



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 6, 2011

No. 99

## House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the House reconvenes, we ask Your blessing upon deliberations informed by the experiences and interactions of the Members with their constituents.

We thank You for the time to be together with family and friends as our Nation celebrated 235 years of being a marvelous experiment in the self-governance of a people brought together by ideals and trusting in the ability of a free people to govern themselves in justice and peace.

Mindful of this great heritage, and the hard work and sacrifices of so many American ancestors to us all, may the Members of this people's House deliberate in good faith, mindful not only of short-term interest, but of their place in history and of the tremendous responsibility to govern wisely for a bright future for our Nation.

May all that is done this day in the wake of our national celebration 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.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. FOXX 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.

### UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA BASEBALL DOES IT AGAIN

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the University of the South Carolina men's baseball team ended the College World Series this season just as they did last year: The Gamecocks are national champions again, back-to-back victories, by beating the Florida Gators on June 28 at Omaha, Nebraska's TD Ameritrade Park. The University of South Carolina became only the sixth team in NCAA history to win back-to-back baseball national championships.

The Gamecocks won the national title in record-setting fashion. This is the first team ever to go 10-0 in an NCAA tournament. The Gamecocks' streak of 16 NCAA tournament wins and 11 straight in the College World Series are both all-time records.

In the title game, the Gamecocks rode the arm of Michael Roth as he only allowed two runs by the Gators. He was helped by Series Most Outstanding Player Scott Wingo, who not only batted in a couple of runs, but made defensive plays throughout the tournament. Coach Ray Tanner should be credited with putting the pieces together once again in steering the Gamecocks to a 55-win season, capped off by this national championship victory.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

### REMEMBERING AND HONORING THE LIFE OF ART HENRI JERBERT

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Arthur Jerbert of North Stonington, Connecticut. As we approach the 1-year anniversary of his passing, it's important for this House to remember Art's remarkable service to our Nation and his community.

Art was a member of the Greatest Generation, entering the U.S. Navy during World War II, serving in the submarine force for 20 distinguished years. His career in the Navy included time aboard one of the subs that executed the "wolf pack" attack strategy in the Sea of Japan. That strategy was instrumental in asserting allied naval supremacy in the Pacific, an essential ingredient to final victory. During the conflict, he earned the Bronze Star and after the war rose to the rank of commander, retiring in 1962.

After leaving the Navy, Art applied his talents to improving the quality of life in southeastern Connecticut. He taught math to high schoolers all across the State, he coached little league, served on the North Stonington Board of Education, and became Ledyard's first mayor in 1971. What an amazing guy.

Art is deeply missed by his loving wife, Marilyn; his children; grandchildren; and great-grandchild. His example of human excellence and service is an inspiration for us all today and for generations to come.

### PERSECUTION OF EGYPTIAN CHRISTIANS

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, we were all glued to our televisions and 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.

H4591

Internet watching the Egyptian people, Christian and Muslim alike, demand free and fair elections for the first time.

The history of the Christian church in Egypt far exceeds that of Islam. Even now, Coptic Christians make up 10 percent of Egypt's population of 80 million people.

Unfortunately, some fringe groups of extremist Muslims took this opportunity to attack their fellow Egyptians simply because they are Christians in an attempt to drive them out of Egypt. In some cases, they were successful.

Our country was founded on the principles of religious freedom. As a Christian and a Member of the House of Representatives, I'm hopeful that this example of a broad range of beliefs of our 435 Members will stand as an example to the Egyptian people.

I would ask the Egyptian people and the current military leadership to stand with the Christian minority in Egypt and ensure their ability to freely practice their faith is not impugned by the current leadership or the one that may be elected in the future.

I will continue to keep the Coptic Christians in Egypt in my prayers, and I would ask my colleagues to do the same.

#### YELLOWSTONE RIVER PIPELINE SPILL

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, last week-end while most Americans were celebrating the Fourth of July, Montanans were, unfortunately, immersed in what has become a new American tradition: cleaning up oil spills.

After Exxon's Silvertip pipeline failed and spewed 40,000 gallons of toxic oil into the Yellowstone River, Exxon quickly labeled the incident a "freak accident"—a phrase commonly used by the oil industry after major spills. But an exhaustive history of Big Oil's spills makes it clear that these incidents are not "freak accidents" but evidence of Big Oil's neglect.

Perhaps the most blatant, recent exhibit of empty safety promises belongs to TransCanada, who dubbed the Keystone pipeline "the safest pipeline ever built." A year and 12 spills later, Keystone was shut down and deemed an "imminent threat to life, property, and the environment."

Before we permit the Keystone XL pipeline—another deadly TransCanada pipeline—we need to reauthorize our pipeline safety legislation because our pipelines need to be as consistent as Old Faithful.

#### ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, this last weekend we celebrated America's Inde-

pendence Day; and as I visited with constituents, they asked that we create another independence movement, independence from Middle Eastern oil, and I agree.

Unfortunately, rather than pursuing energy independence, the Obama administration keeps fostering an energy-dependence policy that costs American jobs, brings higher prices at the pump, and endangers our national security by making us more dependent on unstable Middle Eastern governments.

House Republicans have responded by introducing and passing four bills to increase our domestic energy production and create American jobs. But the Senate has taken no action. Liberal Democrats are obstructing the opportunity for jobs for Americans, lower energy costs, and a new era of independence.

It's time, Mr. Speaker, to declare independence from Middle Eastern oil and start using our own resources for the benefit of all Americans.

#### U.S. MILITARY INVOLVEMENT IN LIBYA

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, within the next 24 hours, the House will have the opportunity to end U.S. military involvement in Libya. And we should do so for the following reasons:

First, the war is illegal under the United States Constitution and our War Powers Act because only the U.S. Congress has the authority to declare war, and the President has been unable to show that the U.S. faced an imminent threat from Libya. The President even ignored his top legal advisers at the Pentagon and the Department of Justice, who insisted he needed congressional approval before bombing Libya.

Second, the war has reached a stalemate and is unwinnable without the deployment of NATO ground troops, effectively an invasion of Libya. The whole operation was terribly ill-considered from the beginning.

While NATO supports the Benghazi-based opposition situated in the oil rich northeast, there is little evidence that the opposition has the support of the majority of Libyans. The leading opposition group, the National Front for the Salvation of Libya, which had been reportedly backed by the CIA in the 1980s, should never have launched an armed civil war against the government if they had no chance absent a massive NATO air campaign and the introduction of NATO troops.

It's time to put an end to this war. Vote to cut off funds.

□ 1410

#### REPUBLICAN JOBS PLAN

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, rising unemployment continues to populate the headlines. An article last week by the AP points out that several cities in my State of Michigan, including Battle Creek, which I have the privilege of representing, endured big increases in unemployment. Michigan's unemployment stands at over 10 percent. The policies of this administration exacerbate bad situations. We do not need more overspending, higher taxes, rising energy costs, government takeover of health care, and more regulations.

My Republican colleagues and I have put forth a jobs plan. We know government cannot create jobs. Instead, we can support an environment where the private sector flourishes and creates jobs. Our jobs plan will reduce regulatory burdens, which are currently costing small businesses over \$10,000 per employee each year, requiring congressional approval for any regulation that has significant impact on the economy. Our jobs plan will fix the Tax Code, streamlining and lowering tax rates. Our jobs plan will encourage entrepreneurship. Our jobs plan will increase domestic energy production and will cut unsustainable spending that creates crushing burdens of debt.

At home last week, I was constantly reminded how the lack of good-paying jobs is affecting my constituents. It's truly time for America to stand up for its liberty and its next generation.

#### MINNESOTA GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, this week in Minnesota our State government is shut down due to a budget crisis. I want to applaud Governor Mark Dayton for negotiating in good faith, making productive compromises, and for never forgetting the needs of Minnesotans, especially our most vulnerable citizens.

The Republicans controlling the Minnesota Legislature issue ultimatums, and they want to mortgage our State's future by cutting health, education, and law enforcement. In Congress and in Minnesota, Republicans use the same playbook: First, create a crisis, put jobs at risk and the economy in peril; then ignore the needs of middle class families, and then fight to protect the interests of millionaires and billionaires.

What we are seeing in Washington and St. Paul is the radical tea party Republican extremism threatening jobs and the economy with destruction in the name of political advantage. This is a dangerous political strategy, and it needs to end now. Democrats and Republicans need to work together to solve our Nation's problems. The American people and Minnesotans expect that of their elected leaders.

#### ALLOW THE JOB CREATORS TO CREATE JOBS

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I stand to tell a rare success story that I saw firsthand last week. Custom Aluminum Products, a local manufacturing business employing more than 360 people, is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year. Throughout those 50 years, they have grown from a small local manufacturer to a nationally recognized leader in the aluminum industry.

I tell their story today because Custom Aluminum is a thriving local business—expanding, employing, and excelling despite the economic and regulatory burdens. We have much to learn from stories like this: that if given the opportunity to excel, our small businesses will answer the call; and that it is never the role of the Federal Government to create jobs. Instead, government must get out of the way of small businesses by reducing job-killing regulations and bureaucratic red tape and allowing the job creators do what they do best: create jobs.

We must bring back certainty to the small business community and rebuild their confidence in our economy so that we can get Americans working again and celebrate many more local success stories like this in the coming months and years.

#### AFFORDABLE CARE ACT DESTROYS PATIENT ACCESS

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to bring your attention to the front page of USA Today. The story is titled, "Medicaid Payments Go Under the Knife." This is an issue that, unfortunately, is going to continue to get worse. Medicaid isn't just going under the knife; it's being slashed.

The simple truth is that Medicaid has become a coverage without access and only an empty promise for the people who arguably may legitimately need its services. And the Affordable Care Act is only going to exacerbate the problem with patient access to physicians. The new health care law has changed what was a program that was designed for the poorest of the poor, pregnant women, children, and the elderly, and turned it into a one-size-fits-all government program. States will add 16 million new people to the program, millions of younger adults, putting an even greater strain on the State budgets.

The health care law never addressed the root problem. We need to ensure that Medicaid spending is directed in a fashion that provides an actual safety net for those in need and allows States to create a range of products to give

Medicaid patients access to their physicians and better care. We actually need to get back to the basics. And it is essential that we examine Medicaid and realize the ramifications before our States sink even deeper into a budgetary crisis.

#### CHINA HOSTED INDICTED WAR CRIMINAL

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, China recently rolled out the red carpet, pictured behind me, for Sudanese President Omar Bashir, an internationally indicted war criminal facing charges on 10 counts, including murder, extermination, forcible transfer of population, torture, and rape.

