best way to honor his life is to

emulate his commitment to our country. Mr. President, I join with all South Dakotans in expressing my deepest sympathy to the family and friends of SSG Lex Lewis. He will be missed, but his service to our Nation will never be forgotten.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING BOB STENEHJEM

• Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, today I honor the life and exemplary service of North Dakota's late Senate majority leader Bob Stenehjem. Bob died last week in a car accident in Alaska on his way back from doing one of the things he loved best when not working: fishing in the great outdoors.

During the 10 years he served as majority leader of the North Dakota Senate and the nearly 20 years he served as a State senator, I counted Bob as a friend, a colleague, and a partner in the important work we were doing to build a stronger, more dynamic North Dakota.

It has been said many times by many people that Bob had the ability to see all sides of an issue and appreciate everyone's interest. That is an invaluable quality for a leader and essential to a good legislator. He worked well with others and considered among his dearest friends many on the opposite side of the aisle who held a different philosophical viewpoint. Bob could disagree without being disagreeable and always respected the opinions of others. It was that ability that helped him to forge good legislation for the people of North Dakota.

As a public servant, as a citizen, Bob's deep love of North Dakota informed every decision he made in the legislature, and his legacy today is a more vibrant and secure State than it was when he was first elected to represent District 30 in 1993. His remarkable service and devotion to North Dakota benefited our State and our people in countless ways over the years, helping to bridge differences and improve the quality of life for all North Dakotans.

Mikey and I extend our deepest sympathy to his wife Kathy and the entire Stenehjem family on this tragic loss. Our thoughts and prayers go out to them, and we pray that they will take comfort in knowing that he served his State and his fellow North Dakotans well.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. MAX HARRY WEIL

• Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, today I wish to note the golden anniversary of an event that has saved thousands and thousands of lives.

It was 50 years ago this year that the Institute of Critical Care Medicine was founded as a nonprofit public foundation at the University of Southern California School of Medicine.

Thus was born the concept that life-threatening patients have a substantially better chance of survival if minute-to-minute care is provided by highly trained physicians and nurses in emergency rooms and in special intensive care, coronary care, and post-operative care units.

This concept that dangerously ill patients have a better chance at recovery under the care of specially trained physicians and nurses in emergency rooms and intensive care units is standard today but it was revolutionary in 1961.

Considered one of the fathers of critical care medicine who founded the Institute of Critical Care Medicine a half century ago, Dr. Max Harry Weil is also the founding president of the Weil Institute of Critical Care Medicine that continues to operate in Rancho Mirage, CA.

My colleague, Senator BARBARA BOXER would like to join me in recognizing Dr. Weil and his institute and offer our congratulations on a half century of medical success and best wishes on many more successful years to come.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague, Senator NELSON, in recognizing an extraordinary Californian who has done so much, not just to save lives in his community but to advance the practice of medicine in order to save lives around the world.

Recognized as one of the fathers of critical care medicine, 50 years ago Dr. Weil cofounded the Weil Institute of Critical Care Medicine, an international center for clinical education and research in Rancho Mirage, CA.

The institute is renowned for conducting groundbreaking research into finding new ways of monitoring and dealing with life-threatening circulatory shock, heart failure, acute lung failure and infections.

In addition to this impressive record, Dr. Weil led the institute's work in training members of the community in CPR, giving thousands of Californians the basic training they need to help save lives.

I know that I join thousands of Californians and patients who have benefited from Dr. Weil's work many of them without even knowing it in thanking him for his dedication and his service to our Nation.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT DECLARING A NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ORGANIZATIONS—PM 15

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report and papers; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the "order") declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat that significant transnational criminal organizations pose to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States.

Organized crime is no longer a local or regional problem; it has become a danger to international stability. Significant transnational criminal organizations have become increasingly sophisticated and dangerous to the United States, and their activities have reached such scope and gravity that they destabilize the international system. These groups have taken advantage of globalization and other factors to diversify their geographic scope and range of activities. They have increased and deepened their ties to governments and the international financial system, relying not only on bribery and violence, but also more and more on the ability to exploit differences among countries and to create and maintain legal facades to hide illicit activities.

The specific harms that significant transnational criminal organizations threaten today are many. They corrupt—and in some cases co-opt—governments, thereby destabilizing them and weakening democratic institutions and the rule of law. They threaten U.S. economic interests by subverting, exploiting, and distorting legitimate markets, and could gain influence in strategic sectors of the world economy.

Significant transnational criminal organizations that engage in cybercrime threaten sensitive public and private computer networks, undermine the integrity of the international financial system, and impose costs on the American consumer. Those that engage in the theft of intellectual property not only erode U.S. competitiveness, but also endanger the public health and safety through the distribution of tainted and counterfeit goods. Many of them also engage in drug trafficking.

Finally, significant transnational criminal organizations increasingly support the activities of other dangerous persons. Some of these organizations are involved in arms smuggling, which can facilitate and aggravate violent civil conflicts. Others are

involved in human smuggling, exacerbating the problem of forced labor. There is also evidence of growing ties between significant transnational criminal organizations and terrorists.

The Executive Order I have issued today is one part of a comprehensive strategy to address the growing threat of transnational organized crime. The order targets significant transnational criminal organizations and the networks that support them, striking at the core of those networks—their ability and need to move money. It does this by blocking the property and interests in property of four transnational criminal organizations, listed in the Annex to the order, that currently pose significant threats to U.S. domestic and foreign economic interests, as well as to U.S. promotion of transparency and stability in the international political and financial systems. The order provides criteria for the further blocking of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State:

to be a foreign person that constitutes a significant transnational criminal organization;

to have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order; or

to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury the authority, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order.

The order is effective at 12:01 a.m. eastern daylight time on July 25, 2011. All executive agencies of the United States Government are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 24, 2011.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:09 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Clerk be directed to request the Senate to return to the House of Representatives the bill (H.R. 1309) to extend the authorization of the national flood insurance program, to achieve reforms to improve the financial integrity and stability of the program, and to increase the role of pri-

vate markets in the management of flood insurance risk, 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-2619. 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; Identification of Critical Safety Items" ((RIN0750-AH92) (DFARS Case 2010-D022)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 21, 2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2620. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), Strategic Plan, February 2011"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2621. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2011 Report to Congress on Sustainable Ranges"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2622. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to South Korea; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2623. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Financial Stability Oversight Council Secured Creditor Haircut Study; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2624. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (RESPA): Technical Corrections and Clarifying Amendments" (RIN2502-AH85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 21, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2625. A communication from the Deputy to the Chairman for External Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Retail Foreign Exchange Transactions" (RIN3064-AD81) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 21, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2626. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Office of Thrift Supervision Integration; Dodd-Frank Act Implementation" (RIN1557-AD41) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 21, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2627. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Addition of Certain Persons on the Entity List; Addition of Persons Acting Contrary to the National Security or Foreign Policy Interests of the United States" (RIN0694-AF21) received in the Office of the President of the

Senate on July 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2628. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act and regulations issued by the Department that require the use of an assessment of the credit-worthiness of a security or money market instrument; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2629. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Status for the Largetooth Sawfish" (RIN0648-XQ03) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 21, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2630. A communication from the Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Annual Report for 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2631. A joint communication from the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Thefts, Losses, or Releases of Select Agents or Toxins for Calendar Year 2010; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2632. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to implementation of menu and vending machine labeling; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2633. A communication from the Program Manager, Information Sharing Environment, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Annual Report to the Congress on the Information Sharing Environment"; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC-2634. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report related to Delayed-Notice Search Warrants and Extensions during fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2635. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a legislative proposal relative to violence against Native women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. CASEY:

S. 1410. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for life sciences research; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. COBURN):

S. 1411. A bill to require the Public Printer to establish and maintain a website accessible to the public that allows the public to obtain electronic copies of all congressionally mandated reports in one place, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts):

S. 1412. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 462 Washington Street, Woburn, Massachusetts, as the "Officer John Maguire Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to temporarily increase the investment tax credit for geothermal energy property; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 164

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 164, a bill to repeal the imposition of withholding on certain payments made to vendors by government entities.

S. 202

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 202, a bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States before the end of 2012, and for other purposes.

S. 242

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 242, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the roles and responsibilities of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

S. 371

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 371, a bill to improve the efficiency, operation, and security of the national transportation system to move freight by leveraging investments and promoting partnerships that advance interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

S. 384

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 384, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research.

S. 401

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 401, a bill to help Federal prosecutors and investigators combat public corruption by strengthening and clarifying the law.

S. 497

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the requirements of the visa waiver program and for other purposes.

S. 543

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 543, a bill to restrict any State or local jurisdiction from imposing a new discriminatory tax on cell phone services, providers, or property.

S. 570

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 570, a bill to prohibit the Department of Justice from tracking and cataloguing the purchases of multiple rifles and shotguns.

S. 609

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 609, a bill to provide for the establishment of a committee to assess the effects of certain Federal regulatory mandates.

S. 658

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 658, a bill to provide for the preservation by the Department of Defense of documentary evidence of the Department of Defense on incidents of sexual assault and sexual harassment in the military, and for other purposes.

S. 829

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 829, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 834

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 834, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve education and prevention related to campus sexual violence, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

S. 968

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 968, a bill to prevent online threats to economic creativity and theft of intellectual property, and for other purposes.

S. 979

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 979, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. 1025

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1025, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the national defense through empowerment of the National Guard, enhancement of the functions of the National Guard Bureau, and improvement of Federal-State military coordination in domestic emergency response, and for other purposes.

S. 1048

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1048, a bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to the Islamic Republic of Iran, North Korea, and Syria, and for other purposes.

S. 1228

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1228, a bill to prohibit trafficking in counterfeit military goods or services.

S. 1294

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1294, a bill to promote the oil independence of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1346

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1346, a bill to restrict the use of offshore tax havens and abusive tax shelters to inappropriately avoid Federal taxation, and for other purposes.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1369, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt the conduct of silvicultural activities from national pollutant discharge elimination system permitting requirements.

S. 1370

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1370, a bill to reauthorize 21st century community learning centers, and for other purposes.

S. 1392

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1392, a bill to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and for other purposes.

S. 1395

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1395, a bill to ensure that all Americans have access to waivers from the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S.J. RES. 17

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 17, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

S.J. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.

S. RES. 80

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 80, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 175

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 175, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to ongoing violations of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Georgia and the importance of a peaceful and just resolution to the conflict within Georgia's internationally recognized borders.

S. RES. 199

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 199, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Crohn's and Colitis Awareness Week".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts):

S. 1412. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 462 Washington Street,

Woburn, Massachusetts, as the "Officer John Maguire Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, last December, in the middle of a New England blizzard, armed robbers descended on the Kohl's department store in Woburn, MA. They threatened the employees of the store and fled with money and jewelry. Officer John "Jack" Maguire, on duty that night, rushed to the scene in his cruiser. Responding to his fellow officer's call for assistance in a foot chase, Officer Maguire blocked the gunman's path with his cruiser and got out of his vehicle to confront the gunman. The two exchanged gunfire, which killed the gunman and left Officer Maguire mortally wounded. Officer Maguire's death marks the first officer killed in the line of duty in Woburn, MA, since the department was established back in 1847.

On behalf of the Maguire family, Woburn Mayor Scott Galvin, Woburn Chief of Police Richard Kelley, and the residents of Woburn, I am introducing legislation to rename the U.S. Post Office on Washington Street in Woburn the Officer John Maguire Post Office.

This post office is only a few hundred yards from the spot where Officer Maguire was killed. I believe it is a fitting honor to a public servant who gave his life protecting the city of Woburn. It is my hope that when people pass by the Post Office on Washington Street, they will be reminded of the sacrifices made by both Officer John "Jack" Maguire and his family.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to temporarily increase the investment tax credit for geothermal energy property; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleague from Idaho, Sen. MIKE CRAPO, in introducing the Geothermal Tax Parity Act of 2011. This legislation will modify an existing investment tax credit for geothermal energy authorized under Section 48 of the Federal tax code. Although both solar energy and geothermal energy projects are eligible for an investment tax credit under Section 48, they are not equal. While I am a strong supporter of solar energy technology and support the solar energy tax credit, I am also a strong advocate for having a level playing field when it comes to government incentives. That is why this bill is called the Geothermal Tax Parity Act, because it will create parity in the tax code for these two important renewable energy resources.

This bill would provide geothermal energy with the same 30 percent investment tax credit that is now available to solar energy and fuel cell technologies in Section 48 and extend this 30 percent tax credit for geothermal through December 31, 2016, as it is for

these other technologies. Without this legislation, new geothermal energy projects would be allowed only a 10 percent investment tax credit under Section 48. This legislation will create a more level playing field among clean, renewable energy technologies and help stimulate investment in geothermal energy projects.

Geothermal energy can provide a continuous supply of renewable energy with very few environmental impacts. Although the United States has more geothermal capacity than any other country, this potential energy resource has not been widely developed. This is due in large part to the high initial cost and risk involved in locating and developing geothermal resources. Extending the 30 percent tax credit through 2016 will help geothermal developers obtain the financing they need to make investments in exploration and development.

This legislation is identical to a bipartisan companion bill, H.R. 2408, that our colleagues from the Pacific Northwest, Rep. DAVID REICHERT from Washington and Rep. EARL BLUMENAUER from Oregon have sponsored in the House.

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. 1413

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 "Geothermal Tax Parity Act of 2011".

SEC. 2. TEMPORARY INCREASE IN INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT FOR GEOTHERMAL ENERGY PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subclause (II) of section 48(a)(2)(A)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "paragraph (3)(A)(i)" and inserting "clause (i) or (iii) of paragraph (3)(A)".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 581. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1323, to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit.

SA 582. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 581 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 1323, supra.

SA 583. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1323, supra.

SA 584. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 583 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 1323, supra.

SA 585. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 584 submitted by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 583 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 1323, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 581. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1323, to express the

sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit; as follows:

Strike all after “Section” and insert the following:

1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Budget Control Act of 2011”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

TITLE I—DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS AND ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 101. Discretionary spending limits.

Sec. 102. Senate budget enforcement.

TITLE II—OTHER SPENDING CUTS

Subtitle A—Spectrum Auction Proposals and Public Safety Broadband Network

Sec. 211. Definitions.

PART I—AUCTIONS OF SPECTRUM AND SPECTRUM MANAGEMENT

Sec. 221. Clarification of authorities to repurpose Federal spectrum for commercial purposes.

Sec. 222. Incentive auction authority.

Sec. 223. Incentive auctions to repurpose certain mobile satellite services spectrum for terrestrial broadband use.

Sec. 224. Permanent extension of auction authority.

Sec. 225. Authority to auction licenses for domestic satellite services.

Sec. 226. Auction of spectrum.

Sec. 227. Report to Congress on improving spectrum management.

PART II—PUBLIC SAFETY BROADBAND NETWORK

Sec. 241. Reallocation of D Block for public safety.

Sec. 242. Flexible use of narrowband spectrum.

Sec. 243. Public Safety Trust Fund.

Sec. 244. Public safety research and development.

Sec. 245. Incentive auction relocation fund.

Sec. 246. Federal infrastructure sharing.

Sec. 247. FCC report on efficient use of public safety spectrum.

Subtitle B—Federal Pell Grant and Student Loan Program Changes

Sec. 251. Federal Pell Grant and student loan program changes.

Subtitle C—Farm Programs

Sec. 261. Definition of payment acres.

TITLE III—JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON DEFICIT REDUCTION

Sec. 301. Establishment of Joint Select Committee.

Sec. 302. Expedited consideration of joint committee recommendations.

Sec. 303. Funding.

Sec. 304. Rulemaking.

TITLE IV—PUBLIC DEBT

Sec. 401. Public debt.

TITLE I—DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 101. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, amendment, motion or conference report that includes any provision that would cause the discretionary spending limits as set forth in this section to be exceeded.

(b) **LIMITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In this section, the term “discretionary spending limits” has the following meaning subject to adjustments in paragraph (2) and subsection (c):

(A) For fiscal year 2012—

(i) for the security category \$606,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

(ii) for the nonsecurity category \$439,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(B) For fiscal year 2013—

(i) for the security category \$607,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

(ii) for the nonsecurity category \$440,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(C) For fiscal year 2014, \$1,068,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(D) For fiscal year 2015, \$1,089,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(E) For fiscal year 2016, \$1,111,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(F) For fiscal year 2017, \$1,134,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(G) For fiscal year 2018, \$1,156,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(H) For fiscal year 2019, \$1,180,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(I) For fiscal year 2020, \$1,204,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(J) For fiscal year 2021, \$1,228,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(2) **AUTHORIZED ADJUSTMENT TO LIMITS.**—

(A) **ADJUSTMENTS FOR BUDGET SUBMISSION.**—When the President submits a budget under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, OMB shall calculate and the budget shall include adjustments to discretionary spending limits (and those limits as cumulatively adjusted) for the budget year and each out year equal to the baseline levels of new budget authority using up-to-date concepts and definitions minus those levels using the concepts and definitions in effect before such changes. Such changes may only be made after consultation with the committees on Appropriations and the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate and that consultation shall include written communication to such committees that affords such committees the opportunity to comment before official action is taken with respect to such changes.

(B) **ADJUSTMENTS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ENFORCEMENT.**—For the purposes of Congressional enforcement of the limits in this section, the Chairmen of the Committees on the Budget of the Senate and House may adjust the discretionary spending limits in amounts equal to the adjustments made pursuant to subparagraph (A) as contained in the President’s budget. Any adjustment made pursuant to this subparagraph shall not constitute a repeal or change to the limits contained in this section.

(c) **ESTIMATES AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

(A) **LIMITS AND SUBALLOCATIONS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ENFORCEMENT.**—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution relating to any matter described in paragraph (2), (3), or (4), or the offering of an amendment thereto or the submission of a conference report thereon—

(i) for the purposes of enforcement of the discretionary spending limits in the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of that House may adjust the discretionary spending limits in this section, the budgetary aggregates in the concurrent resolution on the budget most recently adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives, and allocations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, by the amount of new budget authority in that measure for that purpose; and

(ii) following any adjustment under clause (i), the Committee on Appropriations of that House may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this subsection.

(B) **OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.**—For the purposes of determining an end of the year sequester pursuant to subsection (f), when OMB submits a sequestration report under subsection

(f)(7) for a fiscal year, OMB shall calculate, and the sequestration report and subsequent budgets submitted by the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, shall include, adjustments to discretionary spending limits (and those limits as adjusted) for the fiscal year and each succeeding year through 2021 upon the enactment of a bill or resolution relating to any matter described in paragraphs (2), (3), or (4).

(C) **ESTIMATES.**—

(i) **CBO ESTIMATES.**—As soon as practicable after Congress completes action on any discretionary appropriation, CBO, after consultation with the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall provide OMB with an estimate of the amount of discretionary new budget authority for the current year (if any) and the budget year provided by that legislation.

(ii) **OMB ESTIMATES AND EXPLANATION OF DIFFERENCES.**—

(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 7 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) after the date of enactment of any discretionary appropriation, OMB shall make publicly available on the day it is issued and, on the following day, shall be printed in the Federal Register a report containing the CBO estimate of that legislation, an OMB estimate of the amount of discretionary new budget authority for the current year (if any) and the budget year provided by that legislation, and an explanation of any difference between the 2 estimates.

(II) **DIFFERENCES.**—If during the preparation of the report OMB determines that there is a significant difference between OMB and CBO, OMB shall consult with the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate regarding that difference and that consultation shall include, to the extent practicable, written communication to those committees that affords such committees the opportunity to comment before the issuance of the report.

(D) **ASSUMPTIONS AND GUIDELINES.**—OMB estimates under subparagraph (C) shall be made using current economic and technical assumptions. In its final sequestration report, OMB shall use the OMB estimates transmitted to the Congress under this paragraph. OMB and CBO shall prepare estimates under this paragraph in conformance with scorekeeping guidelines determined after consultation among the House and Senate Committees on the Budget, CBO, and OMB.

(E) **ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS.**—For purposes of this paragraph, amounts provided by annual appropriations shall include any new budget authority for the current year (if any) and the advance appropriations that become available in the budget year from previously enacted legislation.

(2) **OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.**—Other adjustments referred to in paragraph (1)(B) are as follows:

(A) **CONTINUING DISABILITY REVIEWS AND SSI REDETERMINATIONS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations in a fiscal year of the amount specified in clause (ii) for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations under the heading “Limitation on Administrative Expenses” for the Social Security Administration, and provides an additional appropriation for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, or one or more initiatives that the Office of the Chief Actuary determines would be at least as cost effective as a redetermination of eligibility under the heading “Limitation on Administrative Expenses” for the Social Security Administration of an amount further specified in clause (ii), then the discretionary spending limits, allocation

to the Committees on Appropriations of each House, and aggregates for that year may be adjusted by the amount in budget authority not to exceed the additional appropriation provided in such legislation for that purpose for that fiscal year

(ii) AMOUNTS SPECIFIED.—The amounts specified are

(I) for fiscal year 2012, an appropriation of \$758,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$237,000,000;

(II) for fiscal year 2013, an appropriation of \$758,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$390,000,000;

(III) for fiscal year 2014, an appropriation of \$778,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$559,000,000;

(IV) for fiscal year 2015, an appropriation of \$799,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$774,000,000;

(V) for fiscal year 2016, an appropriation of \$822,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$778,000,000;

(VI) for fiscal year 2017, an appropriation of \$849,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$804,000,000;

(VII) for fiscal year 2018, an appropriation of \$877,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$831,000,000;

(VIII) for fiscal year 2019, an appropriation of \$906,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$860,000,000;

(IX) for fiscal year 2020, an appropriation of \$935,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$890,000,000; and

(X) for fiscal year 2021, an appropriation of \$963,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$924,000,000.