Prior to the visit, I wrote a letter to President Hu Jintao urging the Chinese Government to withdraw their invitation. Not only is Bashir wanted for his role in genocide in Darfur, but, as I speak, atrocities are unfolding against Christians in the Nuba Mountains—reliable reports of door-to-door targeting and killings, mass graves, Antonov bombers indiscriminately shelling civilian populations.

Consider this reality: Bashir is a wanted war criminal. His murderous aims are unchanged. The Chinese Government treats him as a friend and extends every diplomatic grace. And China owns our debt.

What is wrong with this picture? An indicted war criminal with the President of China.

#### DISMANTLING MEDICARE AS WE KNOW IT

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in response to our friend from Texas who spoke just a few minutes ago, talking about Medicaid. It is true that entitlement programs need to be reformed. It's also true that costs need to be reined in. That's what affordable health care reform actually did.

The answer certainly does not lie in the Republican budget passed earlier this year on a party-line vote, which would dismantle Medicare as we know it, turning it into a voucher system, the Ryan plan, and would turn Medicaid into a block grant program which would further impoverish our States at a delicate moment of their recovery.

We need reform in entitlement programs, but the Republican budget, Mr. Speaker, is not the answer. It is the death knell for a program that covers a third of all Americans' health care.

#### SOLVE THE DEBT PROBLEM

(Mr. LANKFORD asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise after spending the week of July 4th in the heartland of America, central Oklahoma, where I had the opportunity to hear the thoughts of the families in my district regarding our economy and the debt.

No one approached me during the last week to tell me they wanted more government spending to create jobs. No one asked me to create more instability in our economy by raising taxes. In fact, no one told me they wanted to celebrate Independence Day by seeing more government dependence.

But over and over again, people asked me to work on solving the problem of the debt, not just voting for another blank check debt ceiling. We need real spending limits to offset our serious budget shortfall. We can't pretend that we can borrow forever with no consequences.

There is a limit to how much debt this Nation can carry and our worldwide markets can sustain. Our current real debt equals our GDP. And I would hope that many others in this House would see that as a problem as well.

Second, we need to address our entitlements. These programs are critical safety nets for the neediest Americans, but they will be worthless for everyone if we allow them to go insolvent.

And, finally, we need a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution, with real teeth to hold Washington accountable. There is simply no other way to bring future stewardship of taxpayer money. Fifteen years ago, the Balanced Budget Amendment failed to pass the Senate by one vote after it passed this House with overwhelming bipartisan support. Our fiscal reality would be very different.

Mr. Speaker, we are at a crossroads in our nation's history. We do not have a debt ceiling vote crisis, we have a debt crisis. We need to stop focusing on a single vote and instead focus on the future consequences of our actions. It is time to put America back on track to debt reduction and job growth.

□ 1420

#### THE DEATH PENALTY AND THE MURDER OF ADRIA SAUCEDA

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, 16-year-old Adria Saucedo was abducted, raped, and strangled in 1994. Her skull was crushed with a rock and her nude body was left with a stick protruding from it on a dirt road in San Antonio, Texas.

Fifteen years ago, Humberto Leal, a Mexican national, was convicted of the grisly murder and sentenced to death by a Texas jury. Tomorrow, he is to be executed in Texas.

But the Mexican government and the administration say that Texas violated an international treaty and should

have allowed Leal to see a Mexican consulate when he was arrested. So the administration has asked the Supreme Court to stop the execution.

However, the Supreme Court has already ruled that States are not bound by such international treaties unless Congress intervenes. Our Federal Government ought to have as much concern and compassion for murder victims as it does for their foreign killers or Mexico's feelings about the death penalty.

Justice should not be denied for Adria Saucedo.

And that's just the way it is.

#### SUPPORT THE REPUBLICAN ENERGY BILLS

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today we asked President Obama, through his virtual town hall, why he won't support the energy bills that have been passed in this House. We also asked President Obama why his administration is keeping American offshore energy resources off-limits.

An example of those bills that were passed by this House are three that came out of the Natural Resources Committee that would have created 1.2 million jobs. President Obama won't support those.

The sad truth is that we already know the answers to these questions, because the administration has made it clear that they want to export American jobs and invest in other countries' resources rather than developing our own. Republicans want to help our economy by creating jobs and creating energy independence, but liberals in Congress are standing in the way.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to consider all the good Republican energy bills would do for jobs, our economy, and our gas tanks. It is imperative that the Senate signs these bills and the President signs them into law.

#### ENERGY CREATES JOBS

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, right now the President is hosting his first ever Twitter town hall to gather input from concerned Americans.

Here's some input from some concerned West Virginians: People are having to choose whether to buy groceries or gas as energy prices skyrocket and the economy continues to remain slow and unrecovered. If West Virginians are wondering about one thing, it's why the President isn't doing more to lower energy costs and get our economy back on track.

America is truly blessed to have an abundant supply of natural resources.

But instead of tapping into these rich minerals, the President has approved extreme regulations that are killing jobs and are hurting our economy.

Frankly, I am stunned as to why the President hasn't connected that a good, solid jobs plan is a good, solid energy plan. Just last month, AEP announced it will shut down five plants in West Virginia and Ohio, costing jobs and payrolls, and will raise electricity 10 to 15 percent. According to AEP, this is a direct response to new and burdensome regulations levied by the EPA within the last year.

It's time to take advantage of the resources found right here in America. Doing so will launch our economy in the right direction and create thousands of good-paying jobs.

#### ENERGY

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

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration has moved our country backwards in terms of energy production.

The de facto moratorium on offshore drilling is causing a significant decline in American energy production. When President Obama took office, these offshore areas were open to drilling and production. Since that time, President Obama has taken steps to effectively reimpose an offshore drilling ban.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue of common sense. Failure to develop our offshore energy resources is increasing our dependence on foreign sources of oil and denying much-needed revenue to help pay down the national debt. But, most importantly, it is costing us American jobs.

We have an abundant supply of natural resources off of our shores. Common sense dictates the use of our own resources to meet our energy needs.

I cosponsored and voted in favor of H.R. 1231, Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act. Not surprisingly, the Senate has failed to consider this bill.

We will continue to push for access to our energy resources.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) 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 1, 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 1, 2011 at 11:50 a.m.:

Appointments:

United States-China Interparliamentary Group.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2219.

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

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 320 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2219.

□ 1427

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 23, 2011, all time for general debate had expired.

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

During consideration of the bill for 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. 2219

*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 fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense and for other purposes, namely:

#### TITLE I MILITARY PERSONNEL MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty, (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for

members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$43,859,709,000.

#### MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$27,141,334,000.

#### MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$13,480,436,000.

#### MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$28,264,646,000.

#### RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10302, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$4,333,507,000.

#### RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$1,948,544,000.

#### RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for

personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$645,422,000.

#### RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10305, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$1,711,653,000.

#### NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under section 10211, 10302, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$7,607,345,000.

#### NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air National Guard on duty under section 10211, 10305, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$3,099,629,000.

## TITLE II

### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Army, as authorized by law; and not to exceed \$12,478,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, \$34,581,321,000.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, as authorized by law; and not to exceed \$14,804,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and

payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, \$39,385,685,000.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, \$6,036,996,000.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Air Force, as authorized by law; and not to exceed \$7,699,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Air Force, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, \$36,065,107,000.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as authorized by law, \$30,682,265,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$47,026,000 may be used for the Combatant Commander Initiative Fund authorized under section 166a of title 10, United States Code: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$36,000,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not less than \$34,311,000 shall be made available for the Procurement Technical Assistance Cooperative Agreement Program, of which not less than \$3,600,000 shall be available for centers defined in 10 U.S.C. 2411(1)(D): *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to plan or implement the consolidation of a budget or appropriations liaison office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the office of the Secretary of a military department, or the service headquarters of one of the Armed Forces into a legislative affairs or legislative liaison office: *Provided further*, That \$8,420,000, to remain available until expended, is available only for expenses relating to certain classified activities, and may be transferred as necessary by the Secretary of Defense to operation and maintenance appropriations or research, development, test and evaluation appropriations, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That any ceiling on the investment item unit cost of items that may be purchased with operation and maintenance funds shall not apply to the funds described in the preceding proviso: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

□ 1430

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 31, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. First, I want to thank Chairman YOUNG, Ranking Member DICKS, and their staffs for coordinating with my office on this amendment and for their work to address operational energy challenges faced by DOD.

According to the Department of Defense, operational energy represented 74 percent of the military's energy costs in 2010; and despite a 9 percent reduction in energy use, costs increased by 19.7 percent. Air conditioning alone for American forces in Iraq and Afghanistan cost \$20 million each year. Last year's bill to heat, cool, and light 539,000 DOD buildings represented at least \$4 billion in direct costs to taxpayers.

More than 3,000 American warfighters and contractors have been killed in the line of duty while moving or defending fuel convoys. We cannot continue sacrificing American lives as a result of failing to improve energy use by our military.

Included in the bill is a targeted investment of \$82 million for Marine Corps expeditionary energy equipment to prevent our marines from carrying more than 13 million pounds of gear and will help taxpayers avoid nearly \$40 billion in annual energy-related costs.

Thank you, Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member DICKS, for including this funding in the bill. This bipartisan amendment would complement that investment in operational energy by increasing funding for the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, known as SERDP, from 56.4 to 66.4 million, which matches both the President's budget request and the House-passed National Defense Authorization Act recently passed on a strong bipartisan vote.

I offer this amendment on behalf of myself and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. HINCHEY of New York. As members of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, respectively, they have been leaders in the efforts to improve our energy security. And I appreciate the bipartisan support of this amendment.

Unfortunately, without the funding that this amendment would provide, the Pentagon would be forced to delay or cancel several strategic environmental programs. For example, this funding would support the joint sensitive technology and munitions program which develops alternatives to TNT. These alternatives are less toxic and have lower cleanup costs. The amendment also supports sustainable wastewater treatment technology for forward-operating bases in combat zones. The purpose of this program is not to protect the environment near the bases but to reduce water and fuel consumption associated with waste treatment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will also help our military adapt to climate change. In Virginia, the Norfolk Naval Base is located at sea level. We are

largely witnessing rising water levels already in the Chesapeake Bay and Atlantic Ocean. This amendment simply provides funding equivalent to that which was authorized already by the House Armed Services Committee and by the full House and recommended by the President.

I do not believe we should risk delaying or canceling these critical defense programs, and I ask my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

With that, 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 rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

This amendment would realign 10 million from defense-wide accounts to support additional work within the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program. The program was established in 1990 and is jointly planned and executed by the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other Federal agencies and industry.

The program improves DOD mission readiness and environmental performance by providing new scientific knowledge and cost-effective technologies in the areas of environmental restoration, munitions response, resource conservation, and weapons systems and platforms.

SERDP enhances military operations, improves military systems' effectiveness, enhances military training and readiness, sustains DOD's training and test ranges and installation infrastructure, and helps ensure the safety and welfare of military personnel and their dependents by eliminating or reducing the generation of pollution and use of hazardous materials and reducing the cost of remedial actions.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would offer \$10 million to restore a cut that the committee had already made in the operation and maintenance, defense-wide account. Actually, the Defense Department offered this up when we were looking to achieve \$9 billion in savings to reach our allocation. This is one of the areas where the Defense Department indicated that there was no problem with taking a cut. You will hear me discussing this throughout the day and evening as long as we're dealing with this bill.

We had to come up with \$9 billion in reductions from the President's request. This is a part of where we found the \$9 billion. And since the Depart-

ment did not have any objection to this, in fact, offered this up as a possible way of helping with the savings, I must oppose this amendment and ask that the Members do so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$216,556,400)".

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$216,556,400)".

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce the operating budget of the Office of the Defense Secretary by 10 percent, moving roughly \$217 million to the spending reduction account.

I have spent a considerable amount of time here on the floor of the House during this appropriations process working hard to find spending cuts across every level of the Federal Government and across nearly every agency.

The Office of the Secretary has roughly \$2.1 billion included in this bill for its operation for this fiscal year, which is four times the combined operating budget of the Secretaries in our three previous fiscal year 12 appropriations bills.

□ 1440

I understand the challenges that the Secretary of Defense faces on a daily basis and the enormity of the department he is tasked with overseeing, but even the Department of Defense must do its part to reduce the deficit. I urge support of this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in very strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment. The decrease appears to be directed at funding provided in operation and maintenance defense-wide for the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The operation and maintenance defense-wide account received a thorough review during the committee process

and has already been reduced by \$258 million from the budget request.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense account has similarly been reduced by \$36.4 million based on a detailed review of specific programs within this account. Adjustments have been made to duplicative efforts and to programs that were poorly justified.

Further reductions risk harm to operations in the defense-wide account such as special operations activities; education programs like the National Defense University and the Defense Acquisition University; and organizations that perform basic operational functions like finance and human resources.

I urge all my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Actually, this just cuts the money, 10 percent, out of the Office of the Secretary of Defense. It doesn't go into cutting Special Ops or other funds that the gentleman from Washington, my good friend, Mr. DICKS, was talking about. It just cuts 10 percent out of the Secretary's operating budget.

I just wanted to clear that up. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DICKS. Unfortunately, that is not the way the gentleman wrote his amendment; so I would stand with my provision which says further reductions risk harm to operations in the defense-wide account.

So if you take 10 percent out of the account, it is going to affect Special Operations activities; education programs like the National Defense University, Defense Acquisition University—and Lord knows, we need help in acquisition; and organizations that perform basic operational functions like finance and human resources. I stand by my statement.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I do so reluctantly because I know my good friend is very sincere about this. However, Mr. DICKS has spoken the position established by the subcommittee very well, and I endorse the comments that Mr. DICKS made and rise in opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$15,000,000)".

Page 31, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$15,000,000)".

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment on behalf of Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mrs. CAPPS, who were unable to arrange flight schedules to get back here for this consideration.

Mr. BLUMENAUER's amendment would increase funding for the Environmental Security Technology Certification program by \$15 million to match the authorization of the National Defense Authorization Act passed by the House earlier this spring.

According to the Department, facilities energy represented at least \$4 billion in direct costs to the taxpayer in fiscal year 2010. The Department is paying to heat, cool, light, and operate 539,000 buildings and structures that hold 2.2 billion square feet.

The Environmental Security Technology Certification program is focused on finding ways to decrease energy demand, develop smart distribution systems, and increase the use of alternative and renewable energy at U.S. military installations.

ESTCP was established in 1995 to promote the deployment of proven innovative technologies to field or production use. The program demonstrates collect cost and performance data for new technologies to help these new technologies overcome the barriers to development. The goals are to identify the most promising new technologies to help DOD improve its environmental remediation, such as unexploded ordnance, cleanup, energy performance, and cost savings.

ESTCP funds projects in five program areas: energy and water; environmental restoration; munitions response; resource conservation and climate change; and weapons systems and platforms. The program uses an energy test bed concept that is focused on finding ways to decrease energy demand, develop smart distribution systems, and increase the use of alternative and renewable energy at military installations worldwide. These projects include energy-efficient lighting, heating, and air conditioning such as daylight harvesting, personalized dimming, combustion control systems, and high-performance cooling technology.

ESTCP is funding initiatives that will make advancements in building control and retrofits such as the ad-

vanced building energy management systems and the Zero Energy Housing, which generate 100 percent of their power requirements through on-site renewable and demand reductions.

Another project, the LED street lighting system, will deliver 50 percent energy reductions over existing street light systems at DOD facilities around the United States.

An additional \$15 million above the President's budget request will help address the immense challenge our military's facilities' energy requirements represent. The HASC has authorized ESTCP at \$45 million, which includes a \$15 million increase; and in doing so the authorizers created account number 82A for that purpose.

I appreciate Mr. BLUMENAUER's work on energy security issues, including this amendment; and I ask for its favorable consideration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the amendment would redistribute \$15 million of Army operation and maintenance account funding in order to finance the Energy Security and Technical Certification program. The program is not authorized. It was added by the House Armed Services Committee, but the defense authorization bill is not law. This program currently is not authorized; and because of that, the amendment had to be written in such a way, as just a straight increase or decrease, without actually mentioning the actual program, to avoid being out of order.

Further, the Army operation and maintenance account is funded at over \$34.5 billion. Should this project remain in the final authorization bill and the Department concurs that it is a high enough priority, then there are more than enough funds for the Department to execute the program.

Unfortunately, however, I don't have the ability to make that determination for the Department on the floor. And because of these and other objections, I must oppose the amendment.

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. Regrettably, I have to oppose this amendment. My good friend from Oregon, Mr. BLUMENAUER, is one of our most thoughtful Members and has been a leader on environmental issues. But in this case, we have already doubled the funding for this. I think this is unnecessary at this time. We have to constrain spending.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,600,000)”.

Page 33, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,600,000)”.

Page 34, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,600,000)”.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, today, along with the support of my colleague, Representative ESHOO, I am offering this amendment to help an estimated 250,000 ailing veterans of the first gulf war, over one-third of those who served. It will bring the modest budget for the Gulf War Illness Research program within the congressionally directed Medical Research program in line with that of its peer programs, to \$10 million.

□ 1450

Too many veterans of the first gulf war suffer from persistent symptoms, such as chronic headache, widespread pain, cognitive difficulties, unexplained fatigue, gastrointestinal problems, respiratory symptoms, and other abnormalities that are not explained by traditional medical or psychiatric diagnoses. Research shows that, as these brave soldiers age, they are at double the risk for ALS, or Lou Gehrig’s disease, as are their non-deployed peers. There may also be connections to multiple sclerosis and Parkinson’s disease. Sadly, there are no known treatments for the lifelong pain these veterans endure.

In a new landmark report, the Institute of Medicine has recognized that and has called for a major national research effort to identify treatments. The scientific community has responded with a dramatic increase in the quality and quantity of proposals that are submitted to the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs, otherwise known as CDMRP.

In the FY12 Defense appropriations bill, CDMRP programs, with direct relevance to current forces, received a 25 percent increase. The research conducted by the Gulf War Veterans Illnesses Research program is vital not only for ill gulf war veterans but also for other U.S. military forces. As summarized by the IOM committee chair on the topic, Dr. Stephen Hauser, gulf war illnesses research is “vital to the health and effectiveness of current and future military forces in addition to gulf war veterans.”

Most encouraging, CDMRP-funded researchers have completed the first suc-

cessful pilot study of a medication to treat one of the major symptoms of gulf war illness. Just last month, a report was released on the first successful medication treatment study in the history of gulf war illness research. The study showed that the low-cost supplement, CoQ10, produced significant improvement in one of the most serious symptoms of gulf war illness, fatigue with exertion, as well as improvements in nearly every other symptom. It is not a cure, and the study needs to be replicated in a larger group; but the result is extremely encouraging. The next step is for clinical trials, which will only be funded by the CDMRP.

The amendment’s offset comes from the Pentagon channel, which is costly—over \$29 million in the past 3 fiscal years. It’s redundant. There are eight other Armed Forces Network Television services which provide news, entertainment, lifestyle, documentary, and religious programming to service-members and their families across the globe, and it doesn’t provide a vital service; but this research is critical to our troops in the field now as well as to those who will be fighting in the future.

According to the VA’s Research Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans’ Illnesses, the known causes of gulf war illness are from exposures incurred in Iraq, like certain pesticides, or are from exposures incurred before deployment, like pyridostigmine bromide, which is a drug taken as an antidote to the nerve gas sarin. There is also some evidence of a link between gulf war illness and a low-level exposure to nerve agents, a close proximity to oil well fires, the receipt of multiple vaccines, and combinations of gulf war exposures.

Current forces in Iraq and Afghanistan can still incur each of these exposures. That is why the chair of the IOM committee’s report on gulf war illnesses said: “This IOM report makes findings and recommendations vital to the health and effectiveness of current and future U.S. military forces in addition to gulf war veterans.”

This is a time for us to say thank you to those who have served, to say that we understand the suffering that gulf war veterans have had with this illness and that we are dedicated to finding higher levels of research to make sure that we can relieve their suffering.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Gulf War Illness Program is an important medical research area, the program to which Mr. KUCINICH speaks; but this bill already contains \$6.4 million for the program. In addition, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill has already included an additional \$15 million for the program.

The committee has been extremely careful to guarantee that medical research programs are funded at the level at which they can be adequately dealt with as far as the medical researchers are concerned. But in the days of having to reduce our budget by \$9 billion, we believe that we have already adequately funded this program at \$6.4 million, in addition to the \$15 million added by the Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs. Therefore, I rise in opposition to 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. I have followed this issue closely ever since the gulf war, and I feel that the gentleman has made a very compelling case. I think we should add this money, and the offset is acceptable. So I urge a “yes” vote on the Kucinich amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KUCINICH. 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 Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$650,000)”.

Page 33, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$500,000)”.

Page 34, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$500,000)”.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I want to express my appreciation to Mr. YOUNG, who is the chairman of the subcommittee, and to Mr. DICKS, who is the ranking member, for their long years of service.