(iii) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subparagraph, the terms “continuing disability reviews” and “Supplemental Security Income redeterminations” mean continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and redeterminations of eligibility under title XVI of the Social Security Act.

(iv) REPORT.—The Commissioner of Social Security shall provide annually to the Congress a report on continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations which includes—

(I) the amount spent on continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations in the fiscal year covered by the report, and the number of reviews and redeterminations conducted, by category of review or redetermination;

(II) the results of the continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations in terms of cessations of benefits or determinations of continuing eligibility, by program; and

(III) the estimated savings over the short-, medium-, and long-term to the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, supplemental security income, Medicare, and Medicaid programs from continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations which result in cessations of benefits and the estimated present value of such savings.

(B) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX ENFORCEMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations in a fiscal year to the Internal Revenue Service of not less than the first amount specified in clause (ii) for tax compliance activities to address the Federal tax gap (taxes owed but not paid), and provides an additional appropriation for tax compliance activities to address the Federal tax gap of an amount further specified in clause (ii), then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Committees on Appropriations of each House, and aggregates for that year may be adjusted by the amount in budget authority not to exceed the amount of additional or en-

hanced tax enforcement provided in such legislation for that fiscal year.

(ii) AMOUNTS SPECIFIED.—The amounts specified are—

(I) for fiscal year 2012, an appropriation of \$5,186,000,000, and an additional \$715,000,000 for additional or enhanced tax enforcement;

(II) for fiscal year 2013, an appropriation of \$5,186,000,000, and an additional \$1,281,000,000 for additional or enhanced tax enforcement;

(III) for fiscal year 2014, an appropriation of \$5,333,000,000, and an additional \$1,639,000,000 for additional or enhanced tax enforcement;

(IV) for fiscal year 2015, an appropriation of \$5,489,000,000, and an additional \$2,016,000,000 for additional or enhanced tax enforcement;

(V) for fiscal year 2016, an appropriation of \$5,662,000,000, and an additional \$2,465,000,000 for additional or enhanced tax enforcement;

(VI) for fiscal year 2017, an appropriation of \$5,858,000,000, and an additional \$2,447,000,000 for additional or enhanced tax enforcement;

(VII) for fiscal year 2018, an appropriation of \$6,065,000,000, and an additional \$2,421,000,000 for additional or enhanced tax enforcement;

(VIII) for fiscal year 2019, an appropriation of \$6,284,000,000, and an additional \$2,383,000,000 for additional or enhanced tax enforcement;

(IX) for fiscal year 2020, an appropriation of \$6,493,000,000, and an additional \$2,371,000,000 for additional or enhanced tax enforcement; and

(X) for fiscal year 2021, an appropriation of \$6,705,000,000, and an additional \$2,361,000,000 for additional or enhanced tax enforcement.

(iii) DEFINITION.—In this subparagraph, the term “additional appropriation for tax compliance activities” means new and continuing investments in expanding and improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the overall tax enforcement and compliance program of the Internal Revenue Service. Such new and continuing investments include, but are not limited to, additional resources for implementing new authorities and for conducting additional examinations, audits, and enhanced third party data matching;

(iv) FIRST AMOUNT.—The first amount specified in clause (ii) is the amount provided for a fiscal year under the heading “Enforcement” for the Internal Revenue Service.

(v) AMOUNT FURTHER SPECIFIED.—The amount further specified in clause (ii) is the amount under one or more headings in an appropriations act for the Internal Revenue Service that is specified to pay for the costs of the additional appropriation tax compliance activities, but such amount shall be “0” (zero) unless the appropriations act under the heading “Operations Support” for the Internal Revenue Service provides that such sums as are necessary shall be available, under the “Operations Support” heading, to fully support tax enforcement and compliance activities.

(C) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations in a fiscal year for program integrity or fraud and abuse activities under the heading “Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Account” program for the Department of Health and Human Services of up to the amount specified in clause (ii), then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Committees on Appropriations of each House, and aggregates for that year may be adjusted in an amount not to exceed the amount in budget authority provided for that program for that fiscal year.

(ii) AMOUNTS SPECIFIED.—The amounts specified are—

(I) for fiscal year 2012, an appropriation of \$581,000,000;

(II) for fiscal year 2013, an appropriation of \$610,000,000;

(III) for fiscal year 2014, an appropriation of \$640,000,000;

(IV) for fiscal year 2015, an appropriation of \$672,000,000;

(V) for fiscal year 2016, an appropriation of \$706,000,000;

(VI) for fiscal year 2017, an appropriation of \$725,000,000;

(VII) for fiscal year 2018, an appropriation of \$745,000,000;

(VIII) for fiscal year 2019, an appropriation of \$765,000,000;

(IX) for fiscal year 2020, an appropriation of \$786,000,000; and

(X) for fiscal year 2021, an appropriation of \$807,000,000.

(iii) DEFINITION.—As used in this subparagraph the term “program integrity or fraud and abuse activities” means—

(I) those activities authorized by section 1817(k)(3) of the Social Security Act; and

(II) those activities, including administrative costs, in the Medicare Advantage and the Medicare Prescription Drug Program authorized in title XVIII of the Social Security Act, in section 1893 of the Social Security Act, in Medicaid authorized in title XIX of the Social Security Act, and in the Children’s Health Insurance Program (“CHIP”) authorized in title XXI of the Social Security Act.

(iv) REPORT.—The report required by section 1817(k)(5) of the Social Security Act for each fiscal year shall include measures of the operational efficiency and impact on fraud, waste, and abuse in the Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP programs for the funds provided by this adjustment.

(D) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE IMPROPER PAYMENT REVIEWS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations in a fiscal year of the amount specified in clause (ii) for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews under the heading “State Unemployment Insurance and Employment Service Operations” for the Department of Labor, and provides an additional appropriation for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews under the heading “State Unemployment Insurance and Employment Service Operations” for the Department of Labor of up to an amount further specified in clause (ii), then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Committees on Appropriations of each House, and aggregates for that year may be adjusted by an amount in budget authority not to exceed the additional appropriation provided in such legislation for that purpose for that fiscal year.

(ii) AMOUNTS SPECIFIED.—The amounts specified are—

(I) for fiscal year 2012, an appropriation of \$60,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$10,000,000;

(II) for fiscal year 2013, an appropriation of \$60,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$15,000,000;

(III) for fiscal year 2014, an appropriation of \$61,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$19,000,000;

(IV) for fiscal year 2015, an appropriation of \$61,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$24,000,000;

(V) for fiscal year 2016, an appropriation of \$62,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$28,000,000;

(VI) for fiscal year 2017, an appropriation of \$63,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$28,000,000;

(VII) for fiscal year 2018, an appropriation of \$64,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$29,000,000;

(VIII) for fiscal year 2019, an appropriation of \$64,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$30,000,000;

(IX) for fiscal year 2020, an appropriation of \$65,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$31,000,000; and

(X) for fiscal year 2021, an appropriation of \$66,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$31,000,000.

(ii) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subparagraph, the terms “in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments” and “unemployment improper payment reviews” mean reviews or assessments conducted in local workforce offices to determine the continued eligibility of an unemployment insurance claimant under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, Title III of the Social Security Act, and applicable State laws, to ensure they are meeting their obligation to search for work as a condition of eligibility, and to speed their return to work.

(3) OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES.—

(A) CAP ADJUSTMENT.—The discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Committees on Appropriations of each House, and aggregates for that year may be adjusted by an amount in budget authority not to exceed the amount provided in such legislation for that purpose for that fiscal year, but not to exceed in aggregate the amounts specified in subparagraph (B) for any—

(i) bills reported by the Committees on Appropriations of either House or in the Senate, passed by the House of Representatives;

(ii) joint resolutions or amendments reported by the Committees on Appropriations of either House;

(iii) amendments between the Houses, Senate amendments to such amendments offered by the authority of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or House amendments to such amendments offered by the authority of the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives; or

(iv) conference reports; making appropriations for overseas deployments and related activities.

(B) LEVELS.—

(i) LEVELS.—The initial levels for overseas deployments and related activities specified in this subparagraph are as follows:

(I) For fiscal year 2012, \$126,544,000,000 in budget authority.

(II) For the total of fiscal years 2013–2021, \$450,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(ii) LEVELS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ENFORCEMENT.—For each fiscal year after fiscal year 2012, Congress shall adopt in the concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year an adjustment for overseas deployments and related activities, provided that Congress may not adopt an adjustment for any fiscal year that would cause the total adjustments for fiscal years 2013–2021 to exceed the amount authorized in subclause (II).

(iii) ACCOUNTING FOR OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENT AND RELATED ACTIVITIES.—In any report issued under section 7(f), the Office of Management and Budget shall state the total amount of spending on overseas deployments and related activities for fiscal years 2013–2021 and the estimated amount of budget authority adjustment remaining for that period.

(C) ADJUSTMENT FOR OFFSET OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENT COSTS.—The levels set in subparagraph (B) may be further adjusted by the amount of budget authority provided in legislation for additional costs associated with overseas deployments and related activities if the amount of budget authority above those levels is offset.

(4) ADJUSTMENTS FOR DISASTER FUNDING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If, for fiscal years 2011 through 2021, appropriations for discretionary accounts are enacted that Congress designates as being for disaster relief in statute, the adjustment shall be the total of such appropriations in discretionary accounts designated as being for disaster relief, but not to exceed the total of—

(i) the average funding provided for disasters over the previous ten years, excluding the highest and lowest years; and

(ii) for years when the enacted new discretionary budget authority designated as being for disaster relief for the preceding fiscal year was less than the average as calculated in (A) for that year, the difference between the enacted amount and the allowable adjustment as calculated in (A) for that year.

(B) OMB REPORT.—The Office of Management and Budget shall report to the Committees on Appropriations in each House the adjustment for disaster funding for fiscal year 2011, and a preview report of the estimated level for fiscal year 2012, not later than 30 days after enactment of this section.

(d) LIMITATIONS ON CHANGES TO THIS SECTION.—Unless otherwise specifically provided in this section, it shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any bill, resolution (including a concurrent resolution on the budget), amendment, motion, or conference report that would repeal or otherwise change this section.

(e) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsections (a) through (d) shall be waived or suspended only—

(A) by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn; or

(B) if the provisions of section (f)(8) are in effect.

(2) APPEAL.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the measure. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(f) END-OF-YEAR SEQUESTER FOR EXCEEDING DISCRETIONARY CAPS.—

(1) SEQUESTRATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 calendar days after Congress adjourns to end a session, there shall be a sequestration to eliminate a budget-year breach, if any, within the discretionary categories as set by subsection (b).

(B) OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS.—Any amount of budget authority for overseas deployments and related activities for fiscal year 2012 in excess of the levels set in subsection (c)(3)(B)(i), or for fiscal years 2013–2021 that would cause the total adjustment for fiscal years 2013–2021 to exceed the amount authorized in section (c)(3)(B)(II), that is not otherwise offset pursuant subsection (c)(3)(C)(i) shall be counted in determining whether a breach has occurred in the security category (for fiscal years 2012 and 2013) or the discretionary category (thereafter).

(C) EMERGENCY SPENDING.—

(i) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION IN STATUTE.—If, for any fiscal year, appropriations for discretionary accounts are enacted that Congress designates as emergency requirements in statute pursuant to this subsection, the total of such budget authority in discretionary accounts designated as emergency requirements in all fiscal years from such appropriations shall not be counted in determining whether a breach has occurred, and shall not count for the purposes of Congressional enforcement.

(ii) DESIGNATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—If an appropriations act includes a provision expressly designated as an emergency for the purposes of this section, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect thereto.

(iii) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering an appropriations act, if a point of order is made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(II) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(aa) WAIVER.—Subclause (I) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(bb) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(III) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—For purposes of subclause (I), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this subsection.

(IV) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subclause (I) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(V) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, an appropriations act, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable under the same conditions as was the conference report. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(2) ELIMINATING A BREACH.—Each non-exempt account within a category shall be reduced by a dollar amount calculated by multiplying the baseline level of sequesterable budgetary resources in that account at that time by the uniform percentage necessary to eliminate a breach within that category.

(3) MILITARY PERSONNEL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may, with respect to any military personnel account, exempt that account from sequestration or provide for a lower uniform percentage reduction than would otherwise apply, provided that the President has notified Congress of the manner in which such authority will be exercised pursuant to paragraph (7)(A)(ii).

(B) REDUCTIONS.—If the President uses the authority to exempt any military personnel from sequestration under paragraph (7)(A)(ii), each account within subfunctional

category 051 (other than those military personnel accounts for which the authority provided under clause (i) has been exercised) shall be further reduced by a dollar amount calculated by multiplying the enacted level of non-exempt budgetary resources in that account at that time by the uniform percentage necessary to offset the total dollar amount by which budget authority is not reduced in military personnel accounts by reason of the use of such authority.

(4) PART-YEAR APPROPRIATIONS.—If, on the date specified in paragraph (1), there is in effect an Act making or continuing appropriations for part of a fiscal year for any budget account, then the dollar sequestration calculated for that account under paragraphs (2) and (3) shall be subtracted from—

(A) the annualized amount otherwise available by law in that account under that or a subsequent part-year appropriation; and

(B) when a full-year appropriation for that account is enacted, from the amount otherwise provided by the full-year appropriation.

(5) LOOK-BACK.—If, after June 30, an appropriation for the fiscal year in progress is enacted that causes a breach within a category for that year (after taking into account any sequestration of amounts within that category), the discretionary spending limits for that category for the next fiscal year shall be reduced by the amount or amounts of that breach.

(6) WITHIN-SESSION SEQUESTRATION.—If an appropriation for a fiscal year in progress is enacted (after Congress adjourns to end the session for that budget year and before July 1 of that fiscal year) that causes a breach within a category for that year (after taking into account any prior sequestration of amounts within that category), 15 days after such enactment there shall be a sequestration to eliminate that breach within that category following the procedures set forth in paragraphs (2) through (4).

(7) REPORTS.—

(A) SEQUESTRATION PREVIEW REPORT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 days before the date of the President's budget submission for CBO, and the date of the President's budget submissions for OMB, OMB and CBO shall issue a preview report regarding discretionary spending based on laws enacted through those dates. The preview report shall set forth estimates for the current year and each subsequent year through 2021 of the applicable discretionary spending limits for each category and an explanation of any adjustments in such limits under this section.

(ii) NOTIFICATION REGARDING MILITARY PERSONNEL.—On or before the date of the sequestration preview report, the President shall notify the Congress of the manner in which he intends to exercise flexibility with respect to military personnel accounts under subsection (f)(3).

(iii) EXPLANATION OF DIFFERENCES.—The OMB reports shall explain the differences between OMB and CBO estimates for each item set forth in this subsection.

(B) SEQUESTRATION UPDATE REPORT.—Not later than August 15 for CBO, and August 20 for OMB, OMB and CBO shall issue a sequestration update report, reflecting laws enacted through those dates, containing all of the information required in the sequestration preview reports. This report shall also contain a preview estimate of the adjustment for disaster funding for the upcoming fiscal year.

(C) FINAL SEQUESTRATION REPORT.—Not later than 10 days after the end of session for CBO, and 14 days after the end of session for OMB (excluding weekends and holidays), OMB and CBO shall issue a final sequestration report, updated to reflect laws enacted through those dates, with estimates for each of the following:

(i) For the current year and each subsequent year through 2021 the applicable discretionary spending limits for each category and an explanation of any adjustments in such limits under this section, including a final estimate of the disaster funding adjustment.

(ii) For the current year and the budget year the estimated new budget authority for each category and the breach, if any, in each category.

(iii) For each category for which a sequestration is required, the sequestration percentages necessary to achieve the required reduction.

(iv) For the budget year, for each account to be sequestered, estimates of the baseline level of sequesterable budgetary resources and the amount of budgetary resources to be sequestered.

(8) SUSPENSION IN THE EVENT OF LOW GROWTH.—Section 254(i) and subsections (a), (b)(1), and (c) of section 258 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 with respect to suspension of this section for low growth only shall apply to this section, provided that those sections are deemed not to apply to titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 1103 of title 31, United States Code.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) NONSECURITY CATEGORY.—The term “nonsecurity category” means all discretionary appropriations, as that term is defined in section 250(c)(7) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, not included in the security category defined in this Act, but does not include any appropriations designated for overseas deployments and related activities pursuant to section (c)(3), or appropriations designated as an emergency pursuant to this Act.

(2) SECURITY CATEGORY.—The term “security category” includes discretionary appropriations, as that term is defined in section 250(c)(7) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, in budget functions 050 and 700, but does not include any appropriations designated for overseas deployments and related activities pursuant to section (c)(3), or appropriations designated as an emergency pursuant to this Act.

(3) DISCRETIONARY CATEGORY.—The term “discretionary category” includes all discretionary appropriations designated as an emergency pursuant to this Act, as that term is defined in section 250(c)(7) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, but does not include any appropriations designated for overseas deployments and related activities pursuant to section (c)(3), or appropriations designated as an emergency pursuant to this Act.

(4) ADVANCE APPROPRIATION.—The term “advance appropriation” means appropriations of new budget authority that become available one or more fiscal years beyond the fiscal year for which the appropriation act was passed.

(5) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—The term “discretionary spending limits” means the amounts specified in section 101 of this Act.

(6) DEFINITIONS.—To the extent they are not defined in this section, the terms used in this section shall have the same meaning as the terms defined in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

(h) SEQUESTRATION RULES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsections (g) and (k) of section 256 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall apply to sequestration under this Act.

(2) INTERGOVERNMENTAL FUNDS.—For purposes of sequestration under this section, budgetary resources shall not include activi-

ties financed by voluntary payments to the Government for goods and services to be provided for such payments, intragovernmental funds paid in from other Government accounts, and unobligated balances of prior year appropriations.

SEC. 102. SENATE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) For the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 through April 15, 2012, including section 300 of that Act, and enforcing budgetary points of order in prior concurrent resolutions on the budget, the allocations, aggregates, and levels set in subsection (b)(1) shall apply in the Senate in the same manner as a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2012 with appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2011 and 2013 through 2021.

(2) For the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 after April 15, 2012, including section 300 of that Act, and enforcing budgetary points of order in prior concurrent resolutions on the budget, the allocations, aggregates, and levels set in subsection (b)(2) shall apply in the Senate in the same manner as a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013 with appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2012 and 2014 through 2022.

(b) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES AND LEVELS.—

(1) As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this section, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall file—

(A) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2011 and 2012 consistent with the discretionary spending limits set forth in this Act for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(B) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2011, 2012, 2012–2016, and 2012–2021 consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's March 2011 baseline adjusted to account for the budgetary effects of this Act and legislation enacted prior to this Act but not included in the Congressional Budget Office's March 2011 baseline, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(C) aggregate spending levels for fiscal years 2011 and 2012 and aggregate revenue levels fiscal years 2011, 2012, 2012–2016, 2012–2021 consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's March 2011 baseline adjusted to account for the budgetary effects of this Act and legislation enacted prior to this Act but not included in the Congressional Budget Office's March 2011 baseline, and the discretionary spending limits set forth in this Act for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(D) levels of Social Security revenues and outlays for fiscal years 2011, 2012, 2012–2016, and 2012–2021 consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's March 2011 baseline adjusted to account for the budgetary effects of this Act and legislation enacted prior to this Act but not included in the Congressional Budget Office's March 2011 baseline, for the purpose of enforcing sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) Not later than April 15, 2012, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall file—

(A) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2012 and 2013 consistent with the discretionary spending limits set forth in this Act for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(B) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2012, 2013, 2013–2017, and 2013–2022 consistent with the Congressional

Budget Office's March 2012 baseline for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(C) aggregate spending levels for fiscal years 2012 and 2013 and aggregate revenue levels fiscal years 2012, 2013, 2013-2017, and 2013-2022 consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's March 2012 baseline and the discretionary spending limits set forth in this Act for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(D) levels of Social Security revenues and outlays for fiscal years 2012 and 2013, 2013-2017, and 2013-2022 consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's March 2012 baseline budget for the purpose of enforcing sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(c) **SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD.**—

(1) Upon the date of enactment of this section, for the purpose of enforcing section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget shall reduce any balances of direct spending and revenues for any fiscal year to zero.

(2) Not later than April 15, 2012, for the purpose of enforcing section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget shall reduce any balances of direct spending and revenues for any fiscal year to zero.

(3) Upon resetting the Senate paygo scorecard pursuant to paragraph (2), the Chairman shall publish a notification of such action in the Congressional Record.

(d) **FURTHER ADJUSTMENTS.**—

(1) The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise any allocations, aggregates, or levels set pursuant to this section to account for any subsequent adjustments to discretionary spending limits made pursuant to this Act.

(2) With respect to any allocations, aggregates, or levels set or adjustments made pursuant to this section, sections 412 through 414 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress) shall remain in effect.

(e) **EXPIRATION.**—

(1) Sections (a)(1), (b)(1), and (c)(1) shall expire if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2012 is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) Sections (a)(2), (b)(2), and (c)(2) shall expire if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013 is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

TITLE II—OTHER SPENDING CUTS

Subtitle A—Spectrum Auction Proposals and Public Safety Broadband Network

SEC. 211. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) **700 MHZ BAND.**—The term “700 MHz band” means the portion of the electromagnetic spectrum between the frequencies from 698 megahertz to 806 megahertz.

(2) **700 MHZ D BLOCK SPECTRUM.**—The term “700 MHz D block spectrum” means the portion of the electromagnetic spectrum between the frequencies from 758 megahertz to 763 megahertz and between the frequencies from 788 megahertz to 793 megahertz.