To my colleagues, good news today: the announcement came that the President of the United States would send the same sympathy letter to families of those soldiers who committed suicide in battle as of those who had fallen in different ways in battle. The reason that is good news is, in a sentence I am reminded of, the President and his office indicated that they did not want to stigmatize the mental health concerns of our soldiers.

I want to pay tribute to the Defense appropriations committee for its work on post-traumatic stress disorder and



to make note of our late friend, Congressman John Murtha, who worked with Houston on establishing a new post-traumatic stress disorder center. I am grateful for that because, as in all of our States, many of us are facing a large numbers of returning soldiers from both Iraq and Afghanistan.

So I ask for my amendment to be supported to increase research and development funding for post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury, which affects our men and women who serve selflessly and bravely in our Nation's armed services. My amendment would increase research and development funds for PTSD and TBI by \$500,000. It will be offset by reducing general operations and maintenance and activities of the Department of Defense.

□ 1500

I believe this is critical in ensuring our country's military strength as we move toward the 21st century.

We obviously were aware of post-traumatic stress for those who follow the military in all of our wars. We've seen it every day by our Vietnam soldiers, those who came home without welcome. We see it in the numbers of homeless soldiers, many of them Vietnam vets.

Over the years, members of the military and veterans have seen a drastic increase in the number of cases of PTSD and TBI. PTSD cases in the military have risen from 1,614 total cases in 2000 to 88,719 total cases in 2010. Additionally, it is reported that 17 percent of all active duty soldiers, 25 percent of reserve soldiers, and 19 percent of Vietnam veterans suffer from PTSD. Traumatic brain injuries in the military have increased from 10,963 total cases in 2000 to 178,876 total cases in 2010.

We know that the kinds of explosives that are now used in war cause greater damage, or more damage, or damage of this kind to our soldiers. Also, in May of this year, a three-judge panel of the Ninth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals ruled that the Department of Veterans Affairs' treatment of mentally ill veterans is so inadequate it is unconstitutional. We are grateful for the work that has been done, but this court said many veterans with severe depression or post-traumatic stress disorder are forced to wait weeks for mental health referrals and are given no opportunity to request or demonstrate their need for expedited care. This is simply unacceptable. The courageous men and women of the Armed Forces brave IED attacks, injury, and horrific violence to protect the safety and security of the United States.

I was listening to a soldier on the television speak about his injuries and then he mentioned the fact that a soldier in front of him, his comrade, his friend, stepped on the IED, but the vast damage was to all of those who were around him. And so we know the collateral damage is as severe as it might be in any other form of mass war.

We see the loss of life, but we see the injuries remaining. We must in turn care for them, and when they return home we must make it a priority—as I know this committee has done—to increase the resources. Members of Congress may disagree when it comes to the level of commitment and resources of the United States to foreign wars and conflicts, however we must not allow these debates and discussions to cause us to fail to properly care for these brave soldiers when they return home or when they are injured. I believe in Congress and its wisdom, and I believe it is committed to taking care of our warriors.

As the members of the military return to their homes and their families, they come without the desire for glory or appreciation. But whenever you talk to a vet, they are looking to make sure that they have the care that they need. Increasing the amount of resources, however small this amendment offers, helps in finding ways to prevent and better treat post-traumatic stress disorder and TBI, and is the first step that Congress can add to the work that is already being done. Access to post-traumatic stress disorder treatment is especially important since veterans living in areas that are outside of some of our largest centers are less likely to be diagnosed.

We should not wait. I believe we are of good mind and good will when it comes to our soldiers. I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. Chair, today I rise to ask for support of my amendment to increase research and development funding for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, PTSD, and Traumatic Brain Injury, TBI, that affects our men and women who serve selflessly and bravely in our Nation's Armed Services. My amendment will increase research and development funds for PTSD and TBI by \$500,000, and will be offset by reducing the general operations and maintenances and activities of the Department of Defense. I believe this is critical to ensuring our country's military strength as we move forward into the 21st century.

Also in May of this year, a three judge panel of the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the Department of Veterans Affairs' treatment of mentally ill veterans is so inadequate, it is unconstitutional. The decision said, "many veterans with severe depression or post-traumatic stress disorder are forced to wait weeks for mental health referrals and are given no opportunity to request or demonstrate their need for expedited care."

This is simply unacceptable.

The courageous men and women of the Armed Forces brave IEDs, attacks, injury, and horrific violence to protect the safety and security of the United States, and we must, in turn, care for them when they return home. We must make this a priority and increase the resources available to help prevent and treat PTSD and TBI.

Members of Congress may disagree when it comes to the level of commitment and resources of the United States to foreign wars and conflicts. However, we must not allow those debates and discussions to cause us to fail to properly care for these brave soldiers

when they return home or when they are injured. Congress must separate the war from the warrior, and Congress should never fail to care for our warriors.

As the members of the military return to their homes and their families, they do not come home seeking glory or appreciation, but no soldier should have to come home to inadequate treatment or care for the injuries they sustained protecting the freedom of all Americans.

Increasing the amount of resources specializing finding ways to prevent and better treat post-traumatic stress disorder and TBI is the first step Congress can take to providing veterans with the services they need. Access to post-traumatic stress disorder treatment is especially important since veterans living in such areas are less likely to be diagnosed and treated for post-traumatic stress disorder.

America shouldn't wait until soldiers with these injuries are discharged to begin treatment. The Department of Defense needs to spend more resources on how to detect and treat PTSD and TBI earlier.

These soldiers need to be certain that Members of Congress will ensure that they receive the necessary treatment to guarantee that their adjustment back into society is a successful one. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment to ensure no soldier is left behind.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that this is a tremendously important issue. Traumatic brain injury is something that we don't even know what the needs are going to be in the future.

Our warriors are coming home wounded, yet full of high spirit, morale, and wishing to go back to the fight if they were medically able. Some of our warriors today don't even know that they have or will be exposed to having traumatic brain injury in the future. It is something we just don't know the answer to.

We also know that the medical professionals tell us that they cannot use money just to spend it, but they have to use it effectively, and they have to use it where it has produced results. In view of this, I think it is important to guarantee that we have an adequate source of funding for this medical research and the treatment of these wounded warriors who suffer with this affliction. And so in view of that, I rise in support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I would just point out that the committee has added \$125 million this year and \$454 million over the last several years, going back to when Mr. Murtha

and I were chairmen. So we completely concur that this is an important issue. The gentlelady has made a very compelling case. I rise in support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am a physician, and I represent Fort Gordon, Georgia. We have a tremendous amount of soldiers as well as vets from the Vietnam area with post-traumatic stress disorder. I am also in the Navy reserve. I was seeing patients earlier today, and I saw a lady who was a sailor, who was an intelligence sailor from Afghanistan. She is suffering from PTSD and all the problems associated with that.

At Fort Gordon, Georgia, we are trying to expand the facilities there to treat PTSD, to do the research and development—that's a teaching hospital as well as a hospital that cares for soldiers. So I applaud my friend from Houston's amendment here. It is certainly an extremely important issue that we are going to face. We are going to face this issue for the next five, six, seven decades as a Nation. We cannot put as much emphasis as this issue is going to demand over the next few decades even. So it's actually an extremely important amendment. I congratulate Ms. JACKSON LEE on this amendment, and I rise in support of the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$600,000)".

Page 33, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$500,000)".

Page 34, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$500,000)".

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I want to take a moment, since I have just followed my amendment, to thank Mr. YOUNG and Mr. DICKS for seeing an expanded category of individuals suffering from PTSD and accepting my amendment and working with us. I want to thank Dr. BROUN for his service and for his direct view of what happens to great Americans, soldiers who have sacrificed and they cannot function because of PTSD. So I am grateful for that.

And the reason why I say that, Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member

DICKS, is because many people don't realize the work that the Defense Appropriations and the Pentagon does on a number of health issues. One of them happens to be cancer. I have heard in coffee clutches or around dinner tables that cancer is an epidemic. It seems appropriate for the Defense Department, which has been at the cutting edge of technology over the years, such as the Internet—can be in the lead.

So I intend to offer an amendment that I would like to discuss with Mr. YOUNG and Mr. DICKS, but I intend to withdraw. But it is very important. This amendment would increase funding under title 6, Defense Health Programs, by \$500,000 in order to fund research related to triple negative breast cancer, and will be offset by reducing the general operations and maintenance and activities at the Department of Defense.

□ 1510

I am hoping my colleagues will work with me on this, and I hope they will be reminded of a young woman by the name of Yolanda Evette Williams, who was an outstanding medical professional who fought against this triple-negative strain of cancer and left behind a husband, a mother, and two children. It is a specific strain of breast cancer for which no targeted treatment is available. The American Cancer Society calls this particular strain of breast cancer "an aggressive subtype associated with lower survival rates."

I offer this amendment to increase funding for research, not to take away moneys from others, but I would certainly like to, out of this discussion, have this kind of cancer looked upon as we are doing our research to develop a targeted treatment for the triple-negative breast cancer strain. Breast cancers with specific, targeted treatment methods such as hormone- and gene-based strains have higher survival rates than the triple-negative subtype, highlighting the need for a targeted treatment.

Just to say a word about Yolanda, she was a dedicated member of the Good Hope Baptist Church. She was a graduate of Texas Southern University. She received a number of degrees. She was a member of the Jack and Jill. Her mother was a medical professional, Dr. Lois Moore. She was a chief clinical officer for the Atrium Medical Center Hospital in Stafford, Texas, having a long history, even though she was very young, of her commitment as a nurse to medical care. This young woman did not have a chance because of this enormous strain that does not have a high survival rate. It is treatment, is hormone- and gene-based strains, and it has, as I said, a difficult time of survival.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the sincerity and the gentlelady's commitment to

these programs. I have been a supporter of these programs over the years. Triple-negative breast cancer is a very, very aggressive and difficult type of cancer. As the Department goes through its work, peer-reviewed research, we will bring this up next year in our hearings and ask them what they're doing about this.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I appreciate it.

Let me just say, breast cancer accounts for one in four cancer diagnoses among women. The American Cancer Society estimates that in 2011, more than 26,000 African American women will be diagnosed with breast cancer and another 6,000 will die. This impacts all women, of all backgrounds, and my interest is to make sure that every subset has a seat at the table, Chairman YOUNG, so that no matter what ethnic background you come from, you will not, in essence, suffer the opportunity for full research.