(3) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.**—Except as otherwise specifically provided, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

(4) **ASSISTANT SECRETARY.**—The term “Assistant Secretary” means the Assistant Sec-

retary of Commerce for Communications and Information.

(5) **COMMISSION.**—The term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission.

(6) **CORPORATION.**—The term “Corporation” means the Public Safety Broadband Corporation established under section 244.

(7) **EXISTING PUBLIC SAFETY BROADBAND SPECTRUM.**—The term “existing public safety broadband spectrum” means the portion of the electromagnetic spectrum between the frequencies—

(A) from 763 megahertz to 768 megahertz;

(B) from 793 megahertz to 798 megahertz;

(C) from 768 megahertz to 769 megahertz; and

(D) from 798 megahertz to 799 megahertz.

(8) **FEDERAL ENTITY.**—The term “Federal entity” has the same meaning as in section 113(i) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 923(i)).

(9) **NARROWBAND SPECTRUM.**—The term “narrowband spectrum” means the portion of the electromagnetic spectrum between the frequencies from 769 megahertz to 775 megahertz and between the frequencies from 799 megahertz to 805 megahertz.

(10) **NIST.**—The term “NIST” means the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

(11) **NTIA.**—The term “NTIA” means the National Telecommunications and Information Administration.

(12) **PUBLIC SAFETY ENTITY.**—The term “public safety entity” means an entity that provides public safety services.

(13) **PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES.**—The term “public safety services”—

(A) has the meaning given the term in section 337(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 337(f)); and

(B) includes services provided by emergency response providers, as that term is defined in section 2 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101).

PART I—AUCTIONS OF SPECTRUM AND SPECTRUM MANAGEMENT

SEC. 221. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES TO REPURPOSE FEDERAL SPECTRUM FOR COMMERCIAL PURPOSES.

(a) **ELIGIBLE FEDERAL ENTITIES.**—Section 113(g)(1) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 923(g)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) **ELIGIBLE FEDERAL ENTITIES.**—Any Federal entity that operates a Federal Government station authorized to use a band of frequencies specified in paragraph (2) and that incurs relocation costs because of planning for a potential auction of spectrum frequencies, a planned auction of spectrum frequencies, or the reallocation of spectrum frequencies from Federal use to exclusive non-Federal use, or shared Federal and non-Federal use shall receive payment for such costs from the Spectrum Relocation Fund, in accordance with section 118 of this Act. For purposes of this paragraph, Federal power agencies exempted under subsection (c)(4) that choose to relocate from the frequencies identified for reallocation pursuant to subsection (a), are eligible to receive payment under this paragraph.”

(b) **ELIGIBLE FREQUENCIES.**—Section 113(g)(2)(B) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 923(g)(2)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) any other band of frequencies reallocated from Federal use to non-Federal or shared use, whether for licensed or unlicensed use, after January 1, 2003, that is assigned—

“(i) by competitive bidding pursuant to section 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)); or

“(ii) as a result of an Act of Congress or any other administrative or executive direction.”

(c) **DEFINITION OF RELOCATION AND SHARING COSTS.**—Section 113(g)(3) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 923(g)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) **DEFINITION OF RELOCATION AND SHARING COSTS.**—For purposes of this subsection, the terms ‘relocation costs’ and ‘sharing costs’ mean the costs incurred by a Federal entity to plan for a potential or planned auction or sharing of spectrum frequencies and to achieve comparable capability of systems, regardless of whether that capability is achieved by relocating to a new frequency assignment, relocating a Federal Government station to a different geographic location, modifying Federal Government equipment to mitigate interference or use less spectrum, in terms of bandwidth, geography, or time, and thereby permitting spectrum sharing (including sharing among relocated Federal entities and incumbents to make spectrum available for non-Federal use) or relocation, or by utilizing an alternative technology. Comparable capability of systems includes the acquisition of state-of-the-art replacement systems intended to meet comparable operational scope, which may include incidental increases in functionality. Such costs include—

“(A) the costs of any modification or replacement of equipment, spares, associated ancillary equipment, software, facilities, operating manuals, training costs, or regulations that are attributable to relocation or sharing;

“(B) the costs of all engineering, equipment, software, site acquisition, and construction costs, as well as any legitimate and prudent transaction expense, including term-limited Federal civil servant and contractor staff necessary to carry out the relocation activities of an eligible Federal entity, and reasonable additional costs incurred by the Federal entity that are attributable to relocation or sharing, including increased recurring costs above recurring costs of the system before relocation for the remaining estimated life of the system being relocated;

“(C) the costs of research, engineering studies, economic analyses, or other expenses reasonably incurred in connection with—

“(i) calculating the estimated relocation costs that are provided to the Commission pursuant to paragraph (4) of this subsection, or in calculating the estimated sharing costs;

“(ii) determining the technical or operational feasibility of relocation to 1 or more potential relocation bands; or

“(iii) planning for or managing a relocation or sharing project (including spectrum coordination with auction winners) or potential relocation or sharing project;

“(D) the one-time costs of any modification of equipment reasonably necessary to accommodate commercial use of shared frequencies or, in the case of frequencies reallocated to exclusive commercial use, prior to the termination of the Federal entity's primary allocation or protected status, when the eligible frequencies as defined in paragraph (2) of this subsection are made available for private sector uses by competitive bidding and a Federal entity retains primary allocation or protected status in those frequencies for a period of time after the completion of the competitive bidding process;

“(E) the costs associated with the accelerated replacement of systems and equipment if such acceleration is necessary to ensure

the timely relocation of systems to a new frequency assignment or the timely accommodation of sharing of Federal frequencies; and

“(F) the costs of the use of commercial systems (including systems not utilizing spectrum) to replace Federal systems discontinued or relocated pursuant to this Act, including lease, subscription, and equipment costs over an appropriate period, such as the anticipated life of an equivalent Federal system or other period determined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.”

(d) SPECTRUM SHARING.—Section 113(g) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 923(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) SPECTRUM SHARING.—A Federal entity is permitted to allow access to its frequency assignments by a non-Federal entity upon approval of NTIA, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. Such non-Federal entities shall comply with all applicable rules of the Commission and the NTIA, including any regulations promulgated pursuant to this section. Any remuneration associated with such access shall be deposited into the Spectrum Relocation Fund established under section 118. A Federal entity that incurs costs as a result of such access is eligible for payment from the Fund for the purposes specified in paragraph (3) of this section. The revenue associated with such access shall be at least 110 percent of the estimated Federal costs.”

(e) SPECTRUM RELOCATION FUND.—Section 118 of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 928) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and any payments made by non-Federal entities for access to Federal spectrum pursuant to section 113(g)(7) (47 U.S.C. 113(g)(7))”;

(2) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) FUNDS FROM AUCTIONS.—The amounts in the Fund from auctions of eligible frequencies are authorized to be used to pay relocation costs, as such costs are defined in section 113(g)(3), of an eligible Federal entity incurring such costs with respect to relocation from any eligible frequency.

“(2) FUNDS FROM PAYMENTS BY NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.—The amounts in the Fund from payments by non-Federal entities for access to Federal spectrum are authorized to be used to pay the sharing costs, as such costs are defined in section 113(g)(3), of an eligible Federal entity incurring such costs.

“(3) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Director of OMB may transfer at any time (including prior to any auction or contemplated auction, or sharing initiative) such sums as may be available in the Fund to an eligible Federal entity to pay eligible relocation or sharing costs related to pre-auction estimates or research, as such costs are described in section 113(g)(3)(C).

“(B) LIMITATION.—The Director of OMB may not transfer more than \$100,000,000 associated with authorize pre-auction activities before an auction is completed and proceeds are deposited in the Spectrum Relocation Fund.

“(C) APPLICABILITY.—The Director of OMB may transfer up to \$10,000,000 to eligible Federal entities for eligible relocation or sharing costs related to pre-auction estimates or research, as such costs are described in section 113(g)(3)(C), for costs incurred prior to the date of the enactment of the Budget Control Act of 2011, but after June 28th, 2010.”

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and sharing” before “costs”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) by inserting “and sharing” before “costs”; and

(ii) by inserting “and sharing” before the period at the end; and

(C) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) REVERSION OF UNUSED FUNDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Any amounts in the Fund that are remaining after the payment of the relocation and sharing costs that are payable from the Fund shall revert to and be deposited in the General Fund of the Treasury not later than 15 years after the date of the deposit of such proceeds to the Fund, unless within 60 days in advance of the reversion of such funds, the Director of OMB, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, notifies the appropriate committees of Congress that such funds are needed to complete or to implement current or future relocations or sharing initiatives.

“(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means

“(i) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

“(ii) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

“(iii) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

“(iv) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.”;

(4) in subsection (e)(2)—

(A) by inserting “and sharing” before “costs”;

(B) by inserting “or sharing” before “is complete”; and

(C) by inserting “or sharing” before “in accordance”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS FROM THE FUND.—Notwithstanding subsections (c) through (e), after the date of the enactment of the Budget Control Act of 2011, and following the credit of any amounts specified in subsection (b), there are hereby appropriated from the Fund and available to the Director of the OMB up to 10 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund from the auction of licenses for frequencies of spectrum vacated by Federal entities, or up to 10 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund by non-Federal entities for sharing of Federal spectrum. The Director of OMB, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, may use such amounts to pay eligible Federal entities for the purpose of encouraging timely access to such spectrum, provided that—

“(1) any such payment by the Director of OMB is based on the market value of the spectrum, the timeliness of clearing, and needs for essential missions of agencies;

“(2) any such payment by the Director of OMB is used to carry out the purposes specified in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of paragraph (3) of subsection 113(g) to enhance other communications, radar, and spectrum-using investments not directly affected by such reallocation or sharing but essential for the missions of the Federal entity that is relocating its systems or sharing frequencies;

“(3) the amount remaining in the Fund after any such payment by the Director is not less than 10 percent of the winning bids in the relevant auction, or is not less than 10 percent of the payments from non-Federal entities in the relevant sharing agreement; and

“(4) any such payment by the Director shall not be made until 30 days after the Director has notified the Committees on Appropriations and Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Com-

mittees on Appropriations and Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.”.

(f) COMPETITIVE BIDDING; TREATMENT OF REVENUES.—Subparagraph (D) of section 309(j)(8) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)) is amended by inserting “excluding frequencies identified by the Federal Communications Commission to be auctioned in conjunction with eligible frequencies described in section 113(g)(2)” before “shall be deposited”.

(g) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE AND NONDISCLOSURE.—If the head of an executive agency of the Federal Government determines that public disclosure of any information contained in notifications and reports required by section 113 or 118 of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 923 and 928) would reveal classified national security information or other information for which there is a legal basis for nondisclosure and such public disclosure would be detrimental to national security, homeland security, public safety, or jeopardize law enforcement investigations, the head of the executive agency shall notify the NTIA of that determination prior to release of such information. In that event, such classified information shall be included in a separate annex, as needed. These annexes shall be provided to the appropriate subcommittee in accordance with appropriate national security stipulations, but shall not be disclosed to the public or provided to any unauthorized person through any other means.

SEC. 222. INCENTIVE AUCTION AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (8) of section 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “(B), (D), and (E),” and inserting “(B), (D), (E), and (F).”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) INCENTIVE AUCTION AUTHORITY.—

“(i) AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the Commission determines that it is consistent with the public interest in utilization of the spectrum for a licensee to relinquish voluntarily some or all of its licensed spectrum usage rights in order to permit the assignment of new initial licenses through a competitive bidding process subject to new service rules, or the designation of new spectrum for unlicensed use, the Commission may disburse to that licensee a portion of any auction proceeds that the Commission determines, in its discretion, are attributable to the licensee’s relinquished spectrum usage rights.

“(ii) REPACKING.—When assigning spectrum to television broadcast station licensees pursuant to clause (i), if the Commission determines that it is in the public interest to modify the spectrum usage rights of any incumbent licensee in order to facilitate the assignment of such new initial licenses subject to new service rules, or the designation of spectrum for an unlicensed use, the Commission may disburse to such licensee a portion of the auction proceeds for the purpose of relocating to any alternative frequency or location that the Commission may designate.

“(iii) UNLICENSED SPECTRUM.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—With respect to frequency bands between 54 and 72 MHz, 76 and 88 MHz, 174 and 216 MHz, 470 and 698 MHz, 84 MHz (referred to in this clause as the ‘specified bands’) shall be assigned via a competitive bidding process until the winning bidders for licenses covering 90 megahertz from the specified bands deposit the full amount of their bids in accordance with the instructions of the Commission. In addition, if more than 90 megahertz of spectrum from the

specified bands is made available for alternative use utilizing payments under this subsection, and such spectrum is assigned via competitive bidding, a portion of the proceeds may be disbursed to licensees of other frequency bands for the purpose of making additional spectrum available.

“(II) NOTICE.—The Chairman of the Commission, in consultation with the Director of OMB, shall notify the Committees on Appropriations and Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committees on Appropriations and Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives of the methodology for calculating such payments to licensees at least 3 months in advance of the relevant auction, and that such methodology consider the value of spectrum vacated in its current use and the timeliness of clearing; and

“(iv) TREATMENT OF REVENUES.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), and except as provided in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), all proceeds (including deposits and up front payments from successful bidders) from the auction of spectrum under this subparagraph shall be deposited with the Public Safety Trust Fund established under section 243 of the Budget Control Act of 2011.

“(G) ESTABLISHMENT OF INCENTIVE AUCTION RELOCATION FUND.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the ‘Incentive Auction Relocation Fund’.

“(ii) ADMINISTRATION.—The Assistant Secretary shall administer the Incentive Auction Relocation Fund using the amounts deposited pursuant to this section.

“(iii) CREDITING OF RECEIPTS.—There shall be deposited into or credited to the Incentive Auction Relocation Fund any amounts specified in section 243 of the Budget Control Act of 2011.

“(iv) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts in the Incentive Auction Relocation Fund shall be available to the NTIA for use—

“(I) without fiscal year limitation;

“(II) for a period not to exceed 18 months following the later of—

“(aa) the completion of incentive auction from which such amounts were derived; or

“(bb) the date on which the Commission issues all the new channel assignments pursuant to any repacking required under subparagraph (F)(ii); and

“(III) without further appropriation.

“(v) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts in the Incentive Auction Relocation Fund may only be used by the NTIA, in consultation with the Commission, to cover—

“(I) the reasonable costs of licensees that are relocated to a different spectrum channel or geographic location following an incentive auction under subparagraph (F), or that are impacted by such relocations, including to cover the cost of new equipment, installation, and construction; and

“(II) the costs incurred by multichannel video programming distributors for new equipment, installation, and construction related to the carriage of such relocated stations or the carriage of stations that voluntarily elect to share a channel, but retain their existing rights to carriage pursuant to sections 338, 614, and 615.”

SEC. 223. INCENTIVE AUCTIONS TO REPURPOSE CERTAIN MOBILE SATELLITE SERVICES SPECTRUM FOR TERRESTRIAL BROADBAND USE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that the Commission makes available spectrum licenses on some or all of the frequencies between 2000 and 2020 MHz and 2180 and 2200 MHz for terrestrial broadband use, such licenses shall be assigned pursuant to the authority provided in section 309(j)(8) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C.

309(j)(8)), including, as appropriate, subparagraph (F) of such section.

(b) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority granted under subsection (a) shall terminate on September 30, 2021.

SEC. 224. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF AUCTION AUTHORITY.

Section 309(j)(11) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(11)) is repealed.

SEC. 225. AUTHORITY TO AUCTION LICENSES FOR DOMESTIC SATELLITE SERVICES.

Section 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)) is amended by adding the following:

“(17) AUTHORITY TO AUCTION LICENSES FOR DOMESTIC SATELLITE SERVICES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commission shall use competitive bidding under this subsection to assign any license, construction permit, reservation, or similar authorization or modification thereof, that may be used solely or predominantly for domestic satellite communications services, including satellite-based television or radio services. The Commission may, however, use an alternative approach to assignment of such licenses or similar authorities if it finds that such an alternative to competitive bidding would serve the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

“(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ‘predominantly for domestic satellite communications services’ means a service provided in which the majority of customers that may be served are located within the geographic boundaries of the United States.

“(C) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.—This paragraph shall take effect on the date of enactment of this paragraph and shall apply to all Commission assignments or reservations of spectrum for domestic satellite services, including, but not limited to, all assignments or reservations for satellite-based television or radio services as of the effective date.”

SEC. 226. AUCTION OF SPECTRUM.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF SPECTRUM.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall identify and make available for immediate reallocation or sharing with incumbent Government operations, at a minimum, 15 megahertz of contiguous spectrum at frequencies located between 1675 megahertz and 1710 megahertz, inclusive, minus the geographic exclusion zones, or any amendment thereof, identified in NTIA’s October 2010 report entitled “An Assessment of Near-Term Viability of Accommodating Wireless Broadband Systems in 1675–1710 MHz, 1755–1780 MHz, 3500–3650 MHz, and 4200–4220 MHz, 4380–4400 MHz Bands”.

(b) AUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 31, 2016, the Commission shall conduct the auctions of the following licenses, by commencing the bidding for:

(A) The spectrum between the frequencies of 1915 megahertz and 1920 megahertz, inclusive.

(B) The spectrum between the frequencies of 1995 megahertz and 2000 megahertz, inclusive.

(C) The spectrum between the frequencies of 2020 megahertz and 2025 megahertz, inclusive.

(D) The spectrum between the frequencies of 2155 megahertz and 2175 megahertz, inclusive.

(E) The spectrum between the frequencies of 2175 megahertz and 2180 megahertz, inclusive.

(F) Subject to paragraph (2), 25 megahertz of spectrum between the frequencies of 1755 megahertz, minus appropriate geographic exclusion zones.

(G) The spectrum identified pursuant to subsection (a).

(2) LIMITATION.—The Commission may conduct the auctions of the licenses described in paragraph (1) unless the President determines that—

(A)(i) such spectrum should not be reallocated due to the need to protect incumbent Federal operations; or

(ii) reallocation must be delayed or progressed in phases to ensure protection or continuity of Federal operations; and

(B) allocation of other spectrum—

(i) better serves the public interest, convenience, and necessity; and

(ii) can reasonably be expected to produce receipts comparable to auction of spectrum frequencies identified in this paragraph.

(c) AUCTION ORGANIZATION.—The Commission may, if technically feasible and consistent with the public interest, combine the spectrum identified in paragraphs (4), (5), and the portion of paragraph (6) between the frequencies of 1755 megahertz and 1780 megahertz, inclusive, of subsection (b) in an auction of licenses for paired spectrum blocks.

(d) FURTHER REALLOCATION OF CERTAIN OTHER SPECTRUM.—

(1) COVERED SPECTRUM.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “covered spectrum” means the portion of the electromagnetic spectrum between the frequencies of 3550 to 3650 megahertz, inclusive, minus the geographic exclusion zones, or any amendment thereof, identified in NTIA’s October 2010 report entitled “An Assessment of Near-Term Viability of Accommodating Wireless Broadband Systems in 1675–1710 MHz, 1755–1780 MHz, 3550–3650 MHz, and 4200–4220 MHz, 4380–4400 MHz Bands”.

(2) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with requirements of section 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934, the Commission shall reallocate covered spectrum for assignment by competitive bidding unless the President of the United States determines that—

(A) such spectrum cannot be reallocated due to the need to protect incumbent Federal systems from interference; or

(B) allocation of other spectrum—

(i) better serves the public interest, convenience, and necessity; and

(ii) can reasonably be expected to produce receipts comparable to what the covered spectrum might auction for without the geographic exclusion zones.

(3) ACTIONS REQUIRED IF COVERED SPECTRUM CANNOT BE REALLOCATED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) that the covered spectrum cannot be reallocated, then the President shall, within 1 year after the date of such determination—

(i) identify alternative bands of frequencies totaling more than 20 megahertz and no more than 100 megahertz of spectrum used primarily by Federal agencies that satisfy the requirements of clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (2)(B);

(ii) report to the President and appropriate committees of Congress and the Commission an identification of such alternative spectrum for assignment by competitive bidding; and

(iii) make such alternative spectrum for assignment immediately available for reallocation.

(B) AUCTION.—If the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) that the covered spectrum cannot be reallocated, the Commission shall commence the bidding of the alternative spectrum identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) within 3 years of the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) ACTIONS REQUIRED IF COVERED SPECTRUM CAN BE REALLOCATED.—If the President does not make a determination under paragraph

(1) that the covered spectrum cannot be re-allocated, the Commission shall commence the competitive bidding for the covered spectrum within 3 years of the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) AMENDMENTS TO DESIGN REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO COMPETITIVE BIDDING.—Section 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (E)(ii), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon; and

(B) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) by amending clause (i) of the second sentence of paragraph (8)(C) to read as follows:

“(i) the deposits—

“(I) of successful bidders of any auction conducted pursuant to subparagraph (F) or to section 226 of the Budget Control Act of 2011 shall be paid to the Public Safety Trust Fund established under section 243 of the Budget Control Act of 2011; and

“(II) of successful bidders of any other auction shall be paid to the Treasury.”

SEC. 227. REPORT TO CONGRESS ON IMPROVING SPECTRUM MANAGEMENT.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this part, the NTIA shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the status of the NTIA’s plan to implement the recommendations contained in the “President’s Memorandum on Improving Spectrum Management for the 21st Century”, 49 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 2875, Nov. 29, 2004.

PART II—PUBLIC SAFETY BROADBAND NETWORK

SEC. 241. REALLOCATION OF D BLOCK FOR PUBLIC SAFETY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall reallocate the 700 MHz D block spectrum for use by public safety entities in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

(b) SPECTRUM ALLOCATION.—Section 337(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 337(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “24” in paragraph (1) and inserting “34”; and

(2) by striking “36” in paragraph (2) and inserting “26”.

SEC. 242. FLEXIBLE USE OF NARROWBAND SPECTRUM.

The Commission may allow the narrowband spectrum to be used in a flexible manner, including usage for public safety broadband communications, subject to such technical and interference protection measures as the Commission may require and subject to interoperability requirements of the Commission and the Corporation (to be established in subsequent legislation, to provide governance of the network, development of standards to promote system-wide interoperability and security, and implementation grants, where necessary, to state, local and Tribal entities).

SEC. 243. PUBLIC SAFETY TRUST FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY TRUST FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the “Public Safety Trust Fund”.

(2) CREDITING OF RECEIPTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There shall be deposited into or credited to the Public Safety Trust Fund the proceeds from the auction of spectrum carried out pursuant to—

(i) section 102 of this Act; and

(ii) section 309(j)(8)(F) of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 102 of this Act.

(B) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts deposited into or credited to the Public Safety Trust Fund

in accordance with subparagraph (A) shall remain available until the end of fiscal year 2017. Upon the expiration of the period described in the prior sentence such amounts shall be deposited in the General Fund of the Treasury, where such amounts shall be dedicated for the sole purpose of deficit reduction.

(b) APPROPRIATION.—There is hereby appropriated from the Public Safety Trust Fund to the Secretary of Commerce \$7,000,000,000, to remain available through fiscal year 2017, for the establishment of a national network to support secure and interoperable public-safety broadband communications: *Provided*, That the Secretary may make shall make these amounts available to a Public Safety Broadband Corporation, to be established in a subsequent statute, to support the Corporation’s activities in providing governance of such network; in developing standards to promote systemwide interoperability and security of such network; in entering into contracts with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), for NIST to provide services to the Corporation; and in making grants, as necessary, to State, local, and tribal entities for their activities in support of such network: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall make these amounts available to such Corporation after submission of a spend plan by the Corporation and approval by the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and Attorney General of the United States.

SEC. 244. PUBLIC SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

After approval by the Office of Management and Budget of a spend plan developed by the Director of NIST, up to \$300,000,000 for fiscal year 2012 shall be made available for use by the Director of NIST to carry out a research program on public safety wireless communications. If less than \$300,000,000 is approved by the Office of Management and Budget, the remainder shall be transferred to the Public Safety Broadband Corporation, to be established in subsequent statute, and be available to support the Corporation’s activities in providing governance of a national network to support secure and interoperable public-safety broadband communications; in developing standards to promote systemwide interoperability and security of such network; and in making grants, as necessary, to State, local, and tribal entities for their activities in support of such network.

SEC. 245. INCENTIVE AUCTION RELOCATION FUND.

Not more than \$1,000,000,000 shall be deposited in the Incentive Auction Relocation Fund established under section 309(j)(8)(G) of the Communications Act of 1934.

SEC. 246. FEDERAL INFRASTRUCTURE SHARING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of General Services shall establish rules to allow public safety entities licensed or otherwise permitted to use spectrum allocated to the Public Safety Broadband Corporation and other non-Federal users of spectrum to have access to those components of Federal infrastructure appropriate for the construction and maintenance of the nationwide public safety interoperable broadband network to be established under this part or operation of a commercial or other non-Federal wireless networks.

(b) REQUIRED PAYMENT.—Rules established by the Administrator shall require payments from public safety entities or other non-Federal users to cover at least the full incremental costs of using Federal infrastructure.

(c) PAYMENT ABOVE FULL INCREMENTAL COST.—The Administrator may adopt rules

to charge more than the full incremental cost of using the Federal infrastructure if demand for use of a component of Federal infrastructure by non-Federal entities is greater than can be accommodated, as determined by the Administrator. However, the rules established by the Administrator shall prioritize use by Federal agencies over public safety entities and prioritize use by public safety entities over commercial or other non-Federal entities.

(d) USE OF FUNDS.—Remuneration received for use of Federal infrastructure is available to the Administrator without further appropriation to pay for the full incremental costs of using the infrastructure. Any amounts received above the full incremental cost shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

SEC. 247. FCC REPORT ON EFFICIENT USE OF PUBLIC SAFETY SPECTRUM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and every 2 years thereafter, the Commission shall, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary and the Director of NIST, conduct a study and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the spectrum allocated for public safety use.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an examination of how such spectrum is being used;

(2) recommendations on how such spectrum may be used more efficiently;

(3) an assessment of the feasibility of public safety entities relocating from other bands to the public safety broadband spectrum; and

(4) an assessment of whether any spectrum made available by the relocation described in paragraph (3) could be returned to the Commission for reassignment through auction, including through use of incentive auction authority under subparagraph (G) of section 309(j)(8) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)), as added by section 222.

Subtitle B—Federal Pell Grant and Student Loan Program Changes

SEC. 251. FEDERAL PELL GRANT AND STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM CHANGES.

(a) FEDERAL PELL GRANTS.—Section 401(b)(7)(A)(iv) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a(b)(7)(A)(iv)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (II), by striking “\$3,183,000,000” and inserting “\$13,683,000,000”; and

(2) in subclause (III), by striking “\$0” and inserting “\$7,500,000,000”.

(b) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE INTEREST SUBSIDIZED LOANS TO GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS.—Section 455(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE INTEREST SUBSIDIZED LOANS TO GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS.—Notwithstanding any provision of this part or part B, for any period of instruction beginning on or after July 1, 2012—

“(A) a graduate or professional student shall not be eligible to receive a subsidized Federal Direct Stafford Loan under this part;

“(B) the maximum annual amount of Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans such a student may borrow in any academic year (as defined in section 481(a)(2)) or its equivalent shall be the maximum annual amount for such student determined under section 428H, plus an amount equal to the amount of Federal Direct Subsidized Loans the student would have received in the absence of this paragraph; and

“(C) the maximum aggregate amount of Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans such a student may borrow shall be the maximum aggregate amount for such student determined under section 428H, adjusted to reflect the increased annual limits described in subparagraph (B), as prescribed by the Secretary by regulation.”

(C) INAPPLICABILITY OF TITLE IV NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING AND MASTER CALENDAR EXCEPTION.—Sections 482(c) and 492 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1089(c), 1098a) shall not apply to the amendments made by this section, or to any regulations promulgated under those amendments.

Subtitle C—Farm Programs

SEC. 261. DEFINITION OF PAYMENT ACRES.

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001(11) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8702(11)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “subparagraph (B)” and inserting “subparagraphs (B) and (C)”; and

(B) by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) in the case of direct payments for the 2012 crop year, 59 percent of the base acres for the covered commodity on a farm on which direct payments are made.”

(B) PAYMENT ACRES FOR PEANUTS.—Section 1301(5) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8751(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “subparagraph (B)” and inserting “subparagraphs (B) and (C)”; and

(B) by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) in the case of direct payments for the 2012 crop year, 59 percent of the base acres for peanuts on a farm on which direct payments are made.”

TITLE III—JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON DEFICIT REDUCTION

SEC. 301. ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.

(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this title:

(1) JOINT COMMITTEE.—The term “joint committee” means the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction established under subsection (b)(1).

(2) JOINT COMMITTEE BILL.—The term “joint committee bill” means a bill consisting of the proposed legislative language of the joint committee recommended under subsection (b)(3)(B) and introduced under section 302(a).

(B) ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a joint select committee of Congress to be known as the “Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction”.

(2) GOAL.—The goal of the joint committee shall be to reduce the deficit to 3 percent or less of GDP.

(3) DUTIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—

(i) IMPROVING THE SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM FISCAL IMBALANCE.—The joint committee shall provide recommendations and legislative language that will significantly improve the short-term and long-term fiscal imbalance of the Federal Government and may include recommendations and legislative language on tax reform.

(ii) CONSIDERATION OF OTHER BIPARTISAN PLANS.—As a part of developing the joint committee’s recommendations and legislation, the joint committee shall consider existing bipartisan plans to reduce the deficit, including plans developed jointly by Senators or Members of the House.

(iii) RECOMMENDATIONS OF HOUSE AND SENATE COMMITTEES.—Not later than October 14,

2011, each committee of the House and Senate may transmit to the joint committee its recommendations for changes in law to reduce the deficit consistent with the goals described in paragraph (2) for the joint committee’s consideration.

(B) REPORT, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 23, 2011, the joint committee shall vote on—

(I) a report that contains a detailed statement of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the joint committee and CBO and the Joint Committee on Taxation estimate required by paragraph (5)(D)(ii); and

(II) proposed legislative language to carry out such recommendations as described in subclause (I).

(ii) APPROVAL OF REPORT AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE.—The report of the joint committee and the proposed legislative language described in clause (i) shall require the approval of not fewer than 7 of the 12 members of the joint committee.

(iii) ADDITIONAL VIEWS.—A member of the joint committee who gives notice of an intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views at the time of final joint committee vote on the approval of the report and legislative language under clause (ii), shall be entitled to 3 calendar days in which to file such views in writing with the staff director of the joint committee. Such views shall then be included in the joint committee report and printed in the same volume, or part thereof, and their inclusion shall be noted on the cover of the report. In the absence of timely notice, the joint committee report may be printed and transmitted immediately without such views.

(iv) TRANSMISSION OF REPORT AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE.—If the report and legislative language are approved by the joint committee pursuant to clause (ii), then not later than December 2, 2011, the joint committee shall submit the joint committee report and legislative language described in clause (i) to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the Majority and Minority Leaders of both Houses.

(V) REPORT AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE TO BE MADE PUBLIC.—Upon the approval or disapproval of the joint committee report and legislative language pursuant to clause (ii), the joint committee shall promptly make the full report and legislative language, and a record of the vote, available to the public.

(4) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The joint committee shall be composed of 12 members appointment pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(B) APPOINTMENT.—Members of the joint committee shall be appointed as follows:

(i) The majority leader of the Senate shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the Senate.

(ii) The minority leader of the Senate shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the Senate.

(iii) The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the House of Representatives.

(iv) The minority leader of the House of Representatives shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the House of Representatives.

(C) CO-CHAIRS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—There shall be 2 Co-Chairs of the joint committee. The majority leader of the Senate shall appoint one Co-Chair from among the members of the joint committee. The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint the second Co-Chair from among the members of the joint committee. The Co-Chairs shall be appointed

not later than 14 calendar days after the date of enactment of this section.

(ii) STAFF DIRECTOR.—The Co-Chairs, acting jointly, shall hire the staff director of the joint committee.

(D) DATE.—Members of the joint committee shall be appointed not later than 14 calendar days after the date of enactment of this section.

(E) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the joint committee. Any vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled not later than 14 calendar days after the date on which the vacancy occurs in the same manner as the original appointment. If a member of the committee leaves Congress, the member is no longer a member of the joint committee and a vacancy shall exist.

(5) ADMINISTRATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To enable the joint committee to exercise its powers, functions and duties, there are authorized to be disbursed by the Senate the actual and necessary expenses of the joint committee approved by the co-chairs, subject to Senate rules and regulations.

(B) EXPENSES.—In carrying out its functions, the joint committee is authorized to incur expenses in the same manner and under the same conditions as the Joint Economic Committee as authorized by section 11 of Public Law 79-304 (15 U.S.C. 1024(d)).

(C) QUORUM.—7 members of the joint committee shall constitute a quorum for purposes of voting, meeting, and holding hearings.

(D) VOTING.—

(i) PROXY VOTING.—No proxy voting shall be allowed on behalf of the members of the joint committee.

(ii) CBO AND JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION ESTIMATES.—CBO and Joint Committee on Taxation shall provide estimates of the legislation (as described in paragraph (3)(B)) in accordance with sections 201(f) and 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 601(f) and 639(a)), including estimates of the effect on interest payments on the debt. In addition CBO shall provide information on the budgetary effect of the legislation beyond fiscal year 2021. The joint committee may not vote on any version of the report, recommendations, or legislative language unless an estimate described in this clause is available for consideration by all the members at least 48 hours prior to the vote as certified by the Co-Chairs.

(E) MEETINGS.—

(i) INITIAL MEETING.—Not later than 45 calendar days after the date of enactment of this section, the joint committee shall hold its first meeting.

(ii) AGENDA.—The Co-Chairs shall provide an agenda to the joint committee members not less than 48 hours in advance of any meeting.

(F) HEARINGS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The joint committee may, for the purpose of carrying out this section, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, require attendance of witnesses and production of books, papers, and documents, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and administer such oaths the joint committee considers advisable.

(ii) HEARING PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CO-CHAIRS.—

(I) ANNOUNCEMENT.—The joint committee Co-Chairs shall make a public announcement of the date, place, time, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted not less than 7 days in advance of such hearing, unless the Co-Chairs determine that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date.

(II) WRITTEN STATEMENT.—A witness appearing before the joint committee shall file a written statement of proposed testimony

at least 2 calendar days prior to appearance, unless the requirement is waived by the Co-Chairs, following their determination that there is good cause for failure of compliance.

(G) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Upon written request of the Co-Chairs, a Federal agency shall provide technical assistance to the joint committee in order for the joint committee to carry out its duties.

(C) STAFF OF JOINT COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Co-Chairs of the joint committee may jointly appoint and fix the compensation of staff as they deem necessary, within the guidelines for Senate employees and following all applicable Senate rules and employment requirements.

(2) ETHICAL STANDARDS.—Members on the joint committee who serve in the House of Representatives shall be governed by the House ethics rules and requirements. Members of the Senate who serve on the joint committee and staff of the joint committee shall comply with Senate ethics rules.

(D) TERMINATION.—The joint committee shall terminate on January 13, 2012.

SEC. 302. EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS.

(A) INTRODUCTION.—If approved by the majority required by section 301(b)(3)(B)(ii), the proposed legislative language submitted pursuant to section 301(b)(3)(B)(iv) shall be introduced in the Senate (by request) on the next day on which the Senate is in session by the majority leader of the Senate or by a Member of the Senate designated by the majority leader of the Senate and shall be introduced in the House of Representatives (by request) on the next legislative day by the majority leader of the House or by a Member of the House designated by the majority leader of the House.

(B) CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) REFERRAL AND REPORTING.—Any committee of the House of Representatives to which the joint committee bill is referred shall report it to the House without amendment not later than December 9, 2011. If a committee fails to report the joint committee bill within that period, it shall be in order to move that the House discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill. Such a motion shall not be in order after the last committee authorized to consider the bill reports it to the House or after the House has disposed of a motion to discharge the bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion except 20 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. If such a motion is adopted, the House shall proceed immediately to consider the joint committee bill in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3). A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(2) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After the last committee authorized to consider a joint committee bill reports it to the House or has been discharged (other than by motion) from its consideration, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint committee bill in the House. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed with respect to the joint committee bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—The joint committee bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint committee bill and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint committee bill to its pas-

sage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and one motion to limit debate on the joint committee bill. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall not be in order.

(4) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—The vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall occur not later than December 23, 2011.

(C) EXPEDITED PROCEDURE IN THE SENATE.—

(1) COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.—A joint committee bill introduced in the Senate under subsection (a) shall be jointly referred to the committee or committees of jurisdiction, which committees shall report the bill without any revision and with a favorable recommendation, an unfavorable recommendation, or without recommendation, not later than December 9, 2011. If any committee fails to report the bill within that period, that committee shall be automatically discharged from consideration of the bill, and the bill shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(2) MOTION TO PROCEED.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order, not later than 2 days of session after the date on which a joint committee bill is reported or discharged from all committees to which it was referred, for the majority leader of the Senate or the majority leader's designee to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint committee bill. It shall also be in order for any Member of the Senate to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint committee bill at any time after the conclusion of such 2-day period. A motion to proceed is in order even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to. All points of order against the motion to proceed to the joint committee bill are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint committee bill is agreed to, the joint committee bill shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—All points of order against the joint committee bill and against consideration of the joint committee bill are waived. Consideration of the joint committee bill and of all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith shall not exceed a total of 30 hours which shall be divided equally between the Majority and Minority Leaders or their designees. A motion further to limit debate on the joint committee bill is in order, shall require an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members duly chosen and sworn, and is not debatable. Any debatable motion or appeal is debatable for not to exceed 1 hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the motion or appeal. All time used for consideration of the joint committee bill, including time used for quorum calls and voting, shall be counted against the total 30 hours of consideration.

(4) NO AMENDMENTS.—An amendment to the joint committee bill, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint committee bill, is not in order.

(5) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—If the Senate has voted to proceed to the joint committee bill, the vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall occur immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint committee bill, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested. The vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall occur not later than December 23, 2011.

(6) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint committee bill shall be decided without debate.

(D) AMENDMENT.—The joint committee bill shall not be subject to amendment in either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

(E) CONSIDERATION BY THE OTHER HOUSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If, before passing the joint committee bill, one House receives from the other a joint committee bill—

(A) the joint committee bill of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint committee bill had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint committee bill received from the other House shall supplant the joint committee bill of the receiving House.

(2) REVENUE MEASURE.—This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint committee bill received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

(F) RULES TO COORDINATE ACTION WITH OTHER HOUSE.—

(1) TREATMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE BILL OF OTHER HOUSE.—If the Senate fails to introduce or consider a joint committee bill under this section, the joint committee bill of the House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

(2) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES IN THE SENATE.—If following passage of the joint committee bill in the Senate, the Senate then receives the joint committee bill from the House of Representatives, the House-passed joint committee bill shall not be debatable. The vote on passage of the joint committee bill in the Senate shall be considered to be the vote on passage of the joint committee bill received from the House of Representatives.

(3) VETOES.—If the President vetoes the joint committee bill, debate on a veto message in the Senate under this section shall be 1 hour equally divided between the majority and minority leaders or their designees.

(G) LOSS OF PRIVILEGE.—The provisions of this section shall cease to apply to the joint committee bill if—

(1) the joint committee fails to vote on the report or proposed legislative language required under section 201(b)(3)(B)(i) by November 23, 2011; or

(2) the joint committee bill does not pass both Houses by December 23, 2011.

SEC. 303. FUNDING.

Funding for the joint committee shall be derived from the applicable account of the House of Representatives, and the contingent fund of the Senate from the appropriations account "Miscellaneous Items," subject to Senate rules and regulations.

SEC. 304. RULEMAKING.

The provisions of this title are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

TITLE IV—PUBLIC DEBT

SEC. 401. PUBLIC DEBT.

Subsection (b) of section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking

the dollar limitation contained in that subsection and inserting "\$16,994,000,000,000".

SA 582. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 581 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 1323, to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit; as follows:

At the end, add the following new section:
SECTION XXX. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The provisions of this Act shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

SA 583. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1323, to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit; as follows:

At the end, add the following new section:
SECTION EFFECTIVE DATE.

The provisions of this Act shall become effective 3 days after enactment.

SA 584. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 583 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 1323, to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit; as follows:

In the amendment, strike "3 days" and insert "2 days".

SA 585. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA. 584 submitted by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 583 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 1323, to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit; as follows:

In the amendment, strike "2 days" and insert "1 day".

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 26, 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., on Tuesday, July 26; 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; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 12:15 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their des-

ignees, with the majority controlling the first 30 minutes and the Republicans controlling the second 30 minutes; that following morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order; and that the Senate recess following the rollcall vote on the Engelmayr nomination until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings; finally, I ask that at 2:15 the Senate resume consideration of S. 1323, which is the legislative vehicle for the debt limit increase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there will be a rollcall vote on the confirmation of the Engelmayr nomination tomorrow at approximately 12:15.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 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 7:28 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, July 26, 2011, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL TRULAN A. EYRE
BRIGADIER GENERAL MARK R. JOHNSON
BRIGADIER GENERAL BRUCE W. PRUNK
BRIGADIER GENERAL HAROLD E. REED
BRIGADIER GENERAL ROY E. UPTGRAFF III

To be brigadier general

COLONEL PATRICK D. AIELLO
COLONEL AARON J. BOOHER
COLONEL KEVIN W. BRADLEY
COLONEL DAVID T. BUCKALEW
COLONEL PETER J. BYRNE
COLONEL PAUL D. CUMMINGS
COLONEL VYAS DESHPANDE
COLONEL BRIAN T. DRAVIS
COLONEL BRENT J. FEICK
COLONEL MARK K. FOREMAN
COLONEL DAVID R. FOUNTAIN
COLONEL TIMOTHY L. FRYE
COLONEL PAUL D. GRUVER
COLONEL MICHAEL A. HUDSON
COLONEL SALVATORE J. LOMBARDI
COLONEL STEPHEN E. MARKOVICH
COLONEL RICHARD L. MARTIN
COLONEL BRIAN A. MILLER
COLONEL WILLIAM W. POND

COLONEL JONATHAN T. WALL
COLONEL JENNIFER L. WALTERS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL DAVID B. ENYEART

To be brigadier general

COLONEL RANDY A. ALEWEL
COLONEL KAREN D. GATTIS
COLONEL CATHERINE F. JORGENSEN
COLONEL BLAKE C. ORTNER
COLONEL TIMOTHY P. WILLIAMS
COLONEL DAVID E. WILMOT

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL STEPHEN E. BOGLE
BRIGADIER GENERAL DOMINIC A. CARIELLO
BRIGADIER GENERAL DAVID J. ELICERIO
BRIGADIER GENERAL SHRYL E. GORDON
BRIGADIER GENERAL RONALD W. HUFF
BRIGADIER GENERAL GERALD W. KETCHUM
BRIGADIER GENERAL WILLIAM L. SEEKINS
BRIGADIER GENERAL RICHARD E. SWAN
BRIGADIER GENERAL JOE M. WELLS

To be brigadier general

COLONEL MATTHEW P. BEEVERS
COLONEL JOEL E. BEST
COLONEL MICHAEL E. BOBECK
COLONEL JOSEPH M. BONGIOVANNI
COLONEL BRENT E. BRACEWELL
COLONEL ALLEN E. BREWER
COLONEL LEON M. BRIDGES
COLONEL ERIC C. BUSH
COLONEL SCOTT A. CAMPBELL
COLONEL WILLIAM R. COATS
COLONEL ALBERT L. COX
COLONEL SYLVIA R. CROCKETT
COLONEL TERRY A. ETHRIDGE
COLONEL KEVIN R. GRIESE
COLONEL JOHN J. JANSEN
COLONEL DONALD O. LAGACE, JR.
COLONEL LOUIS J. LANDRETH
COLONEL WILLIAM S. LEE
COLONEL JERRY H. MARTIN
COLONEL ROBERT A. MASON
COLONEL CRAIG M. MCGALLIARD
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER J. MORGAN
COLONEL TODD M. NEHLS
COLONEL KEVIN L. NEUMANN
COLONEL MICHAEL J. OSBURN
COLONEL LANNIE D. RUNCK
COLONEL GEORGE M. SCHWARTZ
COLONEL DAVID O. SMITH
COLONEL TERENCE P. SULLIVAN
COLONEL ALICIA A. TATE-NADEAU
COLONEL THOMAS P. WILKINSON
COLONEL WILBUR E. WOLF III
COLONEL DAVID C. WOOD

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL, UNITED STATES NAVY, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5141:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. SCOTT R. VAN BUSKIRK

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. CHARLES H. JACOBY, JR.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING HUMAN TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION AND THE ABILITYONE PROGRAM

HON. RICHARD L. HANNA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize a program, which in the last several years, has helped more than 47,000 Americans who are blind or who have significant disabilities gain skills and training that ultimately led to gainful employment: The AbilityOne Program.