My amendment was \$500,000. It is in tribute to the honor and the leadership and the life of Yolanda Williams. I would like to ask my colleagues here on the Appropriations Committee to allow me to engage with you and to possibly modify, as we go forward, language to just say that this money will be available for difficult strains of cancer so that her life will be honored and that we would be able to move forward.

In conclusion, I would indicate that I had the privilege and honor of paying tribute to Ms. Williams at her homegoing service. I want to offer to her family again, her husband, her children, her mother and all her family members, my deepest sympathy for this valiant American woman. With that, I know that we will work together.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment #67 to H.R. 2219, the "FY2012 Department of Defense Appropriations Act." My amendment would increase funding under Title VI Defense Health Programs by \$500,000 in order to fund research related to triple negative breast cancer, and will be offset by reducing the general operations and maintenances and activities of the Department of Defense.

Triple negative breast cancer is a specific strain of breast cancer for which no targeted treatment is available. The American Cancer Society calls this particular strain of breast cancer "an aggressive subtype associated with lower survival rates." I offer this amendment to increase funding for research in order to develop a targeted treatment for the triple negative breast cancer strain. Breast cancers with specific, targeted treatment methods, such as hormone and gene based strains, have higher survival rates than the triple negative subtype, highlighting the need for a targeted treatment.

Breast cancer accounts for 1 in 4 cancer diagnoses among women in this country. It is also the most commonly diagnosed cancer among African American women. The American Cancer Society estimates that in 2011, more than 26,000 African American women will be diagnosed with breast cancer, and another 6,000 will die from the disease.

Between 2002 and 2007, African American women suffered a 39 percent higher death rate from breast cancer than other groups. African American women are also 12 percent less likely to survive five years after a breast cancer diagnosis. One reason for this disparity is that African American women are disproportionately affected by triple negative breast cancer. More than 30 percent of all breast cancer diagnoses in African American are of the triple negative variety. Black women are far more susceptible to this dangerous subtype than white or Hispanic women.

Mr. Chairman, last month, I spoke at a funeral for Yolanda Williams, one of my constituents in the 18th Congressional District of Texas. Yolanda died from her battle with triple negative breast cancer. Like many other women who are diagnosed with this aggressive strain, she did not respond to treatment. Yolanda, wife and mother of two daughters, was only 44 years old.

This strain of breast cancer is not only more aggressive, it is also harder to detect, and more likely to recur than other types. Because triple negative breast cancer is difficult to detect, it often metastasizes to other parts of the body before diagnosis. Seventy percent of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than five years after being diagnosed.

Research institutions all over the nation have started to focus on this dangerous strain of breast cancer. In my home city of Houston, Baylor College of Medicine has its best and brightest minds working tirelessly to develop a targeted treatment for the triple negative breast cancer subtype. It is time for the Department of Defense to follow that example and commit additional funding to study the triple negative strain.

I urge my colleagues to join me in protecting women across the nation from this deadly form of breast cancer by supporting my amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY  
RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Army Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, \$3,047,033,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Navy Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, \$1,323,134,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS  
RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Marine Corps Reserve;

repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, \$271,443,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE  
RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Air Force Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, \$3,310,459,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY  
NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Army National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehicles; personnel services in the National Guard Bureau; travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, for Army National Guard division, regimental, and battalion commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; supplying and equipping the Army National Guard as authorized by law; and expenses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment (including aircraft), \$6,979,232,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL  
GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Air National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; transportation of things, hire of passenger motor vehicles; supplying and equipping the Air National Guard, as authorized by law; expenses for repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment, including those furnished from stocks under the control of agencies of the Department of Defense; travel expenses (other than mileage) on the same basis as authorized by law for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, for Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau, \$6,094,380,000.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE  
ARMED FORCES

For salaries and expenses necessary for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, \$13,861,000, of which not to exceed \$5,000 may be used for official representation purposes.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, \$346,031,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Army, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided fur-*

*ther*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Navy, \$308,668,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Navy, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Navy, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Air Force, \$525,453,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Air Force, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Air Force, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense, \$10,716,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of Defense, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of Defense, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY  
USED DEFENSE SITES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, \$276,495,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris at sites formerly used by the Department of Defense, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND  
CIVIC AID

For expenses relating to the Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid programs of the Department of Defense (consisting of the programs provided under sections 401, 402, 404, 407, 2557, and 2561 of title 10, United States Code), \$107,662,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013.

COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACCOUNT

For assistance to the republics of the former Soviet Union and, with appropriate authorization by the Department of Defense and Department of State, to countries outside of the former Soviet Union, including assistance provided by contract or by grants, for facilitating the elimination and the safe and secure transportation and storage of nuclear, chemical and other weapons; for establishing programs to prevent the proliferation of weapons, weapons components, and weapon-related technology and expertise; for programs relating to the training and support of defense and military personnel for demilitarization and protection of weapons, weapons components and weapons technology and expertise, and for defense and military contacts, \$508,219,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION  
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND

For the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund, \$105,501,000.

TITLE III  
PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$6,487,481,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, equipment, including ordnance,

ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$1,464,223,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED  
COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$2,178,886,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$1,952,625,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of vehicles, including tactical, support, and non-tracked combat vehicles; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; communications and electronic equipment; other support equipment; spare parts, ordnance, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$9,371,952,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and

procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, \$17,804,750,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, torpedoes, other weapons, and related support equipment including spare parts, and accessories therefor; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, \$2,975,749,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND  
MARINE CORPS

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$633,048,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by law, including armor and armament thereof, plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; procurement of critical, long lead time components and designs for vessels to be constructed or converted in the future; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, as follows:

Carrier Replacement Program (AP), \$554,798,000;  
Virginia Class Submarine, \$3,221,314,000;  
Virginia Class Submarine (AP), \$1,461,361,000;  
CVN Refueling (AP), \$529,652,000;  
DDG-1000, \$453,727,000;  
DDG-51, \$1,978,314,000;  
DDG-51 (AP), 100,723,000;  
Littoral Combat Ship, \$1,755,093,000;  
LHA Replacement, \$1,999,191,000;  
LPD-17, \$1,833,444,000;  
Joint High Speed Vessel, \$185,106,000;  
Oceanographic Ships, \$89,000,000;  
Moored Training Ship (AP), \$131,200,000;  
Service Craft, \$3,863,000;  
LCAC Service Life Extension Program, \$84,076,000;

For outfitting, post delivery, conversions, and first destination transportation, \$270,639,000; and

Completion of Prior Year Shipbuilding Programs, \$73,992,000.

In all: \$14,725,493,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That additional obligations may be incurred after September 30, 2016, for engineering services, tests, evaluations, and other

such budgeted work that must be performed in the final stage of ship construction: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading for the construction or conversion of any naval vessel to be constructed in shipyards in the United States shall be expended in foreign facilities for the construction of major components of such vessel: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading shall be used for the construction of any naval vessel in foreign shipyards.

#### OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For procurement, production, and modernization of support equipment and materials not otherwise provided for, Navy ordnance (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, \$5,996,459,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

#### PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, and modification of missiles, armament, military equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; vehicles for the Marine Corps, including the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, \$1,453,602,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

#### AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft and equipment, including armor and armament, specialized ground handling equipment, and training devices, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, \$13,987,613,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

#### MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of missiles, spacecraft, rockets, and related equipment, including spare parts and accessories therefor, ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, \$5,689,998,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

#### PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$522,565,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

#### OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For procurement and modification of equipment (including ground guidance and electronic control equipment, and ground electronic and communication equipment), and supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; lease of passenger motor vehicles; and expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon, prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, \$17,260,619,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

#### PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) necessary for procurement, production, and modification of equipment, supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, equipment, and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, \$5,046,447,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

#### DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

For activities by the Department of Defense pursuant to sections 108, 301, 302, and 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2078, 2091, 2092, and 2093), \$29,964,000, to remain available until expended.

#### TITLE IV

##### RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

##### RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, \$9,381,166,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013.

□ 1520

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 30, line 11, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$25,798,000)".

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$25,798,000)".

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. This amendment eliminates both the Environmental Quality Technology Research account and the management support set to accompany that research under the Department of Army, sending \$25.7 million to the spending reduction account.

Much of the research conducted by the Army is of merit and deserves the funding provided. Without some of these research programs, we would not have many of the technologies that protect our servicemembers and make them more effective soldiers. However, I do not see the need for the Army to conduct research on technologies pertaining to environmental quality. This type of research would be best conducted in the university or in the private sector.

Asking the Army to research something that does not directly coincide with their direct mission is imprudent, and these funds would be better used in reducing the burden of debt on our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. The Army's environmental research program develops technologies that support the long-term sustainment of Army training and testing activities by improving the Army's ability to comply with the requirements of Federal, State, and local environmental and health laws and reducing the cost of this compliance.

The program develops technologies to decontaminate or neutralize Army unique hazardous and toxic waste at sites containing waste ammunition, explosives, heavy metals, propellants, chemical munitions, and other organic contaminants. This research concentrates on technology to avoid the potential for future hazardous waste problems by reducing hazardous waste generation through process modification and control, materials recycling, and substitution.

This program also supports military readiness by developing technologies to predict and mitigate range and maneuver constraints associated with current and emerging weapon systems, doctrine, and regulations. This program supports both DOD and environmental stewardship and military requirements. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the Army budget documents submitted to the committee during our lengthy hearing process—and they were lengthy—stated that funding in the request for this purpose is to support the long-term sustainment of Army training and testing activities by improving the Army's ability to comply with requirements mandated by Federal, State, and local environmental laws.

In other words, what we're dealing with here is an issue that the military is mandated to comply with by existing law.

We have already—and I said this before, and I'm going to say it again probably numerous times today—we have already reduced the President's budget request for the defense bill for fiscal year 2012 by \$9 billion. It wasn't easy. We made a lot of cuts, and I just don't think that we should take this cut. And so I object and I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 30, line 11, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$22,796,000)”.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$22,796,000)”.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment zeroes out the HIV research RDT&E funding under the Department of Army, moving \$22.7 million to the spending reduction account. Again, here we see research being conducted by a military that does not focus on the core mission of national security.

HIV research is being conducted in my home State of Georgia at the Centers for Disease Control, as well as at the National Institutes of Health. It is this type of duplication the American people have demanded that Congress eliminate.

This may mean agencies and departments coordinating more effectively to share information, but we must all work together, more sufficiently in the name of reduced spending. I urge support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. HIV poses a threat to military personnel in terms of readiness and force protection, and may af-

fect the stability and security of many nation states.