The AbilityOne Program harnesses the purchasing power of the Federal Government to buy products and services from participating community-based nonprofit agencies that are dedicated to training and employing individuals with disabilities. This program affords Americans with disabilities the opportunity to acquire job skills and training, receive good wages and benefits, and gain greater independence and quality of life.

This comes in a segment of the population that has suffered from significant unemployment. But opportunities through the AbilityOne Program have come a long way in helping to bring people with disabilities into a working society. I am proud to acknowledge that Human Technologies Corporation, also known as HTC, represents one of the many Social Enterprises dedicated to the mission of enhancing the lives of people with disabilities.

HTC is a company made up of six diverse businesses which provide a wide-range of resources that expand opportunities for people with disabilities in New York and provide high quality products and services for Federal customers throughout the United States and Puerto Rico. A DLA Not for Profit Vendor of the Year recipient, HTC manufactures apparel and equipage items for several branches of the military and provides sophisticated employee uniform program management and distribution of apparel to thousands of Federal civilian employees for the U.S. Forest Service, Army Corps of Engineers and will soon manage the Air Force Civilian Police uniform program. In addition to the manufacture and distribution of apparel and equipage, HTC provides building maintenance and associated groundskeeping services for GSA, NAVFAC and the Air Force. HTC performs to the highest standards and does so through the employment of individuals with significant disabilities. In 2010 HTC provided more than 416 jobs for persons with disabilities and an additional 123 jobs for people without disabilities resulting in more than 415,400 hours of employment.

HTC, and its Property Management Group division, is responsible for the cleaning of my district office in Utica. I could not be more pleased with the service provided by these men and women. I am proud to say that among the workforce is a Vietnam War Veteran with a disability named Herb. Herb has

been employed by HTC for more than 24 years. His dedication and quality work allows me to be of even greater service to my constituents every day. I was also visited this past month in my Washington D.C. office by another AbilityOne/HTC employee named Sandy. Sandy is a sewing machine operator and cuts and sews trousers and shirts for the thousands of Federal employees HTC serves in its uniform program line of business. HTC and the AbilityOne Program have given individuals like Herb and Sandy exactly what every American wants and deserves—an opportunity. They have been afforded countless ways to make a difference in both their lives, and in ours, each day and we as a community, and as a country, benefit from their hard work, skills and dedication.

HTC believes that work is inherently dignified and fulfilling, and that individuals with disabilities and other barriers to employment deserve the opportunity to work and to achieve their fullest potential. The direct impact of such an organization on the lives of Americans with disabilities cannot be overstated and as such, the AbilityOne Program and Social Enterprises like HTC are invaluable.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I extend my support to the AbilityOne Program. I also want to commend the dedication and commitment of Richard E. Sebastian, Jr., HTC's President and Chief Executive Officer and his staff for helping individuals who are blind or have significant disabilities find employment. Their work helps people live fuller lives and become contributors to each of their communities and to our country. I also commend each AbilityOne employee who works every day to provide valuable products and services to Federal agencies throughout this great land and in so doing, improve their own lives by engaging in meaningful work.

MAJOR FUEL DISTRIBUTOR CALLS FOR ENFORCING DODD-FRANK ANTI-SPECULATION PROVISIONS

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last month, I met in my office with Joseph Petrowski, who is the Chief Executive Officer of the Cumberland Gulf Group of Companies, headquartered in the district of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY). I was interested in meeting with Mr. Petrowski to get his view of the current debate that is going on as to whether or not we should be taking action at the Federal level to curb speculation in the energy industry. As Mr. Petrowski notes in the accompanying letter, the Cumberland Gulf Group includes "Gulf Oil, which distributes motor fuels through a network of more than 3,500 gasoline stations in over 27 States, 12 proprietary oil terminals,

and more than 70 other supply terminals." As he notes, "Gulf Oil supplies gasoline, heating oil, diesel fuel, jet fuel and kerosene through its terminal network."

Mr. Speaker, the central point is that Mr. Petrowski, as someone who is in the business of selling various forms of fuel, for the ultimate purchase by individual consumers, rebuts those who argue that speculation is irrelevant to the price that is paid at the pump and elsewhere by consumers, as Mr. Petrowski notes in the accompanying letter, "Today with price levels more volatile than ever, prices higher than ever, and open interest larger than ever, and both exchange and off exchange volume of trade a double digit multiple to physical usage, there is little doubt that speculation is a key determinant of prices and may very well be the determining factor in setting prices."

Mr. Speaker, this point deserves great emphasis—to repeat, because of the centrality of this to our policy debate, the CEO of one of the leading distributors of gasoline, oil and diesel fuel affirms, based on the experience he has had in this industry for many years and the current economics, "there is little doubt that speculation is the key determinant of prices and may very well be the determining factor in setting prices."

Mr. Speaker, there has been a totally misguided effort here in this House to slash funds for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission, and to suspend until late next year the authority given by the Financial Reform bill to Federal regulators to limit speculation. Mr. Petrowski makes very clear that the effect of this is to add to higher prices through unchecked speculation, and given the authority that he brings to this issue, I ask that his very thoughtful letter on this subject be printed here.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to affirming the importance of speculation, Mr. Petrowski makes some other thoughtful suggestions about legislative changes and it is my intention to study these carefully and after that talk with my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee about acting on Mr. Petrowski's suggestions in some respects. But the key point is to affirm here what one of the leading voices in the fuel business thinks about speculation and the impact it has on the prices ultimately paid by retailers.

CUMBERLAND GULF GROUP

OF COMPANIES,

Framingham, MA, July 7, 2011.

HON. BARNEY FRANK,

U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FRANK: While I understand some of the criticism of the Dodd-Frank legislation, no legislation and no reform effort is ever going to be perfect. All administrative oversight and legislative response is a continuous process as markets and technologies evolve. Dodd-Frank was not

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

the end point of financial reform but a good first step in addressing market structure in a way that would improve performance. Having worked in the commodities and energy business for over 35 years, I am well aware of how the commodity markets operate and what factors determine the price of energy, food stuffs, and other essential commodities. I am a strong advocate of free markets but only the most naive would claim that free markets can exist and flourish without parameters and a framework of rules and procedures that render the process fair. This has always been so but never more so than today. Globalization, technology, and securitization among other factors have amplified the need for effective legislative and administrative oversight.

In my current capacity, I serve as CEO of the Cumberland Gulf Group. Under that umbrella sits Gulf Oil, which distributes motor fuels through a network of more than 3,500 gasoline stations in over 27 states, 12 proprietary oil terminals, and more than 70 other supply terminals. Gulf Oil supplies gasoline, heating oil, diesel fuel, jet fuel and kerosene through its terminal network. Before coming to Gulf Oil, I served as the Chief Executive Officer and President of Louis Dreyfus Energy Corp., one of the largest commodities traders in the world. In both capacities, as a trader and now a fuel purchaser and supplier, I am intimately familiar with the inner workings of the derivatives market.

As in any market, supply and demand play a critical role for energy prices. The perception of the future pace of both supply and demand are often more of a determinant of prices than actual supply and demand. This can be frustrating to members of the general public who sometimes see a price rise or fall without any tangible change in current supply or demand. Yet today with price levels more volatile than ever, prices higher than ever, and open interest larger than ever, and both exchange and off exchange volume of trade a double digit multiple to physical usage, there is little doubt that speculation is a key determinant of prices and may very well be the determining factor in setting prices. And even if the disproportionate increase in trade volume to physical usage were not disturbing and one believed that in the end the average price was still set by supply and demand forces rather than financial speculation (an assertion with which I would disagree), volatility induced by excess speculation is not in the best interests of efficient markets, the general public and industrial activity. Simply put, an oil market that goes from \$40/barrel to \$147 per barrel and back to \$32 per barrel in less than a year is destructive to society and beneficial to only a very few.

I should note that speculation is not necessarily a bad thing—it brings liquidity to the market and allows commercial entities to hedge their risk on future contracts for the trade of physical goods. However, there has been a rapid increase of the participation in the market by non-commercial entities such as hedge funds and financial institutions. Those entities, depending on their behavior, have the ability not only to speculate in the market but manipulate the market. It is the regulation of these entities that is most necessary and the Dodd-Frank Act brings regulation to this market through a requirement of mandatory clearing of swaps and the placement of position limits on certain futures contracts, including energy. Financial markets in certain aspects do resemble a casino and I am not making a moral judgment on casinos but even a casino has rules of engagement and enforcement that ensure a level playing field. A rigged casino is certainly not good for most participants and in the long run is

not good for the casino itself. Instruments of risk sharing and markets of financial intermediation perform a vital function but they do not grow spontaneously nor do they exist for long in a state of nature absent oversight and rule making.

I have set forth some preliminary thoughts below on reforms we need to improve market performance set forth below and would welcome the opportunity to discuss these issues in more detail with you, your staff and others on the Financial Services Committee.

1. Make the exchange requirements of what it means to be a "Hedger" much more stringent. Today, almost anyone with a small and insignificant physical position can qualify as a "hedger". Also large entities with massive financial strength can qualify as a hedger, exceed the speculative limits in a given index or exchange instrument, manipulate that index and then trade multiple volume contracts off that index in non-exchange business. We see a proliferation of financial and bank entities entering the physical market for no other reason but to qualify for the more generous liberties afforded a "hedger".

2. Raise the margin requirements for non-hedgers significantly to minimize speculator-driven volatility and still allow enough liquidity in the market so that entities with real business purposes can transact. This will drive weaker speculators out of the market. It will also dramatically reduce volatility because the Variance Margin buffer could be increased dramatically which would stop the phenomenon of leverage that has often been at the foundation of many financial train wrecks (see mortgage market). Assume you are a \$10/bbl balance sheet company. You buy 1 barrel of oil costing \$100 and you only have to post \$6, the market goes from \$100 to \$96, you are poised to sell quickly because you know if it goes to \$90, you are out of business, so you start selling to make sure you can pull back your initial margin to cover your variance margin and live to fight another day (and likely lose as 90% of spec traders do). Now imagine the same scenario with \$30 margin requirements. The market would never move enough for the trader to be concerned about not having enough initial margin to pull back to cover the variance. The fundamental/technical influence would shift hard back towards the fundamental. I am not certain exactly what the right margin increase should be (though 500% is not out of the question from my perspective), but it is clear that today the margin requirements are too low. The phenomenon of sharp spikes in the absence of attributing "events" is evidence of a highly leveraged market.

3. The government should create a government-backed exchange that helps long term consumers and producers hedge. If a small land owner owns a 3,000 bbl/day well in middle Kansas and wants to lock in his price at \$95 a barrel for 5 years, how does he do it? Is he going to sell 5.5 million barrels of futures on Nymex and post \$32,000,000 in initial margin? What happens if the price goes up \$40 per barrel? Mr. Small Producer is going to pay the exchange \$220,000,000 in margin and claw it back 3,000 bbls a day at a time? I think not. Right now some of the banks will do that business but they are enjoying "healthy" margins. If the government came in and provided the credit umbrella (through a government sponsored exchange) they would bring a lot of production to the hedging market and would also incentivize both producers and consumers to think long term. Users should have the opportunity to lock in costs for longer durations and sellers should be able to hedge out their revenue streams but credit, financing costs, and other structural factors remain impediments to development. While some might criticize this proposal based upon the recent issues in the

mortgage markets, this would be an important reform to allow small businesses to participate in the commodities markets. Such liquidity was not the problem with mortgages, it was leverage, lack of transparency, complexity, and very simply in many cases dishonesty, that brought down the housing market.

In general, all markets operate best when they are transparent, liquid and not over leveraged. I am hopeful that Congress will allow the Commodities Futures Trading Commission to proceed with the implementation of the Dodd-Frank Act. I strongly believe we will see positive effects from this regulation on not only the price of oil but many other commodities upon which our country relies.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH H. PETROWSKI,
CEO.

EGYPT ASSESSMENT

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to the Report on a Trip to Cairo, Egypt, written by R. Leslie Deak, and presented to the Policy and Planning section of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Mr. Deak is an American businessman who has spent the last nine years living part of each year in Egypt. He is on the Board of Advisors of the Center for a New American Security and is a Trustee of the National Defense University Foundation.

This is an interesting and important document, and I commend it to my colleagues.

EGYPT ASSESSMENT: REPORT ON TRIP TO
CAIRO, EGYPT

(By R. Leslie Deak)

PRESENTED TO J-5 JCS, MAY 11, 2011

(Pentagon—Policy and Planning for Joint
Chiefs of Staff)

I just returned from two weeks in Egypt. During my trip, I spent most of my time in Cairo reestablishing existing contacts and developing contacts with new players in the emerging power structure.

I met with informed figures in the business, political, legal, journalism and religious fields. I also had extensive contact with our people over there to get their assessment and to gauge their views against those from the Egyptians.

The country is a transition that will likely end in a manner not to our liking. There are some efforts that can be undertaken at this time to help try to impact the outcome if implemented rapidly.

I have summarized the current situation, explored in more depth the key areas of concern and suggested actions that may help impact on the outcome.

First Impressions

The fall of Mubarak's regime is widely welcomed. There is a palpable relief among people that the repression and corruption are finally easing. This is mixed with an uncertainty about what the future holds. This is very much an Inch Allah moment at all levels that I had contact with.

The impression of the US is poor. We are viewed as a contributory factor to the problems because of our prior support for Mubarak and our wavering during the early stages of the revolution. Our direct involvement in their affairs is not welcomed. Our operating in the background and providing support is more acceptable.

The society in general is fascinated with the unfolding spectacle of arrests, incriminations and the extent of the corruption. Politics and then soccer are the subjects discussed, in that order. Since there is uncertainty about the future, most attention is focused on the past and day-to-day life.

Prices are up by thirty percent from before the revolution but people seem to take it in stride. The Government is raising public employee salaries dramatically and is hiring unemployed workers in great numbers in order to try to maintain social stability. Continued and worsening inflation in the near term is inevitable and the population is reacting accordingly—retaining or acquiring property, jewelry, hoarding, converting pounds to foreign currency when possible, etc.

Withdrawal of Egyptian Pounds was just liberalized. Foreign currency withdrawals are restricted to the equivalent of EL10,000 per day in foreign currency. Transfers abroad are restricted to \$100,000 maximum per account and need individual approval from the Central Bank.

Tourism, second largest source of external funds after Suez, is off by 85%. Although the recent lifting of the USDOS Travel Advisory initially helped increase interest in travel from the US to Egypt, the recent sectarian conflict has been a new setback. The consensus opinion is that travel will not recover until the Fall at the earliest assuming that the security situation stabilizes by that time.

Recently, traffic police have returned to the streets in Cairo but regular police, special police, detectives and prosecutors have not yet returned. Our people have been informed by sources they consider reliable, that police presence is back up to 65%. Reliable Egyptian sources I spoke with put the figure closer to 50%. Police salaries have been increased ten-fold (to EL 3,000–4,000 per month) and law school graduates are being recruited to become police. Internal security is nonoperational and is supposedly being overhauled. All US assisted police training programs have been suspended over concerns of working with bad actors.

While Cairo is safe during the daytime, at night there is occasionally sporadic gunfire. Travel outside populated areas carries dangers of hijacking. There is widespread carrying of firearms by the population and no apparent consequence or prosecution for use of deadly force in self-defense.

Politically, the general belief is that things will work out and that the Muslim Brotherhood will play a role in the country's future but will not dominate. Unfortunately, I do not agree with this assessment.

Where Things are Heading

The following analysis is conjecture on my part. However, I vetted the conclusions against all of my sources in Egypt and here and, sadly, found that none could refute them.

Economics

The country seems to be sliding towards a modified socialism with the government set to play a significantly increased role in the economy. We can expect that most, if not all, of the economic reforms implemented over the last five years to be rolled back.

The government is already beginning to abrogate contracts and seize properties implicated in any dealings with the prior government. Since the Mubarak regime and their cronies were involved in every aspect of the economy, no prior business arrangement is immune—this is especially true where deals were based on the use of or access to State assets (land, businesses, natural resources, etc.)

Another current problem for the private sector is that there is no place to get a reli-

able or binding decision on which to make business judgments since the current Cabinet is transitional and their decisions are subject to change in the future.

The public sector is growing dramatically both in terms of cost and size as the Supreme Council races to prevent uprisings from the lower class.

They recognize that they are going to soon be facing a massive external liquidity squeeze and are casting about for any sources of foreign funds available in order to be able to continue to import essential staples. Their foreign policy reflects this with their playing off the U.S., Iran and Saudi to see who will give them money first.

I believe we can expect increasing economic and, eventually, social instability due to the deteriorating economic trends.

Politics

In my opinion, I see little likelihood of the Muslim Brotherhood not becoming the dominant force in Egypt in the near term. This will occur despite the desire by the population as a whole to have a more representative secular government.

To understand this conclusion, some background is in order.

For the last eighty years, the Muslim Brotherhood (MB) has been providing social services to a growing sector of the population. They provide health care, education, food, shelter, counseling, adjudicate disputes, etc. This impact has become especially pronounced over the last thirty years as increasing resources were diverted from government services and wound up in the pockets of corrupt officials. During this time, the MB had developed a highly efficient network that is well integrated into the society throughout the country and especially in the poorer areas and in the rural areas in Upper Egypt (the South) and the Delta.

The military, which is a conscript army, is largely drawn from this lower socio-economic half of the population. Accordingly, they are familiar with, and are largely sympathetic to, the MB. They do not currently view them as a threat. In fact, virtually all of the Military officers I have met over the years are religiously conservative as are their families.

An alliance with the MB does not pose an issue for the military and in fact helps solve two critical issues that the military faces.

The first issue is complicity—the military leadership is assumed to be complicit in all of the corruption and problems of the old regime. They have been able to shelter almost all of the ex-military from prosecution, but pressure is mounting to throw them to the wolves. This does not bode well for the current leadership and they are focused on protecting themselves from prosecution with any new civilian government that they allow to emerge. I believe that they have reached this accommodation with the MB.

Secondly, is the issue of the patronage system. The military controls thirty percent patent of the economy and much of the land in Egypt. The proceeds from these enterprises and sale of land are used to provide benefits and perks to the officer corps so as to maintain loyalty and discipline. If anything interrupts this arrangement, the senior staff faces the danger of possible insurrection from the junior officers. I believe the MB recognizes the need to maintain this system and has reached an accommodation with the military to continue it.

With these two issues apparently resolved, I believe that the military cleared the path for accelerated elections in September knowing that the MB would dominate the elections despite the desire by the opposition forces to see a more balanced and secular

(civil) outcome. They then dissolved the NDP in order to further strengthen the MB.

Unfortunately, barring a change in the timing of the elections or a suspension by the Military due to security concerns, the MB will sweep the elections simply due to their organizational capabilities. They recently raised their public target from 35% to 50% of the seats. I personally believe that they will ultimately win more than 70% of the seats. This will place them in position to dominate the process that will result in a new constitution that has been mandated as part of the recent referendum.

Except for the MB, there is no organization with the capability to get out the vote. The opposition is highly fragmented and disorganized. There is a possibility that the old parliamentarians may run for election independently and serve to weaken the MB, but it is unlikely. The old members benefitted from their positions in Parliament and under the current environment will most likely not run (as one told me, it cost him EGP 5 million to win each election but he could make EGP 50 million through his position—he has no interest in exposing his past activities of running again with no prospect of recovering his investment—I believe this is representative of the situation in general).

While this has been going on in the background, much international and public attention has been kept focused on the Presidential election. This is a diversion since the new President will have very proscribed powers. The MB has indicated that they will not run, but they are negotiating with the candidates and will throw their weight behind the one that will assure their interests.

The recent issue with the Salafis is largely viewed as manufactured by the MB in order to make the MB appear more moderate. I would personally expect that the MB and the military will resolve the Salafi problem once it has served its purpose.

What Can be Done

The first thing that needs to be done is to improve our image with the Egyptian people. We can do this through several actions.

First, we could use our current available resources to help locate and freeze funds that belong to the long list of individuals under detention or indictment. Publicizing our efforts to assist in this manner will be front page news throughout the Middle East and will have an enormous positive impact on public perception of the U.S. in Egypt. I recommend this while at the same time acknowledging the broader impact such an action may have on investors from other countries.

Secondly, we should remain neutral and supportive of the election process and their right to set their own destiny regardless of the outcome. It will be very important for us not to be seen as judgmental of, or in opposition to, the outcome of the election. Any perceived effort on our part to influence the election will backfire and both damage our reputation and adversely impact any individual or group perceived to be supported by us.

This does not mean that we have to sit back and accept the long term impact of the elections.

If we hope to see the situation improve, then the next, and immediate, focus should be to ramp up our efforts to work with groups that can bring influence to bear on the constitutional process. These include the opposition groups, the youth groups, the emerging parties, the Copts and the military and possibly the new President once we know who it is.

The only way to short-circuit the MB dominating the constitutional process after the election is to help the opposition organize to focus the issues and bring people out

in to the streets again. We can also try to work in the background to convince the military that it is in everyone's interest to assure a balanced and open constitutional process. The street protests will help in this effort.

To the extent that our assistance is requested, we can also work with those domestic change agents with whom contact has already been established in order to help them work towards an open process so as to assure a fully representational political process in the future.

As long as the constitutional process can be opened up so that it is representative, it is likely that the MB will be a one-election phenomenon and that we will see an outcome like Kuwait. Any group that wins this election is doomed to fail because of the deteriorating economic and security situation. The only real concern we should have is what happens next. I believe that we can have an impact on that outcome which will serve the interest of both Egypt and the U.S.

However, our window of opportunity is closing quickly.

HONOR THE LIFE OF JAMES T.
MOLLOY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the life of James T. "Jimmy" Molloy, former Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives. Jimmy was one of my district's finest citizens, a proud and favorite son of South Buffalo, New York and undoubtedly one of the greatest public servants in our Nation's Capitol for over 40 years. Jim's passing marked a sad day throughout Capitol Hill and throughout Jim's neighborhood, a loss that will be felt for years to come, yet his gracious spirit and world-class stories will be remembered by all those who were fortunate enough to call Jimmy Molloy a friend.

James T. Molloy was born in South Buffalo on June 3, 1936, to Matthew Molloy and Katherine Hayden Molloy. Educated in Buffalo's Catholic schools, he followed his father's footsteps by working in the grain elevators of Buffalo's waterfront and fighting fires as a proud member of the Buffalo Fire Department.

Through his labor, James T. Molloy paid his own way through Canisius College, a great Jesuit institution in Western New York, and became a lifelong friend of Western New York working families. He was a member of the AFL-CIO, the International Brotherhood of Longshoremen and International Association of Firefighters. After pursuing studies at St. John's University Law School, James T. Molloy worked as a schoolteacher in the cities of Buffalo and Lackawanna. He also worked in the office of Erie County District Attorney where he met his wife, Roseanne.

Jim came to Washington in 1968 at the invitation of New York Congressman John Rooney. During his service in the House Finance Office, he oversaw the legislative appropriations for the House as they grew from \$75 million to \$126 million per year. James T. Molloy was elected doorkeeper of the United States House of Representatives in 1974 and proudly remained in that post through the 103d Congress, serving as the primary aide to Speakers

Carl Albert, Thomas "Tip" O'Neill, James Wright and Tom Foley.

In fact, Jim was the last of 30 people to hold the position of doorkeeper from its establishment in 1789 to its elimination in 1995. Within this capacity, he introduced Presidents and numerous heads of state to our august body. He coordinated 71 joint sessions of Congress, as well as many other special events, within this Chamber. Jim also acted as a vital connection between his hometown, South Buffalo, New York, and Congress, inspiring countless men and women from the Buffalo area to consider careers in public service. Additionally, Jim served as chairman of the board on the Wright-Patman Congressional Credit Union, a position he held for 30 years.

James T. Molloy was awarded numerous honors for his life's work in public service. He received the Outstanding Citizen Award for the New York State AFL-CIO, the President's Award from the New York State Federation of Police, the United States Senate Youth Alumni Association Outstanding Service, and the Sid Yudin Congressional Staffer of the Year Award from Roll Call. In July of 2005, I considered it a privilege and an honor to sponsor a bill in the U.S. House of Representatives to name a South Buffalo Post Office in James T. Molloy's honor. This recognition was so well deserved and a lasting reminder of Jim's strong commitment to his neighborhood and our great Nation.

I was deeply saddened upon learning of the passing of James T. Molloy. To pay respect to his legacy, I issued the following statement:

"For 20 years South Buffalo's own James T. Molloy served as the House of Representatives doorkeeper, a prestigious title held by only 34 people going back to 1789. As the individual with control of access to the House Chambers he held great authority but was especially known for greeting Western New Yorkers visiting the Capitol with particular affection. Generations of local residents, many of whom can be found working on the Hill today, benefited from his welcoming spirit and institutional knowledge."

"Jim was a friend and confidant. In my first days and months in Congress he was generous with his time and advice, passing on valuable lessons I keep with me today. He will be dearly missed by those in Washington, DC and friends and family locally but we have peace knowing that our own legendary and beloved doorkeeper has now gone on to meet a doorkeeper of a much higher power."

Mr. Speaker, our country has suffered a great loss with Jim's passing and my deepest condolences are with his wife, Roseanne, his daughter, Amy and son-in-law Michael Bogardus, his beloved grandchildren Catherine and Caroline and Jim's siblings Janet Molloy and Kathleen and William Straub, as well as extended family members and friends. As someone who was blessed to know Jimmy Molloy, I will always carry his memory through these halls.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES A. HIMES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present to cast my vote on final passage of H.R. 2018, The Clean Water Cooperative Federalism Act of 2011. I wish the record to reflect my intentions had I been able to vote.

Had I been present for rollcall No. 573, I would have voted "no."

This bill is an assault on the fundamental water protections the American people rely on and would reverse decades of progress. It significantly undermines the Clean Water Act, jeopardizes public health, and gravely affects our environment and economy.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, due to the celebration of my daughter's wedding, I was unable to be in Washington, DC for votes during the week of July 18. Had I been present for the votes that week, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall vote 602: I would have voted in favor of H.R. 33, legislation amending the Securities Act of 1933 to specify when certain securities issued in connection with church plans are treated as exempted securities for purposes of that Act.

Rollcall vote 606: I would have voted against H.R. 2560, legislation submitting a constitutional amendment to the States that would irresponsibly limited the government's ability to respond to wars, disasters, or other challenges as well as changing Congressional voting procedures that would end majority rule.

Rollcall vote 611: I would have voted against H.R. 2553, legislation that, while extending the operations of the Federal Aviation Authority, would undermine labor relations.

Rollcall vote 621: I would have voted against H.R. 1315, legislation undermining consumer protections implemented as part of the Dodd-Frank Act.

Rollcall vote 629: I would have voted against H.R. 2551, ideologically driven legislation that cuts funding for House and joint operations by \$227 million (6.4 percent) from FY11 enacted levels, which is \$472 million (12.4 percent) below the requested amount. These cuts risk possible layoffs and pay-cuts for legislative branch staff, which will damage Congress' ability to fulfill its Constitutional duties and responsibilities to the public. For example, the Library of Congress, which is the nation's oldest federal cultural institution and provides critical resources to Members of Congress, was severely cut to 13.7 percent below the request. I was also dismayed by the cuts to related agencies such as Congressional Research Service, Government Accountability Office and Congressional Budget Office, which provide crucial assistance and oversight to Congress. These cuts will make the Legislative Branch less effective, not more efficient.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE MICHAEL ALLEN DAVIDSON 9/11 FOUNDATION

HON. FRANK PALLONE JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the philanthropic activities of the Michael Allen Davidson (M.A.D.) 9/11 Foundation and their efforts to provide a new playground facility in Neptune, New Jersey. The late Michael Davidson is remembered as a young professional determined to make a difference in the lives of those around him, yet tragically lost his life in the North Tower of the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001. The new playground facility in Neptune has been erected in his honor and will continue to stand as a symbol of Michael's spirit and fortitude.

Michael Allen Davidson was an impressive individual, dedicated to building a successful professional career while assisting others. Michael was a member of the Rutgers University Class of 1997 and applied his educational background to become a successful trader. In 2001, Michael was to be named the youngest Partner at Cantor Fitzgerald, located on the 104th floor of the World Trade Center, North Tower. At the early age of 27, Michael tragically lost his life during the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. He is remembered for his uncanny ability to make others smile and laugh. These characteristics are a testament to his continuous outpouring of love and compassion for others.

The M.A.D. 9/11 Foundation has continued to organize various philanthropic activities in honor of the late Michael Davidson. Playgrounds, for children ages 2 through 5, have been erected in Tinton Falls, Wall, and Eatontown, New Jersey. The most recent project in Neptune has expanded the recreational facilities for children in the community and continues to provide a beautiful landscape for children to grow, while commemorating the life of an outstanding individual. Among many other projects, the foundation has also committed to fund the majority of a rehabilitation project—a World Trade Center replica memorial that sits in front of the Tinton Falls Fire Department. The M.A.D. 9/11 Foundation has been supported by caring individuals dedicated to making a difference in the community on behalf of the late Michael Allen Davidson.

As a result of their outstanding efforts, the M.A.D. 9/11 Foundation was awarded the 2001 Fay S. Mathewson Award, presented by the New Jersey Recreation and Parks Association as a testament to their contributions to the Monmouth County community. They are also the recipient of the 2009 Monmouth County Parks and Recreation Difference Maker Award and the Tinton Falls Appreciation Award.

Mr. Speaker, once again please join me in thanking the Michael Allen Davidson 9/11 Foundation for their dedication to the Monmouth County community and commemorate the life of Michael Allen Davidson.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DIANE BLACK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on amendment rollcall Nos. 622, No. 623, No. 624, No. 625, No. 626, No. 627, No. 628 as well as rollcall No. 629 for final passage of H.R. 2551, I am not recorded because I was attending to a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted:

“Yes”—Representative Melvin Watt Amendment;

“Yes”—Representative Nan Hayworth Amendment;

“No”—Representative Paul Broun Amendment;

“Yes”—Representative Marlin Stutzman Amendment;

“No”—Representative Glenn Thompson Amendment;

“No”—Representative James Moran Amendment;

“No”—Representative Rush Holt Amendment; and

“Yes”—Final Passage of H.R. 2551.

HONORING THE COHOCTON VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the brave men and women of the Cohocton Volunteer Fire Department who have tirelessly served our local and national community for 125 years. As the Cohocton Volunteer Fire Department celebrates its 125th anniversary, I applaud the many ways they have served our community.

From July 22–24, members of the department will hold several events commemorating the service of their valiant volunteers. Historical displays, parades, competitions and dinners will be held. The department will even be publishing a commemorative book on its history to celebrate this milestone.

For the past 125 years, members have selflessly given their time and energy to serve our community throughout periods of emergency and disaster. While the Cohocton Volunteer Fire Department should be commemorated for all of their service to our community, I want to especially highlight their tireless work during the 1972 Flood, the Ice Storm of 1991 and the Blizzard of 1993—three major storms which devastated the Chemung Valley.

Furthermore, the department also aided the national community during the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Under a mutual aid request, the department sent an ambulance and personnel to the Twin Towers Site after the attack. The ambulance was equipped with medical supplies donated by the local community for use by the FDNY.

Members of the Cohocton Volunteer Fire Department have repeatedly risked their lives in order to save our friends and neighbors. I am proud to recognize such a self-sacrificing and courageous organization. I congratulate the Cohocton Volunteer Fire Department and thank them for their 125 years of service.

MASSACHUSETTS AND PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL WILL GREATLY MISS MYRA KRAFT

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week, one of Massachusetts' leading citizens succumbed to a long illness, which she had courageously fought. Myra Kraft was the partner and wife of Robert Kraft, and co-owner of the New England Patriots. Under the leadership of the Kraft family, the Patriots became one of the great sports franchises in America, not simply because of their extremely impressive record of Super Bowl championships, but because of the honorable way in which they conducted their business, and because of the great contributions they made to their community. I have the honor of representing the Town of Foxboro, in which the Patriots play, and in which the Kraft family created a wonderful commercial complex that adds a great deal to the economic and cultural life not just of the town but of the entire region.

Mr. Speaker, I've had the pleasure of walking through the complex with members of the Kraft family and I can report to you that the residents of New England—not just Massachusetts—are understandably great enthusiasts of the work the family has done.

Myra Kraft was an extraordinary contributor to the society around her, not just through the work of the Patriots, but through her great charitable efforts. She was a leading member of the organized work of the Jewish community of Greater Boston, but her good works were not confined.

All of Massachusetts will miss her, even those who did not know of the work she did, because she was not one to seek publicity for her efforts. And those of us who did have the privilege of knowing her are particularly saddened by her loss.

Mr. Speaker, the Boston Globe for Friday, July 22, in its lead editorial expressed what our community feels about Myra Kraft and I ask that because she presented such a wonderful example of good citizenship in a democracy, that this editorial be printed.

[From the Boston Globe, July 22, 2011]

MYRA KRAFT WAS A ROLE MODEL FOR FAMILY LOYALTY AND GIVING

Bob Kraft, the developer turned football impresario, made the once-derided New England Patriots a symbol of local pride. Myra, his wife of 48 years, made the Kraft family a symbol of civic responsibility. Her numerous charitable works, including chairing the local boards of the Combined Jewish Philanthropies and the Boys & Girls Clubs, paralleled Bob's rise in the statewide business community.

The Krafts were an unbreakable unit. Bob and Myra's four sons shared in all their parents' endeavors. On May 3, the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce honored the family for their work on behalf of the community, fueled by Myra's tireless exertions.

She was too ill to attend the banquet, but her husband, sons, daughters-in-law, and grandchildren all stood proudly together on the dais—an honor guard of which any mother would be eternally proud.

“I got it right the first time,” quipped Bob, referring to Myra, whom he married when she was just 20. Myra Kraft, who died

Wednesday and for whom services will be held today made many contributions to the Boston area. Foremost among them is the example she set for family loyalty and shared commitment. It will live on not only through her offspring, but through others who tightened their own family bonds, even if in a small way, in response to her inspiration.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2551) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the FY 2012 Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill. Not because I object to cuts affecting Members of Congress or their staff. I do not. As I have repeatedly said, I believe a responsible solution to our national debt will require shared sacrifice from every American—and that includes Members of Congress, their staff and other employees of this House.

I object to this legislation because of the wrongheaded choices it makes elsewhere in the legislative branch of our government. For example, H.R. 2551 cuts funding for the Government Accountability Office by 6.4%—despite the fact that every dollar spent by the GAO on its oversight activities returns \$4 in savings to the taxpayers. Additionally, as we wrestle with difficult issues in an increasingly complex world, I think Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle would agree that policymakers need access to more objective and independent expert analysis, not less. Yet this bill slashes funding for the Library of Congress and its widely respected nonpartisan Congressional Research Service by 8.5%—and it cuts funding for the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office that serves as the definitive scorekeeper for every measure Congress considers by 6.4%.

Mr. Speaker, there are responsible and effective ways to reduce federal spending, and there are irresponsible and ineffective ways to reduce Federal spending. Unfortunately, this bill has too much of the latter and not enough of the former.

I urge a no vote.

RECOGNIZING THE 2011 SAGE
WORLD CUP

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 2011 SAGE World Cup, which is being hosted by Canisius College in Buffalo, NY.

SAGE (Students for the Advancement of Global Entrepreneurship) is an international

network dedicated to creating leaders, innovations, and social enterprises to address the world's needs. Founded in 2002 by Dr. Curtis L. DeBerg, the network now extends to over 500 high schools in 17 countries, and is run completely by volunteers.

Each year, the winners of SAGE's national competitions advance to the "SAGE World Cup," where teams are judged not only on marketplace viability, but also on social impact, environmental stewardship, and civic engagement. This year, the World Cup will be held in Buffalo and Niagara Falls, NY.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that you will join me in honoring SAGE and its 2011 World Cup participants, whose dedication to creating better futures for themselves and others through socially responsible enterprises and businesses is commendable.

IN HONOR OF MRS. IRENE M.
MORROW

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mrs. Irene Morrow who is being honored at this year's American Nationalities Movement's awards dinner.

Mrs. Morrow began her work in the public sector in 1964 when she was appointed as Deputy Registrar for the Board of Elections and began working for the Notary Public Commission. During the same year, she began serving as Deputy Auditor in the Cuyahoga County Auditor's Office where she would remain for eight years. Subsequently, Irene worked as the Personnel Administrator and Secretary of the Civil Service Commission for seventeen years. In 1978 she was elected Executive Secretary and Treasurer of the American Nationalities Movement, a post which she retained until 2011. In 2004, Irene established the Ralph J. Perk Foundation, an organization which works to fund free mammograms and prostate screenings for the inner-city poor.

Mrs. Morrow has received numerous awards and honors throughout her decades of public service. She was presented with the Keys to the City of Cleveland from Mayor Ralph J. Perk and then Mayor George V. Voinovich in 1977 and again in 1985. In 1982 she was honored as one of the forty most outstanding women in Ohio by Mrs. Barbara Bush. She has also received accolades from the Polonia Foundation of Ohio in 1985, the American Nationalities Movement in 1988, and she was presented with an Appreciation Award from the United Hungarian Societies in 2007. Last year, she was inducted into the International Hall of Fame of Greater Cleveland.

Irene is married to Mr. Edward Morrow, and together they have six children and six grandchildren. She continues to serve on the Advisory Board of Fairview Park and Lutheran Hospitals.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Mrs. Irene M. Morrow, a woman who has done so much for her community and for her country.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE MURID ISLAMIC COMMUNITY IN AMERICA'S 23RD ANNUAL CHEIKH AHMADOU BAMBA MBACKE ISLAMIC CULTURAL WEEK CELEBRATION IN NEW YORK CITY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor, recognize, and celebrate the Murid Islamic Community in America's 23rd Annual Cheikh Ahmadou Bamba Mbacke Islamic Cultural Week Celebration in New York City. On Thursday, July 21, the Murid Islamic Community in America (MICA) will host its annual welcome reception at Wadleigh Secondary School for the Performing & Visual Arts in Harlem, where they will officially launch the North American Tour of the Cheikh Ahmadou Bamba Mbacke Islamic Cultural Weeks.

The Honorable Iman Ababacar Dabo, President of the Murid Islamic Community in America and The Honorable Serigne Mame Mor Mbacke, grandson to Cheikh Ahmadou Bamba Mbacke will pay special tribute to my brother, the Honorable David N. Dinkins, first African American and 106th Mayor of the City of New York. David Dinkins was the first public official outside of Senegal, West Africa to proclaim "Cheikh Ahmadou Bamba Day" in celebration of his profound philosophies of Universal Peace and International Brotherhood.

Cheikh Ahmadou Bamba was born in the year 1271 (A.H.), which is 1853 in Mbacke Baol, a small village in Senegal. Cheikh Ahmadou Bamba Mbakke was born in the village of Mbacké Mbakke Bawol in Wolof in the Kingdom of Baol, the son of a Marabout from the Xaadri Qadriyya brotherhood, the oldest in Senegal. A religious prayer leader, poet and monk, Ahmadou Bamba founded the Mouride brotherhood in 1883 and the city of Touba. In one of his numerous writings, Matlابل Fawzeyni the quest for happiness in both worlds, Sheikh Ahmadou Bamba describes the purpose of the city, which he founded in 1887. In his concept, Touba should reconcile the spiritual and the temporal.

Cheikh Ahmadou Bamba intended to have the spiritual capital of Brotherhood, by showing all the characteristics of a Muslim city. He is the son of Muhammad, and grandson of Abibul-allah, who was the son of Muhammad. His father Mohammad Ibn Habiballah was a famous Juriconsult and a well-respected Imam. The Cheikh's mother was known as Diaratoullah close to Allah, because of her renowned piety and chastity. Cheikh Ahmadou Bamba memorized the Holy Qu'ran very early. He was very educated in the different fields of Islamic sciences and the Arabic language. He wrote many books in the teaching of Islam, and great poems dedicated to the Prophet Muhammad.

As his fame spread, the French colonial government worried about Bamba's growing power and potential to wage war against them. He had converted a number of traditional kings and their followers and no doubt could have raised a huge military force, as Muslim leaders like Umar Tall and Samory Touré had before him.

The French sentenced him to exile in Gabon 1895–1902 and later in Mauritania

1903–1907. However, these exiles fired stories and folk tales of Bamba's miraculous survival of torture, deprivation, and attempted executions, and thousands more flocked to his organization. On the ship to Gabon, forbidden from praying, Bamba is said to have broken his leg irons, leapt overboard into the ocean and prayed on a prayer rug that appeared on the surface of the water or, when the French put him in a furnace, he simply sat down in it and drank tea with Muhammad. In a den of hungry lions, the lions slept beside him, etc.

By 1910, the French realized that Bamba was not interested in waging war against them, and was in fact quite cooperative, eventually releasing him to return to his expanded community. In 1918, he won the French Legion of Honor for enlisting his followers into World War I. The French allowed him to establish his community in Touba, believing in part that his doctrine of hard work could be made to serve French economic interests. The French government allowed his movement to grow, and in 1926, he began work for the great Mosque at Touba, where he is buried. Upon his death in 1927, The Cheikh has been succeeded by his descendants as hereditary leaders of the Brotherhood with absolute authority over their followers.

Murid Islamic Community in America MICA is a non-profit organization was founded in 1989 to spread the teachings of Cheikh Ahmadou Bamba in accordance with the Quran and the Sunnah of the Prophet Muhammad. I ask my colleagues and our nation to join me in this special Congressional Recognition in celebration of Cheikh Ahmadou Bamba Mbacke Islamic Cultural Week in New York City.