American troops deployed to areas of the world such as sub-Saharan Africa and Asia face an increased risk of exposure to the HIV virus. Targeted research into prevention of infection, treatment, and cures is needed to reduce this threat to U.S. military personnel, protect U.S. military readiness, and decrease treatment costs for the Department of Defense health infrastructure.

The bill provides a total of \$24 million above the request, including \$8 million in the defense health program and \$16 million in Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, related to HIV/AIDS research. This funding will enhance efforts to prevent new HIV infections in the military, develop better tests and treatment options for military personnel and health care beneficiaries, and provide for a comprehensive program of research and development on preventive HIV vaccines. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, which would eliminate all of the funds for the Army's military HIV research program.

Since 1986, the military has recognized the HIV epidemic as a threat to U.S. and allied forces worldwide, and this program has evolved to become an important international partner in efforts to combat this disease. With over 33 million infections worldwide, HIV poses a significant threat to our own military who are serving our Nation throughout the world.

Additionally, HIV has been identified as a national security priority in the President's national security strategy since 2002.

□ 1530

Previous funding for the Military HIV Research Program has helped ensure a safe blood supply for our warfighters. More recently, funding has supported the first vaccine clinical trial, which showed a reduction in the risk of HIV infections to humans.

This funding for the Military HIV Research Program will continue to support the development of an HIV vaccine, ensure accurate HIV testing for the Army, track the prevalence of HIV in the military population, and assess the risk of HIV exposure to U.S. and allied forces deployed overseas.

This amendment would eliminate all \$22.8 million of funds for this very important Army program, and so I must 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 Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, \$17,798,950,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph which are available for the V-22 may be used to meet unique operational requirements of the Special Operations Forces: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for the Cobra Judy program.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 30, line 18, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$21,714,000)”.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$21,714,000)”.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment eliminates the environmental protection research under the Department of the Navy, sending \$21.7 million to the spending reduction account. Again, we see research being conducted that is not directly related to the Armed Forces' mission, which could and should be conducted elsewhere.

Currently, the Department of Energy, EPA, Department of the Interior, and NASA are all conducting similar environmental protection research like the Department of Defense. This is yet another example of duplicative programs conducting duplicative research. Instead, let's free up the Navy to research technologies that fulfill their constitutional obligation of providing for the common defense of our Nation and its citizens, while decreasing unnecessary spending.

I urge support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. Many environmental laws, regulations, and policies impose restrictions on Navy vessels, aircraft, and facilities that would impede Navy operations if not met. The Navy must be able to conduct its national security mission in compliance with applicable environmental requirements in the U.S. and abroad without compromising performance, safety, or health, while simultaneously minimizing the cost of compliance.

This program develops and evaluates processes, hardware, systems, and operational procedures which allow the Navy to operate in U.S., foreign, and international waters, air, space, and

land areas while complying with environmental laws, regulations, Executive orders, policies, and international agreements. Projects funded in this program support Navy compliance with the Clean Water Act, the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships, the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, and numerous others.

I come from an area where the Navy operates very effectively in the State of Washington, and these kinds of on-board waste disposal are absolutely critical; because when you serve on a nuclear submarine, you are out there for many, many days, and you have got to have things onboard ship as well to deal with these kinds of problems.

So I think this is in the best interests of the Navy, and I urge a “no” on the gentleman’s amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 30, line 18, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$9,140,000)”.

Page 31, line 17, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$9,140,000)”.

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

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would eliminate the Navy’s funding for NATO research and development and transfer \$9.1 million to the Israeli Cooperative Program.

The Secretary of Defense has gone on record stating that, and I quote, “The NATO alliance has been used by many European nations as a means to subsidize their own defense spending with U.S. taxpayer money.” I cannot agree more with the Secretary. Many members of NATO refuse to bear their share of the cost and risk.

Instead, Mr. Chairman, we should invest our valuable research dollars in an ally who is more than willing to pull its weight and take the fight to the enemy. The Israeli Cooperative Program is a ballistic missile program co-managed by Israel and the United States that will ensure the capability of our two missile defense programs.

Mr. Chairman, we have never had a greater need for missile defense, not only in this Nation, but in the Middle East with our great ally Israel. We have no greater ally in the Middle East than Israel. And our research programs should reflect our commitment to those allies who stand ready and willing to partner with us to protect our mutual interests. This would strengthen that mutual interest and strengthen that partnership.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. NATO funding in this bill should not be curtailed because the U.S. and the NATO nations are one another’s closest partners, and the NATO alliance has been a vital and successful part of U.S. foreign policy dating back to its formation in 1949. While the alliance must evolve in light of changing world events, there is no other practical option to structure U.S. strategic and security cooperation with our European allies.

For all NATO nations, the alliance allows for security capabilities and a structure to control operations that the allies on their own could not afford to maintain. Active participation in NATO also allows the U.S. to pursue defenses against emerging threats, such as implementation of improved missile defense capabilities. To maintain its commitment to NATO, the U.S. must continue to contribute funding to NATO programs.

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

NATO has been a very, very important part of keeping peace in the world. Are there some changes that might be necessary in NATO as we see the world unfold and the world develop differently? Maybe so. But it should not be done in a hit-or-miss, helter-skelter way.

Mr. DICKS and I, as the leaders of the Defense Appropriations Committee, have already had several lengthy meetings on this subject. And we have agreed that following the completion of this fiscal year’s Defense appropriations bill, we plan to hold hearings and look thoroughly into what we see as the role of NATO today, tomorrow, and next year. But in the meantime, it’s important that we don’t do any serious damage to NATO, which is probably one of the most effective international organizations at maintaining peace that we have in the world. So I must object to the gentleman’s amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1540

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, \$26,313,196,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$297,023,000)”.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$297,023,000)”.

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, as you know, to govern is to choose. To write a budget is where governing makes choices.

My amendment raises the question as to whether or not spending \$297 million for research in the next generation of fighter is the right choice to make at this time.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. It’s not a fighter; it’s a bomber.

Mr. WELCH. Bomber, yes.

Mr. DICKS. It’s a much different type of airplane.

Mr. WELCH. I misspoke. The gentleman is correct—\$297 million for the next generation of bomber. Is that the right choice?

Here’s the question: Number one, it may be desirable, but is it affordable? The Office of Management and Budget did not include this as a recommendation in the budget, nor did the President, who is charged more than anyone else in this country with our national defense. We have the right, as a Congress, and the constitutional responsibility to make our own judgments.

Mr. DICKS does a great job at that, as does Mr. YOUNG.

But we have to ask the question as to whether or not, when our Office of Management and Budget, our House Armed Services Committee both say that the current fleet of bombers—bombers, Mr. DICKS—is functioning very well, can we afford at this time \$297 million for additional research?

Now, the question is, it may be desirable but is it affordable when we have this horrendous budget squeeze that we know is dividing this Congress because we have to make some very tough choices in the future.

The second question that comes up is whether something that may be desirable comes at a cost that is unacceptable. Now, the Defense budget is large,

unnecessarily so; but it is the one item of spending that has been exempt from cuts.

The Environmental Protection Agency is going to be down 15 percent, NASA down 10 percent. Yet the spending increase in the Pentagon is going to be substantial despite the enormous budget pressures in this ongoing, very serious debate we are having about revenues and taxes that embraces both sides of the aisle.

The third question is if it's necessary, is there some burden on those who have the responsibility of overseeing taxpayer dollars in the Defense budget to poke around and find that \$300 million somewhere else in a nearly \$700 billion budget?

So those are the questions. It's not a direct assertion that we must suspend forever research on the next generation of bombers, but it is asking those questions in this time: Just because something is desirable, does that make it affordable?

If it's desirable, at what cost does it come and, if it's necessary, are there other places in a \$700 billion budget that we can find this \$300 million to do research that will allow us to proceed, and that's what this amendment asks. It says tough choices for America have to begin here, and they have to include tough choices within the Pentagon budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in very strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. First of all, I have to again correct the record here that the President of the United States, OMB and Defense Department requested \$197 million.

Our committee held hearings with the Air Force and found, from a lot of dialogue with the three companies that are competing, that we might be able to accelerate this bomber replacement program if we could get an additional \$100 million. So the President requested \$197 million, and we added \$100 million to that because we see that this program is vitally important.

Now, I led the fight many years ago in the House on the B-2 bomber, and my colleagues got very tired of listening to me on this. But we started with that program at 125 bombers, and we wound up with only 20. So we need another stealth bomber, which can reach around the world as we have seen the B-2 do just recently.

This is a very high priority of the Air Force. I mean, next to tankers, the replacement of the bomber and along with the Joint Strike Fighter, are going to be the top priorities for the Air Force. So this would be a catastrophic blow to terminate this program.

And though I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Vermont, I would say that I would stay with the

committee, which unanimously supported this program, has always supported modernization of our strategic bombers and our strategic modernization of our submarines, which are two of the major issues that our committee is dealing with.

So, again, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to this amendment.

I have suggested so many times that I would not do anything, produce any bill or support any bill, that negatively affects our soldiers or that negatively our affects readiness.

Well, this bomber is a long time from production because it takes time to develop a new bomber due to the nature of that vehicle. But by the time it gets online, we are going to need the new bomber because the old bombers are going to be old.

Now, without going into all the details that Mr. DICKS did, and he did a very good job of explaining in detail why this new bomber is needed, just let me relate a story that happened to me as a freshman and a member of the Armed Services Committee after a lengthy hearing with the United States Marine Corps.

This very, very distinguished, very powerful-looking marine came to me after the hearing and he said, listen, son—he called me son back in those days—he said, listen, son, we marines will go anywhere to fight any war our country sends us to. We will fight on the beach, we will fight on the sea, we will fight in the hills, we will fight in the jungle. Just promise me that as a Member of Congress you will do everything in your power to make sure that any airplane that flies over the battlefield is an American airplane. You can certainly understand why the troops on the battlefield would want that to be the case, why he would want that bomber flying overhead to be an American, why he would want that fighter flying overhead to be an American, why he would want that strike fighter flying over the battlefield to be an American. It just makes good common sense that if you are going to send troops to war, make sure that the aircraft that fly over the battlefield belong to us and not to the enemy.

And, having said that, I again say I strongly oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont will be postponed.

□ 1550

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 31, line 6, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$4,424,000)".

Page 31, line 17, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$4,424,000)".

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is nearly identical to the amendment that transfers NATO research to U.S.-Israeli missile defense. This one simply takes the \$4.4 million in the Air Force's NATO R&D program and places those funds in the Israeli Cooperative Program for Israel and the United States, who are cooperating to develop a missile defense system that will help them and, as well, help us.