IN HONOR OF JAMES T. MOLLOY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and remembrance of Mr. James T. Molloy, the former Doorkeeper for the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Molloy was born in South Buffalo on June 3, 1936, the son of Matthew Molloy (a Buffalo firefighter) and Catherine Hayden Molloy. He graduated from Bishop Timon High School and proceeded to work in waterfront grain elevators. He also joined the Buffalo Fire Department before continuing his education at Canisius College. Upon graduating, Mr. Molloy began teaching in Buffalo and Lackawanna, New York.

Mr. Molloy was a member of the Erie County Democratic Party and later moved to Washington, DC, where he became the Chief Finance Officer of the House of Representatives. In 1974, he became the Doorkeeper of the House, a position that he would hold for the next 20 years. Throughout his tenure as doorkeeper, Mr. Molloy was able to make many friends in Washington, including Speaker Thomas O'Neill, Jr. and President Reagan. He was known around Washington as a "Buffalo Guy." Tom Brokaw called him "the pride of South Buffalo" each year when he introduced Mr. Molloy as the President walked out for the State of the Union.

Mr. Molloy has received many awards throughout his lifetime, including having a U.S.

post office building on South Park Avenue named after him in 2006. He was also recognized by the New York AFL-CIO, the New York State Federation of Police and the United States Senate Youth Alumni Association.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Mr. James T. Malloy, a man whose presence in Washington will be sorely missed.

IN OPPOSITION TO CUTS TO HIGH SPEED RAIL FUNDING

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my opposition to the cuts to high-speed rail included in H.R. 2354, the Fiscal Year 2012 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill.

At a time when this Congress should be focused on creating jobs, investing in our infrastructure, and supporting transportation alternatives, the bill before us unfortunately includes a provision to cut funding for high-speed rail. These cuts are both harmful and short-sighted, and will limit key opportunities for job growth and economic development throughout our nation.

According to a recent study from the U.S. Conference of Mayors, building high-speed rail networks in the U.S. will have a significant positive economic impact. The study shows that in the four urban areas surveyed, high-speed rail could add \$19 billion in new business development and 150,000 jobs. We should not be turning our backs on this historic opportunity.

It is clear: investing in rail, whether it is high-speed, or inter-city, has the potential to create desperately-needed jobs in communities around the country. Case in point: in October last year, a contract awarded to the Siemens Transportation Systems manufacturing plant in my district of Sacramento, California to build 70 new electric trains for Amtrak is creating 200 local jobs—not to mention that they employ approximately 64,000 people throughout the country. Not only is Siemens creating jobs, but they are also building a high-quality product that will make train travel more efficient and environmentally friendly. These trains are built in an environmentally-friendly way, using solar energy developed on site.

In Sacramento, rail is not just a part of our history, it is our future.

In April, we broke ground on a track relocation project that will not only improve safety and efficiency, but will pave the way for the development of both an intermodal transportation facility and future economic growth in our downtown. This project is creating 350 jobs onsite, and 1,100 jobs in total. It will also make room for high-speed rail.

What is happening in Sacramento is a snapshot of the interest in rail statewide. The voters in my home state of California have approved plans to build a high-speed rail network that will eventually link Sacramento to San Diego, and communities throughout the state. This high-speed rail line will create jobs, provide viable transportation options to residents and visitors alike, and reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

But as forward-thinking as California is, progress will be held back if the provisions to cut high-speed rail funding are included in the final version of this bill.

In my district alone, we would lose millions of dollars intended for rail projects funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. This rescission would result in the loss of many jobs and endanger the necessary safety and efficiency improvements need for the tracks between Sacramento and Davis.

I think we can all agree that now is not the time to remove opportunities for improved job growth and economic recovery. Yet, my Republican colleagues are doing just that by including the elimination of funding for high-speed rail in this bill.

It is my hope that the Senate approves a final bill that restores this funding, and that the President signs into law a bill that appropriately invests in our infrastructure: levees and rail alike.

IN HONOR OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OMEGA PSI PHI FRATERNITY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 100th anniversary of the Omega Psi Phi fraternity, the first African-American national fraternal organization with roots in a historically African-American college.

The Omega Psi Phi fraternity was founded at Howard University in Washington, D.C. on November 17, 1911. As illustrated by the prominent careers of its four founders, Bishop Edgar Amos Love, Dr. Oscar James Cooper, Professor Frank Coleman and Dr. Ernest Everett Just, members of Omega Psi Phi are known to go on to successful careers.

Omega Psi Phi is dedicated to the principles of "manhood, scholarship, perseverance and uplift." The fraternity has also shown a strong commitment to philanthropy and community. It began a National Social Program in 1945 to aid with health, housing, civil rights and educational issues of the African-American community. Furthermore, the fraternity has made annual donations of \$50,000 to the United Negro College Fund since 1955.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in recognizing the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Omega Psi Phi fraternity, whose members have been strong community supporters and leaders since the fraternity's origin. I wish the alumni and current members of the Omega Psi Phi fraternity the best in all of their future endeavors.

CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and under

consideration the bill (H.R. 1315) to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes:

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the so-called "Consumer Financial Protection Safety and Soundness Improvement Act," which would weaken the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, just as it is beginning its work on behalf of American consumers. While its supporters claim this bill is innocuous, it would water down the CFPB's ability to issue consumer protections and subject new proposals to an additional layer of bureaucratic review.

It is noteworthy that the Republican majority has brought this bill to the floor one year after Congress passed sweeping reforms and consumer protections for the nation's financial sector, maybe to blunt any press coverage on the launch of the CFPB. With no chance of this bill becoming law, House Republicans are sending a message to big banks and financial institutions that they are fighting to protect their interests, not the interests of American consumers.

But House Republicans are sending another message—that they still fail to understand the causes of our current economic troubles. If we have learned any lesson from the financial crisis of the last several years, it should be that by protecting consumers we can protect the rest of the financial system.

It is clear that the consumer credit and housing bubbles of the last decade were the result of unfair and deceptive practices of credit card companies and lenders that steered families into financial products that they did not understand and that they could not afford to repay.

Congressional Republicans claim the CFPB will be a cumbersome bureaucracy that will be a drag on the marketplace. All we need to do is look at the CFPB's first reform effort—simplifying the long, tedious paperwork consumers face when purchasing a home down to a short, simple form—to know that Republican claims have no merit.

I am hearing different messages from consumer advocates like AARP and the Consumer Federation of America and my constituents. They know that transparency in consumer financial products is long overdue and they support the CFPB.

A free marketplace can only function properly if consumers can make well-informed decisions about financial products, whether they are home mortgages or credit cards. The American people deserve a strong, effective CFPB. We should allow it to do its work, and that is why I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

IN HONOR OF THE MONTEREY COUNTY FAIR ON ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Monterey County Fair on the occasion of its 75th anniversary. The mission of

the Fair, to create, produce and offer quality events in their unique setting of 22 oak-studded acres, has educated, entertained and inspired our people for 75 years.

The Monterey County Fairground is a State owned Multi-Use Facility, generating \$22.9 million annually in spending activity over its history and contributing 300 full-time and part-time jobs. This year's theme, chosen by the 7th District Agricultural Association, will be "Horse'n Around" and was inspired by the artwork of artist Jo Mora. This summer, from August 31st to September 5th, livestock demonstrations, displays and auctions will recall and promote the rich agricultural heritage and diverse resources of Monterey County. The money raised from the auctions goes towards scholarships for local students and includes the participation of over 5,000 of Monterey County's youth through the Future Farmers of America and 4-H programs.

The Monterey County Fair prides itself on being an inclusive environment where everyone in Monterey County can join in the festivities. Seniors' Day, Kids' Day, Special Friends' Day and Military Day ensure that citizens of all abilities and income levels can participate and enjoy the fair.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to hold up the Monterey County Fair as a model for other community and cultural events. On behalf of the whole House, I acknowledge the valuable contributions of the Monterey County Fair, and invite the community to join the celebration of its 75th Anniversary. May their continued success inspire many more generations to celebrate our agricultural and cultural heritage.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 21, I missed a rollcall vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on No. 612.

IN HONOR OF TERRANCE R. DUNCAN

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of my good friend, Terrance Duncan, who is retiring from the Superior Court of California of Monterey County on August 17, 2011. Terry honorably served as a judicial officer in the Monterey County Courts for over 29 years. We shared the Monterey Court-house as a workplace before he was sworn in as a Court Commissioner.

Since Terry's appointment as a Municipal Court Commissioner in 1982, he worked tirelessly to help serve justice in Monterey County. In 1995 he was elected as a Municipal Court Judge and elevated to the Superior Court in 2000. As a judge Terry presided over thousands of criminal and civil cases in Salinas, Monterey, and King City. From 2003 to 2005 he served as the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court.

Terry's dedication to the teaching of the legal system is inspiring. He served as an instructor for the California Center for Judicial Education and Research where he taught judicial skills and ethics to both new and experienced Judges. Throughout California, Terry educated students in places like the California Judicial College, the Stanford Law School Trial Advocacy Program and the Monterey College of Law Community Education Program.

Terry has also been an active member of the legal community by being a part of many prestigious organizations. He served as an Officer and Director of the California Judges' Association, was President of the California Court Commissioners' Association, and he was also the President of the Board of Trustees of the Monterey College of Law.

Not only is Terry an active member of his professional community but he has also been heavily involved with helping the community of Monterey County. He was the founder in 1989 and President of Monterey County Sober Graduation which is an all-volunteer organization that introduced the concept of sober graduation activities for high school seniors. Terry was also President of the Monterey Kiwanis Club and director of the Sports Car Racing Association of the Monterey Peninsula (SCRAMP). SCRAMP is an organization that makes major donations to charities each year. Terry also served as a Board President of the Beacon House alcohol recovery home in Pacific Grove, along with numerous other community activities serving those in need.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the whole House as I commend the contribution Terry has made to Monterey County's justice system. This is not the end of a career of service to the legal system for I know that Terrance will continue to serve the County of Monterey and the legal community in other capacities. Our region is fortunate to have the quality of leadership that Judge Terrance Duncan exemplifies.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO MARINE SCIENCE TECHNICIAN SECOND CLASS NICOLE EMMONS FOR BEING SELECTED AS THE MILITARY TIMES COAST GUARD SERVICE MEMBER OF THE YEAR

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Marine Science Technician Second Class Nicole Emmons, of Clearwater Florida, for her selection as the Military Times Coast Guard Service Member of the Year. Nicole exemplifies the best in our nation's military and serves as a shining example of how one person can make an impact at the community, the state and the national level.

Nicole Emmons was chosen as both the Marine Safety Unit Lake Charles, Louisiana and the Coast Guard Sector Houston-Galveston's Enlisted Person of the Year by area Chiefs, Senior Chiefs and Master Chiefs. Working with the Contingency Preparedness/ Incident Management Division at Marine Safety Unit Lake Charles, Nicole contributed countless hours to stand-up her unit's first Homeland Security Division. As one of three Law

Enforcement instructors, she shoulders significant responsibility. She organizes a month-long training program for new members, leads hands-on practice sessions and organizes qualifications boards. Nicole Emmons also worked during off-duty hours in mission requirements associated with specially targeted vessels and has participated in over 20 security boardings.

Displaying exceptional initiative, she deployed to the Marine Safety Unit Port Arthur Incident Command Post, providing her expertise as a Situation Unit Leader in the aftermath of the EAGLE OTOME's 450,000 gallon crude oil spill. She filled a key role in providing operational commanders with continuous feedback regarding the progress of the clean-up efforts and was awarded the Coast Guard Commandant's Letter of Commendation. During the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, she was awarded the Coast Guard's Special Operations Ribbon for training reservist pollution investigators. In November of 2010, she transferred to the Planning Division and immediately accepted several large areas of responsibility well above her pay grade, including providing critical updates needed for the Geographic Response Plan and Area Response Plan.

Nicole Emmons also serves her community. She helped create the unit's Moving Assistance Team to minimize the financial burden of local moves for fellow shipmates. She is a founding member of her unit's COMPASS program, which promotes community outreach and diversity education in local high schools. Serving as the Vice President of the Human Relations Council, she helps to provide a safe, open forum for discussing human relation issues and celebrating different cultures.

Nicole Emmons' service to the community also includes volunteering for the local Boys and Girls Club, Big Brothers/Big Sisters Lunch Buddy program and mentoring an academically and socially challenged child. She has participated in charity fund-raising and community events, such as the Ethel Precht Breast Cancer 3K, the Coast Guard Relay for Life and volunteering for the Lake Charles Special Olympics Torch Run.

Along with all of her numerous career achievements, Nicole holds two Bachelor of Arts degrees from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful Nation, I join my colleagues today in saying thank you to Marine Science Technician Second Class Nicole Emmons for her extraordinary dedication to duty and service to this country through her outstanding performance in the United States Coast Guard and her community. We wish Nicole, her husband Michael, and her family all the best in her remarkably bright future.

HONORING MR. LOU VIVERITO AND
STICKNEY TOWNSHIP FOR EXPANDING
HEALTHCARE CLINIC STICKNEY'S

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Lou Viverito, President of Stickney

Public Health District, and to recognize his efforts in constructing a new wing to a medical center in Stickney, Illinois. The wing, which opened on July 23, 2011, will provide quality healthcare for the residents of Stickney, a township in my district, for generations to come.

Mr. Viverito's career in public service spans five decades, starting in 1965. Since that time, he has held many positions, but public health has always been his passion. He has served as a State Senator, reaching positions of leadership in that capacity. Mr. Viverito was elected President of Stickney Public Health District in 1973, and has worked tirelessly for his constituents in Stickney since then. Mr. Viverito's decades of work will culminate in a brand new section of Stickney's health center that will preserve the wellbeing of thousands over the next several decades.

Stickney's new medical center stands as a testament to dedicated public service and intelligent public policy. The six million dollar health center will open after years of work from public servants who put the needs of their citizenry first: the Officials of Stickney Township, the Stickney Public Health District, and especially Lou Viverito. The project was completed without any increases in taxes and without a bond issue, showing how responsible planners can bring substantial public good to a community without the need for public debt.

The medical center is a continuation of a long history of quality health care for the residents of Stickney. Since the founding of Stickney's Public Health District in 1946, residents have enjoyed excellent care for little or no cost. Medical professionals will continue to offer ambulatory health care, podiatry, immunizations, maternal health, WIC nutrition programs, school health services, communicable disease control, chronic disease management, elderly community care, behavioral health, and dental services in this state-of-the-art facility.

Please join me in honoring Mr. Viverito, the Officials of Stickney Township, and the Stickney Public Health District on their accomplishment. I know this project will have wide-ranging positive effects for Stickney residents for years, and I thank Mr. Viverito for his pivotal role in bringing this idea to fruition.

VICTIMS OF AGENT ORANGE RELIEF ACT OF 2011

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, from 1961 to 1971, approximately 19 million gallons of fifteen different herbicides, including 13 million gallons of Agent Orange, were sprayed over the southern region of Vietnam. Many, including Agent Orange were based with the toxic contaminant, known as dioxin.

It is estimated that between 2.1 million and 4.8 million Vietnamese people were present during the spraying of Agent Orange and other herbicides and many more were or continue to be exposed through contact with the environment and food that was contaminated, or as offspring of those exposed who now suffer from illnesses and deformities.

Today there are still dozens of environmental hot spots in Vietnam which contami-

nate the food, soil, sediment and wildlife and continue to expose Vietnamese to dioxin.

Agent Orange exposure continues to negatively affect the lives of men and women in Vietnam and in the United States. Many victims' lives are cut short and others live with disease, disabilities and pain, often untreated or unrecognized.

Therefore, Congress resolves to address and remediate the ongoing problems and concerns that arose or will arise from the use of these deadly Agents during the Vietnam War in both the United States and in Vietnam.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2634.

DOG PARK COMPETITION OFFERS LESSON OF UNITY

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the dog days of summer, exacerbated by the hot air sometimes generated in this city, are contributing to our current budget morass. Rather than throwing our hands up, and saying everything is going to the dogs, I want to share with our colleagues, that man's best friend, and maybe our only friend in this city, Mr. Speaker, can be a rallying cry for unity and a lesson on how to get things done.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the good people of Huntington, West Virginia, are rallying support for their city in a nationwide contest that has a grand prize of \$100,000 to construct the town's first off-leash dog park.

Huntington is a town devoted to beautiful, peaceful and useful parks, and has a long and proud history of maintaining a grand system of parks. Moreover, Huntington has a tradition of coming together, when it seems the world as they know it, is coming apart. I refer of course to the tragic loss of Marshall University's football team in 1970. Ultimately, and with sheer determination as their only ally at times, the University and the City produced National Championship teams. Herein, I do believe, lie lessons for our fellow Americans, for the members of this body, and the entire Congress.

At last count, Huntington was in first place in the contest that will be decided by Internet voting and ends next week. Local businesses and media are all supporting this community driven effort. This past weekend, Hillbilly Hot Dogs in downtown Huntington sponsored a hot dog eating contest to draw attention to the campaign. As the winning contestant Ron Clark said, the proposed park can be a "good place to make great friends." Maybe members of this body ought to take a few minutes each morning to walk their pooches and pass some pleasantries with their colleagues.

My little dog, Billie Sue, will enjoy romping with Huntington's proud pets in their newest park and I look forward to chatting with my constituents old and new. Whatever the final outcome however, Huntington will have fiercely and fairly campaigned to the final second. But I know I join Huntingtonians in saluting every community taking part in this contest that has reawakened pride, stirred spirit and strengthened ties across the country. Huntington will always be in first place with that commitment. I ask my colleagues to reflect

upon Huntington's example in the coming days.

CONGRESSIONAL COMMENDATION
COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF
DEACON HORACE A. MCKNIGHT,
II

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this communication is forwarded with great love, respect and admiration on behalf of the constituents of the Third Congressional District of Florida and myself as we pay tribute to the life of Deacon Horace A. McKnight, II.

We are all deeply saddened by the loss of this most loved and admired gentleman, who, by his sheer determination served his country, his community, his church and most proudly, his family, immediate and extended. Mr. McKnight, a World War II Veteran served valiantly for an ideal, a place in his heart that would be a testament to one's ability to rise above the mediocre and the perceived notions of others, in order to serve the common good for all. His was a selfless and true act of patriotism and love of country and he perhaps knew that with such service, the lives of his flintily and his fellow countrymen would be made better. He was right, and his act of service at that time in our history and his dedication, helped shape the social direction of an entire nation and paved the way for all he was to accomplish and did, for many to benefit from.

Horace McKnight, husband to his beloved childhood sweetheart Delia of forty-seven years, father, brother, uncle, grandfather, great grandfather, friend, church and community leader and entrepreneur, was and shall always be our example of a leader and caring man, deserving of all the accolades and acknowledgements received and most deserved. This quiet, calm, confident gentleman and "Chief Deacon", was a giant among men who saw a job and just got it done, without fanfare or applause. It is this manner of applause, great respect and love we now bestow upon our dear Horace. And in so doing, we say thank you for all you have done, for all you stand for and most assuredly, for all that you have meant to so many of us. We are eternally grateful for having known, loved and respected Horace McKnight, and are blessed for, and by, his manner of life, living and giving. A true gentleman was he. God Bless each one, and may the memory of Deacon Horace A. McKnight remain with you always.

HONORING HAL DAVID

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my good friend Hal David on the occasion of his 90th birthday. Hal is being honored by his many colleagues, family and friends for his ability to touch the lives of others through the art of songwriting.

Hal is a first-generation American, born in Brooklyn to immigrant parents. One of his earliest ventures in using his musical talents to help others occurred when he served in the U.S. Army Entertainment Section during World War II, along with his colleagues Carl Reiner and Werner Klemperer. Four years after the conclusion of the war, Hal—along with Don Rodney—co-wrote his first hit record, "The Four Winds and the Seven Seas" recorded by Vic Damone. Hal continued to write hits, including "Bell Bottom Blues" for Teresa Brewer, "Brokenhearted Melody" for Sarah Vaughan and "Johnny Get Angry" for Joanie Sommers.

Hal then began his legendary collaboration with composer Burt Bacharach. The two comprised one of the best-known songwriting teams of the 50's and 60's. The incredibly prolific duo Hal and Burt wrote four songs that were nominated for Academy Awards, with "Raindrops" from the 1969 film *Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid* winning the Oscar for "Best Song." The two also co-wrote the score for the hit 1968 Broadway musical *Promises, Promises*, for which the original cast recording won a Grammy Award. The show was revived last year with Hal's original lyrics.

In addition to his career as a lyricist, Hal also served as President of the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers. I was fortunate enough to meet and work with him during these years. Hal's devotion to his art was apparent as he led the battle against source licensing efforts and today he continues to serve on ASCAP's Board of Directors.

Hal also spent ten years as the Chairman and CEO of the Songwriters Hall of Fame. During his tenure, the Songwriters Hall of Fame established an important digital presence and launched a gallery at the Grammy Museum in Los Angeles.

As a result of his professional accomplishments, Hal has been inducted into both the Songwriters Hall of Fame and the Nashville Songwriters Hall of Fame. He has also received the prestigious Songwriters Hall of Fame Towering Song Award and its Johnny Mercer Award. Hal has also been honored with The Recording Academy's Grammy Trustees Award and the British Performing Rights Society's Ivor Novello Award, becoming the first American citizen ever to receive that award. He is also listed as a "Distinguished Patron of the Arts" at the Los Angeles Music

Center and serves as a member of the Board of Governors at Cedars Sinai Medical Center.

Mr. Speaker and distinguished colleagues, I ask that you join me in thanking Hal for the joy his music has brought to our lives, and in wishing him a happy birthday and many happy returns.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL
WILLIAM R. TRACY ON HIS PRO-
MOTION TO THE RANK OF COLONEL
IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great American and constituent of Illinois' 3rd Congressional District, Lieutenant Colonel William R. Tracy. On July 29th, 2011, he will be promoted to the rank of Colonel in the United States Air Force. William Tracy's talent and commitment were obvious 25 years ago when he received his appointment to the United States Air Force Academy from my father, Representative William O. Lipinski. I am privileged today to recognize Lt. Col. Tracy for his exemplary service to our country.

Upon his graduation from the United States Air Force Academy in 1990 as a Second Lieutenant, Lt. Col. Tracy served for three years as a maintenance officer at Luke Air Force Base in Arizona. After his completion of flight training to become an F-15C Eagle Pilot, Lt. Col. Tracy served at Tyndall Air Force Base. Over the past 17 years he has accumulated more than 2,000 flying hours, including participation in no-fly missions over both northern and southern Iraq. While taking part in these no-fly missions, Lt. Col. Tracy was awarded a Purple Heart for injuries sustained when an insurgent's bomb exploded near him in Saudi Arabia.

Lt. Col. Tracy graduated in the top ten percent of his class at the Air Force Staff and Command Academy, demonstrating his intellect and work ethic, and received his promotion to Lieutenant Colonel upon graduation from the Air Force War College. Due to his excellent leadership qualities, the Air Force placed Lt. Col. Tracy as commanding officer of a Test and Evaluation Squadron at Nellis Air Force Base, where he currently serves today.

I would like to recognize the dedication, skill, and valor Lt. Col. Tracy has displayed throughout his career in the United States Air Force. We are all thankful for his service and the sacrifices he has made during his lifetime of service to the United States. I congratulate Lt. Col. William R. Tracy on his promotion and I will continue to follow his career closely as he continues to be an asset to our armed services.

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 Tuesday, July 26, 2011 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 27

10 a.m.
 Finance
 To hold hearings to examine chief executive officer (CEO) perspectives on how the tax code affects hiring, businesses and economic growth. SD-215
 Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
 To hold hearings to examine ten years after 9/11, focusing on emergency communications. SD-342
 Judiciary
 To hold hearings to examine fulfilling our treaty obligations and protecting Americans abroad. SD-226
 Appropriations
 Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of Education. SD-124
 Veterans' Affairs
 To hold hearings to examine the lifetime costs of supporting the newest generation of veterans. SD-562
 Joint Economic Committee
 To hold hearings to examine maximizing America's prosperity, focusing on how fiscal rules can restrain Federal over-spending. SH-216
 10:30 a.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard Subcommittee
 To hold hearings to examine defending United States economic interests in the changing arctic, focusing on if there is a strategy. SR-253
 2 p.m.
 Armed Services
 Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee
 To hold hearings to examine financial management and business transformation at the Department of Defense. SR-232A

2:30 p.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Insurance Subcommittee
 To hold hearings to examine improving highway and vehicle safety, focusing on reauthorization of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. SR-253
 Judiciary
 To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Edgardo Ramos, of Connecticut, Andrew L. Carter, Jr., and Jesse M. Furman, all to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, James Rodney Gilstrap, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas, and Jennifer Guerin Zippis, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona. SD-226

JULY 28

9:30 a.m.
 Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
 To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Brian T. Baenig, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine opportunities for specialty crops and organics in the farm bill. SD-G50
 Armed Services
 To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Admiral Jonathan W. Greenert, USN for reappointment to the grade of admiral and to be Chief of Naval Operations, and Lieutenant General Charles H. Jacoby, Jr., USA to be general and to be Commander, United States Northern Command, and Commander, North American Aerospace Defense Command, both of the Department of Defense. SD-106
 9:45 a.m.
 Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
 To hold hearings to examine Food and Drug Administration (FDA) user fees, focusing on advancing public health. SD-430
 10 a.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security Subcommittee
 To hold hearings to examine aviation fuels, focusing on needs, challenges, and alternatives. SR-253
 Energy and Natural Resources
 To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Charles DeWitt McConnell, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of Energy for Fossil Energy, and Rebecca R. Wodder, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife. SD-366
 Finance
 To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Janice Eberly, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and Juan F. Vasquez, of Texas, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court. SD-215
 Judiciary
 Business meeting to consider S. 401, to help Federal prosecutors and investigators combat public corruption by strengthening and clarifying the law, S. 657, to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement

officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, S. 409, to ban the sale of certain synthetic drugs, S. 605, to amend the Controlled Substances Act to place synthetic drugs in Schedule I, S. 839, to ban the sale of certain synthetic drugs, and the nominations of Steve Six, of Kansas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, Morgan Christen, of Alaska, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Scott Wesley Skavdahl, to be United States District Judge for the District of Wyoming, Sharon L. Gleason, to be United States District Judge for the District of Alaska, Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, and Richard G. Andrews, to be United States District Judge for the District of Delaware. SD-226

1:30 p.m.
 Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
 To hold hearings to examine United States policy and the Organization for Co-operation in Europe, focusing on making good on commitments and challenges, including unresolved conflicts, ethnic tension, corruption and lack of governance, racism and intolerance, and trafficking in persons. 210, Cannon Building
 2 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Financial Service and General Government Subcommittee
 To hold hearings to examine Federal disaster assistance budgeting, focusing on the role of the Federal government in mitigating the economic impact of severe weather events through long-term budgetary planning. SD-138
 2:15 p.m.
 Indian Affairs
 To hold an oversight hearing to examine enforcing the "Indian Gaming Regulatory Act", focusing on the role of the National Indian Gaming Commission and tribes as regulators. SD-628
 2:30 p.m.
 Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
 To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Mark D. Acton, of Kentucky, and Robert G. Taub, of New York, both to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission. SD-342
 Energy and Natural Resources
 National Parks Subcommittee
 To hold hearings to examine S. 264, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, S. 265, to authorize the acquisition of core battlefield land at Champion Hill, Port Gibson, and Raymond for addition to Vicksburg National Military Park, S. 324, to amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission, S. 764, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to make technical corrections to the segment designations for the Chetco River, Oregon, S. 864, to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California, S. 883, to authorize National Mall Liberty Fund D.C. to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia to honor

free persons and slaves who fought for independence, liberty, and justice for all during the American Revolution, S. 888, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 925, to designate Mt. Andrea Lawrence, S. 970, to designate additional segments and tributaries of White Clay Creek, in the States of Delaware and Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 1063, to allow for the harvest of gull eggs by the Huna Tlingit people within Glacier Bay National Park in the State of Alaska, and S. 1134, to authorize the St. Croix River Crossing Project with appropriate mitigation measures to promote river values.

SD-366

Intelligence

Closed business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SH-219

AUGUST 2

10 a.m.

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine health reform and health insurance premiums,

focusing on empowering states to serve consumers.

SD-430

2:30 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Francis Joseph Ricciardone, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Turkey, and Norman L. Eisen, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Czech Republic, both of the Department of State.

SD-419

AUGUST 3

10 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Wendy Ruth Sherman, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

SD-419

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 958, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program of payments to children's hospitals that operate graduate medical education programs, and S. 1094, to reauthorize the Combating Autism Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-416), an original bill entitled, "Workforce Investment Act Reauthor-

ization of 2011", and any pending nominations.

SD-430

Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine cybercrime, focusing on updating the "Computer Fraud and Abuse Act" to protect cyberspace and combat emerging threats.

SD-226

2:30 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Public Lands and Forests Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine S. 1024, to designate the Organ Mountains and other public land as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System and the National Landscape Conservation System in the State of New Mexico, S. 1090, to designate as wilderness certain public land in the Cherokee National Forest in the State of Tennessee, S. 1144, to amend the Soda Ash Royalty Reduction Act of 2006 to extend the reduced royalty rate for soda ash, S. 1149, to expand geothermal production, and S. 1344, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to take immediate action to recover ecologically and economically from a catastrophic wildfire in the State of Arizona.

SD-366

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4855–S4881

Measures Introduced: Four bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1410–1413. **Pages S4868–69**

Measures Considered:

Sense of the Senate Regarding the Budget Deficit—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of S. 1323, to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit, taking action on the following amendments and motions proposed thereto: **Pages S4865–66**

Withdrawn:

Reid motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Reid Amendment No. 531, of a perfecting nature. **Page S4865**

Reid Amendment No. 529, to change the enactment date. **Pages S4865–66**

Pending:

Reid Amendment No. 581, to cut spending, maintain existing commitments, and for other purposes. **Page S4866**

Reid Amendment No. 582 (to Amendment No. 581), to change the enactment date. **Page S4866**

Reid motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Reid Amendment No. 583, to change the enactment date. **Page S4866**

Reid Amendment No. 584 (to the instructions (Amendment No. 583) of the motion to commit), of a perfecting nature. **Page S4866**

Reid Amendment No. 585 (to Amendment No. 584), of a perfecting nature. **Page S4866**

During consideration of this measure today, the Senate also took the following action:

Reid Amendment No. 532 (to the instructions (Amendment No. 531) of the motion to commit), of a perfecting nature, fell when Reid motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Reid Amendment No. 531, was withdrawn. **Page S4865**

Reid Amendment No. 533 (to Amendment No. 532), of a perfecting nature, fell when Reid Amendment No. 532 (to the instructions (Amendment No. 531) of the motion to commit), fell. **Page S4865**

Reid Amendment No. 530 (to Amendment No. 529), of a perfecting nature, fell when Reid Amendment No. 529, fell. **Page S4865**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at 2:15 p.m., on Tuesday, July 26, 2011. **Page S4881**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report declaring a national emergency with respect to significant transnational criminal organizations; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM—15) **Pages S4867–68**

Engelmayer and Manglona Nominations—Agreement: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Paul A. Engelmayer, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, and the nomination of Ramona Villagomez Manglona, of the Northern Mariana Islands, to be Judge for the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands for a term of ten years. **Pages S4860–62**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that the votes on confirmation of the nominations scheduled for Monday, July 25, 2011 be vitiated; that Senate continue consideration of the nominations at 12:15 p.m., on Tuesday, July 26, 2011; that there be two minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nomination of Paul A. Engelmayer, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, and the nomination of Ramona Villagomez Manglona, of the Northern Mariana Islands, to be Judge for the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands for a term of ten years, in that order; and that no further motions be in order. **Pages S4862, S4881**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

- 26 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.
- 50 Army nominations in the rank of general.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.	Page S4881
Messages from the House:	Page S4868
Executive Communications:	Page S4868
Additional Cosponsors:	Pages S4869–70
Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:	Page S4870
Additional Statements:	Page S4867
Amendments Submitted:	Pages S4870–81

Adjournment: Senate convened at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 7:28 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, July 26, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4881.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 11 public bills, H.R. 2631–2641; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 368–369, 371 were introduced. **Page H5488**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H5489–90**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2587, to prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from ordering any employer to close, relocate, or transfer employment under any circumstance, with an amendment (H. Rept. 112–179);

H.R. 2445, to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide States and local educational agencies with maximum flexibility in using Federal funds provided under such Act, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 112–180); and

H. Res. 370, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1938) to direct the President to expedite the consideration and approval of the construction and operation of the Keystone XL oil pipeline, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 112–181).

Pages H5487–88

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Campbell to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5401**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:07 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H5402**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 233 yeas to 108 nays with 2 voting "present", Roll No. 631.

Pages H5402, H5409–10

Privileged Resolution: The House agreed to H. Res. 368, Requesting return of official papers on H.R. 1309. **Page H5408**

Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in honor of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson of the United States Capitol Police who were killed in the line of duty defending the Capitol against an intruder armed with a gun on July 24, 1998. **Page H5447**

Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012: The House began consideration of H.R. 2584, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012. **Pages H5409–70**

Pursuant to section 2 of the rule, the amendment considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole is as follows: Strike section 427. **Page H5403**

Agreed to:

Simpson manager's amendment that makes technical and conforming changes to the bill and

Pages H5442–43

Richmond amendment that increases funding, by offset, for Ocean Energy Management by \$5 million (by a recorded vote of 221 yeas to 192 noes, Roll No. 635). **Pages H5464–65, H5468–69**

Rejected:

Richmond amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for the North American Wetlands Conservation Fund by \$10,617,000; **Pages H5465–66**

Moran amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Indian Health Facilities by \$18,663,000 (by a recorded vote of 175 yeas to 237 noes, Roll No. 632); **Pages H5443–45, H5466–67**

Huelskamp amendment that sought to reduce funding in various accounts by a total of \$3,000,231,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 126 yeas to 284 noes, Roll No. 633);

Pages H5445–47, H5467–68

Cleaver amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Environmental Programs and Management by \$3 million (by a recorded vote of 165 ayes to 248 noes, Roll No. 634); and

Pages H5447–64, H5468

Hochul amendment that sought to reduce the amount in the Bureau of Land Management account available for the processing of applications for drilling permits by \$4,452,000 (by a recorded vote of 141 ayes to 271 noes, Roll No. 636).

Pages H5466, H5469–70

H. Res. 363, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 205 yeas to 131 noes, Roll No. 630, after the previous question was ordered without objection.

Page H5409

Suspension: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Extending the term of the incumbent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation: S. 1103, to extend the term of the incumbent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Pages H5470–71

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed:

Restoring GI Bill Fairness Act of 2011: Concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1383, to temporarily preserve higher rates for tuition and fees for programs of education at non-public institutions of higher learning pursued by individuals enrolled in the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs before the enactment of the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Improvements Act of 2010.

Pages H5471–72

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he transmitted notification that an Executive Order was issued declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat that significant transnational criminal organizations pose to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 112–46).

Pages H5472–73

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H5402.

Senate Referrals: S. 300 was referred to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform and Armed Services.

Page H5487

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5409, H5410,

H5466–67, H5467, H5468, H5468–69, H5469–70. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:31 p.m.

Committee Meetings

NORTH-AMERICAN-MADE ENERGY SECURITY ACT

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 1938, the “North-American-Made Energy Security Act.” The Committee granted, by voice vote, a structured rule providing one hour of general debate with 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Rep. Terry; Rep. Waxman; Rep. Hanabusa; and Rep. Kucinich.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on the following: H.R. 198, the “Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act”; H.R. 1154, the “Veterans Equal Treatment for Service Dogs Act”; H.R. 1855, the “Veterans’ Traumatic Brain Injury Rehabilitative Services’ Improvements Act of 2011”; H.R. 2074, the “Veterans Sexual Assault Prevention Act”; H.R. 2530, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for increased flexibility in establishing rates for reimbursement of

State homes by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for nursing home care provided to veterans; and draft legislation. Testimony was heard from Rep. Grimm; Rep. Carter; Rep. Walz of Minnesota; Rep. Bucshon; Robert L. Jesse, M.D., Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Health, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 26, 2011

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of General Martin E. Dempsey, USA for reappointment to the grade of general and to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 9:30 a.m., SD-106.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Martin J. Gruenberg, of Maryland, to be Chairperson and to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Thomas J. Curry, of Massachusetts, to be Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, and S. Roy Woodall, Jr., of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, 10 a.m., SD-538.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine perspectives on deficit reduction, focusing on a review of key issues, 10 a.m., SD-215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider S. 1280, to amend the Peace Corps Act to require sexual assault risk-reduction and response training, and the development of sexual assault protocol and guidelines, the establishment of victims advocates, the establishment of a Sexual Assault Advisory Council, S. Res. 216, encouraging women's political participation in Saudi Arabia, S. Con. Res. 17, expressing the sense of Congress that Taiwan should be accorded observer status in the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), S. Res. 227, calling for the protection of the Mekong River Basin and increased United States support for delaying the construction of mainstream dams along the Mekong River, S. Res. 175, expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to ongoing violations of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Georgia and the importance of a peaceful and just resolution to the conflict within Georgia's internationally recognized borders, Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Rwanda Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, signed at Kigali on February 19, 2008 (Treaty Doc. 110-23), Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Hun-

gary for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed on February 4, 2010, at Budapest (the "proposed Convention") and a related agreement effected by an exchange of notes on February 4, 2010 (Treaty Doc. 111-07), Protocol Amending the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed on May 20, 2009, at Luxembourg (the "proposed Protocol") and a related agreement effected by the exchange of notes also signed on May 20, 2009 (Treaty Doc. 111-08), Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Swiss Confederation for the Avoidance of Double Taxation with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington on October 2, 1996, signed on September 23, 2009, at Washington, as corrected by an exchange of notes effected November 16, 2010 and a related agreement effected by an exchange of notes on September 23, 2009 (Treaty Doc. 112-01), Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Bermuda relating to Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, signed at Hamilton on January 12, 2009 (Treaty Doc. 111-06), and the nominations of Jonathan Don Farrar, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Nicaragua, Derek J. Mitchell, of Connecticut, to be Special Representative and Policy Coordinator for Burma, with the rank of Ambassador, Frankie Annette Reed, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Fiji Islands, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Nauru, the Kingdom of Tonga, Tuvalu, and the Republic of Kiribati, Paul D. Wohlers, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Macedonia, William H. Moser, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Moldova, Thomas M. Countryman, of Washington, to be Assistant Secretary of State for International Security and Non-Proliferation, Jeffrey DeLaurentis, to be Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador, and to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during his tenure of service as Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, all of the Department of State, 2:30 p.m., S-116, Capitol.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine building a ladder of opportunity, focusing on what's working to make the American dream a reality for middle class families, 10 a.m., SD-430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Contracting Oversight, to hold hearings to examine small business contracts, focusing on how oversight failures and regulatory loopholes allow large businesses to get and keep small business contracts, 10 a.m., SD-342.

Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia, to hold hearings to examine Federal workers' compensation program for injured employees, 2 p.m., SD-342.

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees and Border Security, to hold hearings to examine the economic imperative for enacting immigration reform, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Matthew G. Olsen, of Maryland, to be Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, 10 a.m., SD-562.

Full Committee, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing on Ten Years After the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force: Current Status of Legal Authorities, Detention, and Prosecution in the War on Terror, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, hearing on Department of Defense investment in technology and capability to meet emerging security threats, 1:30 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing on total force readiness, 3 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, hearing entitled "Redefining 'Fiduciary': Assessing the Impact of the Labor Department's Proposal on Workers and Retirees." 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled "Cybersecurity: An Overview of Risks to Critical Infrastructure." 11 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health, markup of the following: H.R. 2405, the "Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act"; H.R. 1254, the "Synthetic Drug Control Act"; and H.R. 1852, the "Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act." 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing entitled "Examining Rental Purchase Agreements and the Potential Role for Federal Regulation." 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy and Technology, hearing entitled "Impact of Monetary Policy on the Economy: A Regional Fed Perspective on Inflation, Unemployment, and QE3." 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Europe and Eurasia, hearing on Eastern Europe: The State of Democracy and Freedom, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Reassessing American Grand Strategy in South Asia, 2:30 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights and the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Non-

proliferation, and Trade, joint hearing on AFRICOM: Promoting Partnership for Global Security in Africa, 2 p.m., 2255 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies, hearing entitled "The Last Line of Defense: Federal, State, and Local Efforts to Prevent Nuclear and Radiological Terrorism Within the United States." 10 a.m. in 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security, hearing on H.R. 2572, the "Clean Up Government Act of 2011." 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement, hearing on H.R. 2497, the "Hinder the Administration's Legalization Temptation Act." 1:30 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans, and Insular Affairs, hearing entitled "NOAA's Fishery Science: Is the Lack of Basic Science Costing Jobs?" 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, hearing on the following: H.R. 2578, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act related to a segment of the Lower Merced River in California, and for other purposes; and H.R. 1581, the "Wilderness and Roadless Area Release Act of 2011." 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Operation Fast and Furious: The Other Side of the Border." 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs, Stimulus Oversight and Government Spending, hearing entitled "Lights Out: How EPA Regulations Threaten Affordable Power and Job Creation." 1:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 2587, the "Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act." 3 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Research and Science Education, hearing entitled "The Merit Review Process: Ensuring Limited Federal Resources are Invested in the Best Science." 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, hearing entitled "How to Improve Operations and Implement Efficiencies for the United States Coast Guard." 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, hearing on alternative tax systems, with a focus on tax systems that are based on taxing consumption rather than income, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to hold hearings to examine Bosnia, focusing on obstacles to progress and recommendations for the international response, 2 p.m., 210 Cannon Building.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Tuesday, July 26

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 12:15 p.m.), Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Paul A. Engelmayer, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, and the nomination of Ramona Villagomez Manglona, of the Northern Mariana Islands, to be Judge for the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands for a term of ten years, with a roll call vote on confirmation of the nomination of Paul A. Engelmayer, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, at approximately 12:15 p.m. At 2:15 p.m., Senate will continue consideration of S. 1323, Sense of the Senate Regarding the Budget Deficit.

(Senate will recess following the vote on confirmation of the nomination of Paul A. Engelmayer, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Tuesday, July 26

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of H.R. 1938—North American-Made Energy Security Act (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Berman, Howard L., Calif., E1404
Black, Diane, Tenn., E1399
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E1398
Brown, Corrine, Fla., E1404
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E1396
Farr, Sam, Calif., E1402, E1402

Filner, Bob, Calif., E1403
Frank, Barney, Mass., E1395, E1399
Graves, Sam, Mo., E1402
Hanna, Richard L., N.Y., E1395
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1398, E1400
Himes, James A., Conn., E1398
Holt, Rush D., N.J., E1401
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E1400, E1401, E1401

Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E1403, E1404
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E1401
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E1399
Rahall, Nick J., II, W.Va., E1403
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1400
Reed, Tom, N.Y., E1399
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1400
Young, C.W. Bill, Fla., E1402



Congressional Record

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.gpo.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.