We must stand by Israel now and always. My amendment makes a positive step towards growing our relationship and solidifying security in the Middle East. It will help Israel, but it will help the United States also.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. NATO funding in this bill should not be curtailed because the United States and the NATO nations are one another's closest partners, and the NATO alliance has been a vital and successful part of U.S. foreign policy dating back to the formation in 1949 during the Truman administration. While the alliance must evolve in light of changing world events, there is no other practical option to structure U.S. strategic and security cooperation with our European allies.

For all NATO nations, the alliance allows for security capabilities and a structure to control operations that the allies on their own could not afford or maintain. Active participation in NATO also allows the U.S. to pursue defenses against emerging threats such as implementation of improved missile defense capabilities.

To maintain its commitment to NATO, the United States must continue its contribution to all aspects of the NATO program, including research and development activities.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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



Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I associate my remarks with the ranking member from Washington State in opposing this amendment.

NATO is a strong ally. We have a multiple-year generational commitment to NATO. We do a lot of joint projects, a lot of research and development that is jointly developed, and we need their support and they need our support.

I rise in opposition to Mr. BROUN's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I think it is a very good amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

And while I certainly concur with the words of the distinguished ranking member of the committee and the earlier words of the chairman for how important NATO is, the fact of the matter is that, as Defense Secretary Gates told us a couple of weeks ago, the European members of NATO are not pulling their weight. They're not spending the kind of money that we are spending. They're not spending the kind of money that Israel is spending on their own defense. They're not putting in very much effort at all. We're carrying the burden.

And the fact of the matter is, as we're seeing in Libya where they're running out of ammunition after a couple weeks' fighting with a nothing power, NATO, or at least the European allies, simply aren't spending money. They're relying on us to do it. They ought to get used to spending a little of their own money on this.

The fact of the matter is that Israel is spending 7½ percent of its GDP on the military. She has to because she is the object of the Iranians and others who want to destroy her. And we are getting our money's worth because Israel's technical expertise in anti-missile defenses in the Iron Dome, which we are helping with, is feeding back to us.

So switching these funds from NATO to Israel will benefit the United States in terms of antimissile technology; will benefit Israel, which is putting in 7½ percent of GDP; and may give a little more weight to Secretary Gates' words when he says to the European members of NATO that if they want to pull their weight, they ought to start pulling their weight and spending a little more money instead of—I think they're spending under 2 percent of GDP for defense now. And if they want to be allies of the United States, which we need them to be and which they should be, it can't be a one-way alliance.

This amendment will help Israel, will help us, will help the cause of opposing terrorism generally, and send a little message to the European allies: Maybe you ought to start thinking, if you're

going to pull your weight in NATO, pull your weight in NATO.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NADLER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate his support of this amendment.

And I will remind Members that Iran is developing short-range, medium-range as well as long-range missile technology, as well as it is developing a nuclear weapon. We have never needed this kind of joint research with the Israelis to help prevent not only a missile attack or further missile attacks on Israel, which they get every day, but we need, for our own defense, to put more money into this instead of supporting NATO.

I think this is extremely important that we plus up this missile defense research for Israel, for our own selves, and I thank the gentleman for supporting the amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Reclaiming my time, to sum up, this helps the Israelis; it helps the United States; it helps the general security; and it sends the message to the European allies they should start looking into maybe putting some real effort into NATO, which they haven't been doing in recent years, as our Secretary of Defense Gates said recently.

Let's support Secretary of the Department of Defense Gates and let's get them to start making a little effort and send them a little message here.

So I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation; advanced research projects as may be designated and determined by the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to law; maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, \$19,324,865,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$16,000,000)".

Page 33, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$16,000,000)".

Page 34, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$16,000,000)".

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. Basically, I am taking 16 million, not billion, \$16 million from a part of the Department of Defense budget, which is called defense-wide appropriations, where there's almost 20 billion. So I'm asking to take roughly .0008, or .08 percent, from this defense-wide appropriations which is used for other than military departments. So it is not even applicable to the Army, Navy, and Air Force, not the military departments, but it is used by the Secretary of Defense for the maintenance, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment. And what I'm doing is taking this \$16 million and I'm transferring it to the Peer-Reviewed Prostate Cancer Research Program.

Funding levels, my colleagues, for this program, has gone down dramatically since 2001. Right now, it's funded at \$64 million. It was funded in 2001 at 100. It has continually come down and down and down. So I'm not asking to take it up to the 2001 level; I'm just asking to take it up to perhaps what it was in 2005.

□ 1600

I think, without going into all of the details, this is a very wise move because funding levels for this program have continually decreased, yet prostate cancer is the second-leading cause of male cancer-related death in the United States, with an estimated 27,360 casualties just last year. There are no noticeable symptoms in early stages. The use of widespread testing, however, has led to 9 out of 10 cases of early detection. That is why this very paltry amount of \$16 million in funding would be better spent for prostate cancer research for our military than abroad.

According to the Prostate Cancer Research Program, the PCRCP, active duty males are twice as likely to develop prostate cancer than their civilian counterparts. Research funded by the PCRCP advances treatment and procedures for warfighters exposed to chemical weapons, soldiers exposed to chemical agents such as Agent Orange, and those exposed to depleted uranium. Congress has consistently supported funding levels of over \$80 million annually for this important cause, yet it is only funded at \$64 million.

The PCRCP funds innovative high-risk, high-reward research projects supporting basic and clinical research in both the individual and multidisciplinary collaborative group setting. Funding for the PCRCP enables research to advance faster and to be better prepared to apply for future funding from the National Institute of Health or to advance clinical trials. Unlike any

other Federal cancer research programs, any other, the PCRP award review panels are made up of the country's top researchers and prostate cancer survivors, together making sure that innovative ideas rapidly benefit all men and families burdened by this disease.

In 2010, the PCRP, along with the Clinical Consortium, helped shepherd two new drugs through clinical trials. Both drugs are designed to prolong a man's life with prostate cancer. These drugs moved through the clinical trials process and have made their way to the bedside of men dying from prostate cancer to extend their lives. This public-private partnership is an incredible way to maximize productivity of government funded and privately funded medical research.

So I ask my colleagues to support my simple amendment to transfer \$16 million from defense-wide appropriation, which is other than military which they use presently for maintenance, lease, operational facilities and equipment, and it represents a 0.08 percent reduction of this other military-wide funding.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I include the letter to me regarding the Department of Defense Prostate Cancer Research Program from the Prostate Cancer Foundation for the RECORD.

PROSTATE CANCER FOUNDATION,  
Santa Monica, CA, July 6, 2011.

Hon. CLIFF STEARNS,  
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office  
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEARNS: Founded in 1993, the Prostate Cancer Foundation (PCF) has raised more than \$450 million to fund more than 1,500 prostate cancer research programs at nearly 200 research centers in 12 countries. Our research enterprise aims to improve prostate cancer prevention, diagnosis, and treatment for the more than 16 million men and their families battling prostate cancer worldwide. PCF also serves as a primary source for new standard-of-care and research information.

Prostate cancer poses a substantial public health burden in America. A total of 240,890 new cases of prostate cancer and 33,720 deaths from the disease are anticipated in the United States in 2011, making it the most frequent nondermatologic cancer among U.S. males. A man's lifetime risk of prostate cancer is one in six. Prostate cancer is the second leading cause of cancer death in men, exceeded only by lung cancer.

At this time, the Prostate Cancer Foundation would like to express our strong support for increasing the \$64 million provided for the Department of Defense's Prostate Cancer Research Program (DoD PCRP) by the fiscal year 2012 Defense Appropriations Act, H.R. 2219 by an additional \$16 million. Without this addition, the 20% decrease from the fiscal year 2011 \$80 million appropriation would effectively return the DoD PCRP funding level to what it was ten years ago. This decrease will mean that we lose hundreds of thousands of American lives to lethal prostate cancer in the next few years.

In a unique public-private partnership with the Prostate Cancer Foundation, the Department of Defense Prostate Cancer Research Program co-sponsors the Prostate Cancer Clinical Trials Network (PCCTC), which is the world's most comprehensive "first in man" phase I/II clinical trials group for pros-

tate cancer composed of 13 Centers of Excellence in genitourinary oncology. The Consortium has helped to bring to market 2 new medicines for men with advanced prostate cancer that were approved by the FDA in 2010-11: namely, XGEVA™ (denosumab)—Amgen Inc. and ZYTIGA™ (abiraterone acetate)—Johnson & Johnson. More than 2,700 patients have had access to 83 clinical trials since 2005 through the Department of Defense's sponsorship of this Consortium.

Since 1997, when the DoD PCRP was initiated, about \$1.1 billion has been appropriated by Congress and used to fund more than 2,000 prostate cancer research studies across the U.S. Since 2006, this program has been funded at \$80 million per year. The Department of Defense Prostate Cancer Research Program is America's leading undiluted support to find and fund the best prostate cancer research. The research funded by DoD PCRP has led to many dramatic improvements in our Nation's prostate health, from decreases in deaths due to prostate cancer to increased life expectancy for men facing terminal diagnoses.

Today, continued life-saving progress for prostate cancer patients is threatened because of the possibility of decreased funding through the Department of Defense Prostate Cancer Research Program. The funding for the Department of Defense Prostate Cancer Research Program is not duplicative with funding at the National Cancer Institute. While PCF understands and appreciates the budgetary constraints currently facing our Nation, PCF also believes that advances in prostate cancer research must remain a very high national priority.

Critical funding is needed in order to maintain clinical and translational research that will lead to the development of new cancer therapies and technologies that will help prostate cancer patients. On behalf of the Prostate Cancer Foundation, our Board of Directors, and the two million men and their families battling prostate cancer in America, I urge you to restore funding for the Department of Defense Prostate Cancer Research Program at \$80 million per year in fiscal year 2012.

Thank you for your careful consideration of this important request.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN W. SIMONS, MD,  
President and Chief  
Executive Officer.

DAVID H. KOCH,  
Chair.

THE PROSTATE CANCER CLINICAL  
TRIALS CONSORTIUM,  
New York, NY, July 5, 2011.

PROSTATE CANCER FOUNDATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS,  
Fourth Street,  
Santa Monica, CA.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE BOARD: The Prostate Cancer Clinical Trials Consortium (PCCTC) is the nation's premier prostate cancer clinical research group, established in 2005 in response to unmet needs identified by physician investigators and prostate cancer advocates. Our infrastructure, jointly supported by the Prostate Cancer Foundation (PCF) and appropriations to the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) budget via the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program (CDMRP), enables the 13 member institutions to capitalize on their scientific and clinical expertise in order to fulfill our singular mission: to design, implement and complete hypothesis-driven early-phase trials of novel agents and combinations that could prolong the lives of men with prostate cancer. Crucial to our capacity to turn scientific discoveries into improved standards of care is the continued sponsorship of the

PCCTC's unique approach to multi-institutional clinical research.

A model for successful drug co-development, the PCCTC established an organizational structure that accelerates and streamlines the clinical research process by facilitating collaboration between key stakeholders while centralizing scientific, logistical, and regulatory components of trial management. To keep the pipeline primed with promising novel agents, we select and prioritize clinical development opportunities based on the strength of the science and design highly informative trials incorporating biomarkers to measure medically significant results. Moreover, the diverse array of our expertise including genomics, cancer biology, trial design and biomarker development, uniquely qualifies PCCTC investigators to translate discoveries made from highly innovative prostate cancer research funded by the PCF beginning in the early 1990s into robust clinical programs.

By addressing the barriers to efficient trial activation and completion our centralized management of research activities has affected the progress in prostate cancer research beyond PCCTC member institutions. Notable accomplishments include: since inception, the PCCTC has enrolled over 2700 men—greater than 10% from disproportionately affected populations—to 90 clinical trials, evaluating more than 50 therapeutic strategies; PCCTC designated as the clinical trials group for the NCI-sponsored Specialized Programs of Research Excellence (SPORE) in prostate; nearly 25% of early-phase interventional prostate cancer trials conducted in the U.S. are led by PCCTC investigators; over 85% of PCCTC trials are activated within 1 year; consortium investigators integral to the development of the prostate cancer clinical states model, standard clinical trial endpoints (PCWG2) and Bone Scan Tool for uniform interpreting and reporting of bone scintigraphy data; consortium programs have directly led to phase III testing of eight drugs including MDV3100, tasquinimod, ipilimumab and the FDA-approved drug abiraterone (Zytiga).

Despite the PCCTC's substantial advances, the threat of CDMRP funding cutbacks is of great concern to the consortium and prostate cancer community. With no known substitutes for the public-private partnership between PCF and DOD, early withdrawal of funding will drastically compromise our continued progress. The PCCTC depends on these funds to execute an expanding portfolio of services which foster the unprecedented collaboration between investigators and industry sponsors, strategically positioning us to lead exciting new programs (e.g., XL184 and ARN-509). Before we can implement a business model that would allow us to function independently, these vital resources remain necessary if we are to attract potential sponsors with our built-in advisory boards, expedited regulatory processes, unified contracting and budgeting and our track record of quickly accruing patients to trials at diverse and reputable institutions. However, the most significant impact will be on our ability to impact the lives of men with prostate cancer without the infrastructure to support the high-risk, high-reward projects that have become the hallmark of PCCTC research.

Critical unmet needs in prostate cancer remain. Preserving the PCCTC's distinctive drug development paradigm allows the nation's most talented clinical investigators to fulfill our mission of delivering needed therapies to men with prostate cancer faster by designing and executing hypothesis-driven phase I and phase II trials. Your foresight to strategically support the PCCTC and its investigators from inception of the organization is commendable. These investments

originate in many forms and our gratitude for your confidence and continued support is immense.

Sincerely,

Howard I. Scher, MD; Robert DiPaola, MD; Elisabeth Heath, MD; Michael A. Carducci, MD; George Wilding, MD; Maha H. Hussain, MD, FACP; Daniel George, MD; Celestia Higano, MD, FACP; Walter M. Stadler, MD; Christopher J. Logothetis, MD; Charles Ryan, MD; Tomasz M. Beer, MD; Mary-Ellen Taplin, MD.

#### 10 THINGS EVERYONE SHOULD KNOW ABOUT PROSTATE CANCER

1. 1 in every 6 men will get prostate cancer sometime in his life. It was projected that over 192,000 cases were diagnosed in 2009.

2. The chances of getting prostate cancer are 1 in 3 if you have just one close relative (father, brother) with the disease. The risk is 83% with two close relatives. With three, it's almost a certainty (97%).

3. African-American men are at special risk for the disease, with the highest rate of prostate cancer in the world: 1 in 4 men. African American men are 2.5 times more likely to die from the disease.

4. Prostate cancer is the second-leading cause of male cancer-related death in the United States. An estimated 27,360 men died from prostate cancer last year.

5. There are no noticeable symptoms of prostate cancer while it is still in the early stages. This is why getting tested is so critical.

6. Every man age 45 or over should resolve to be tested annually. African-American men or those with a family history of the disease should start annual testing at 40.

7. Before early detection through PSA testing, only 1 in 4 prostate cancer cases were found while still in the early stages. With the widespread use of testing, about 9 out of 10 cases are now found early—giving men a fighting chance.

8. Nearly 100% of men diagnosed with prostate cancer while it is still in the early stages are still alive 5 years from diagnosis\*. Of men diagnosed in the late stages of the disease, 33.4% survive 5 years\*.

9. Testing for prostate cancer involves a simple blood test and a physical exam. It takes about 10 minutes and is covered by health insurance in many states.

10. Obesity is a significant predictor of prostate cancer severity. Men with a body mass index over 32.5 have about ½ greater risk of dying from prostate cancer. Research shows high cholesterol levels are strongly associated with advanced prostate cancer.

\*Does not include those who died from causes other than prostate cancer.

All prostate cancer statistics are 2009 estimates reported by the American Cancer Society.

#### UNDERSTANDING PROSTATE CANCER WHAT IS THE PROSTATE?

The prostate gland is part of the male reproductive system; it produces fluid for semen. The prostate is about the same size and shape as a walnut, and sits in front of the rectum and below the bladder, where it surrounds the urethra that carries urine out from the bladder.

#### WHAT IS PROSTATE CANCER?

Normally, cells grow and divide in an orderly way. Sometimes this normal process can go wrong. If abnormal cells continue to divide, they can form cancer tumors. Prostate cancer tends to occur in the cells lining the prostate. Its growth is usually slow and supported by male hormones. Prostate cancer cells can spread to other parts of the body.

There are no noticeable symptoms of prostate cancer while it is still in the early stages, which is why testing is so critical. In more advanced stages, symptoms may include difficult or frequent urination, blood in the urine or bone pain.

#### WHO IS AT RISK?

45 is often considered the age to begin annual prostate cancer testing. Men at higher risk, such as African-American men and those with a family history of prostate cancer, should begin getting tested no later than age 40. All men should start discussing early detection with their doctors at age 40.\*

#### TOOLS FOR EARLY DETECTION

The goal of early detection is to find the disease in its early stages when treatment is most likely to be effective. There are two widely used tests to aid in the early detection of prostate cancer.

**Blood Test—PSA.** This simple blood test measures the level of protein called prostate-specific antigen (PSA). Normally, PSA is found in the blood at very low levels. Elevated PSA readings can be a sign of prostate cancer; however, PSA levels can be elevated for reasons other than cancer.

**Physical Exam—DRE.** The digital rectal exam (DRE) is a simple, safe and only slightly uncomfortable physical exam performed by your physician.

These exams are usually done together to increase the accuracy of diagnosis. Although PSA will detect most high-risk cancers, there can be cancers that will be missed by this test and can be detected by the physical exam.

\* According to the National Comprehensive Cancer Network.

#### ZERO, THE PROJECT TO END PROSTATE CANCER, Washington, DC.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: ZERO—The Project to End Prostate Cancer is the nation's leading prostate cancer organization providing advocacy for increased federal funds for life-saving research, education and free testing. Our goal at ZERO is to create "Generation ZERO" the first generation of men free from prostate cancer.

One of the government initiatives that we strongly support is the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program and the Prostate Cancer Research Program. The PCRP strives to conquer prostate cancer by funding medical research that will eliminate death and suffering from the disease. The PCRP labors to reach this goal by funding innovative research with near-term impact, sponsoring multidisciplinary synergistic research, funding translational studies, investing in research on patient survivorship and improving quality of life.

An example of the innovative nature of the PCRP is the Clinical Trials Consortium. To address the significant logistical challenges of multicenter clinical research, the PCRP began support of a clinical trials consortium for rapid Phase I and Phase II clinical trials of promising new treatments for prostate cancer.

Since their first PCRP award in 2005, each site has fulfilled key responsibilities to clinical trials and design and recruitment. Nearly 70 trials with more than 1,800 patients have taken place, leading to potential treatments that will soon be at patients' bedsides. Two recently approved drugs (XGEVA and ZYTIGA) benefited from PCRP funding and the consortium accelerating their approval time by more than 2 years.

The Department of Defense Appropriations Act for FY2012 contains a 20 percent cut to the funding of the PCRP. If enacted, the funding for the PCRP will be cut from \$80 to \$64 million. This amount would be the lowest

amount of funding the program has received since 1999 when Congress allocated \$50 million to the PCRP.

ZERO requests that the PCRP funding levels for FY2012 be restored to 2011 levels. Continuing our commitment to prostate cancer research is crucial to the more than 240,800 men that will be diagnosed and the 33,720 who will die from prostate cancer in 2011.

With Sincere Appreciation,

KEVIN S. JOHNSON,  
SVP Government Relations  
and Advocacy.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment.

I have been very much involved in peer-reviewed prostate cancer research in my home State. I have certainly made a commitment to that community to support additional funds. We are willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. I am so thrilled that the gentleman from Florida has an amendment that I can support. I join with you, and I urge everyone to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. STEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. I thank the gentleman from Washington.

Oftentimes, I give him an amendment which he has very little time to look at. Again this happened, but I am very pleased he is supporting my amendment.

With that, obviously I will not call for a vote. I appreciate the appropriators supporting my amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 33, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 34, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to recognize the gentleman, C.W. "BILL" YOUNG, who is a stalwart not only to this Congress but also to the men and women of the United States military, for his hard work in support of not only making

sure our men and women have what they need, but making sure that he stands behind that, making sure that they get money well spent on behalf of the taxpayers.

Also, I would like to thank Chairman HAL ROGERS and certainly the gentleman from Washington (NORM DICKS) for their hard work and dedication and trying to work on traumatic brain injury, known as TBI, and also posttraumatic stress disorder, PTSD, and to thank all three of them, and others in this Congress, for their continued support by increasing funding for TBI and PTSD in this overall bill by \$125 million.

While I understand the long-standing practice of the committee for not designating specific TBI funds, my amendment confirms the House's support for this amendment which I have offered many times, and certainly related to TBI in May of this year to the National Defense Authorization Act of 2011.

Mr. DICKS. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. The gentleman explained to me that the \$10 million would not be part of the government program, that this would give people with traumatic brain injury, posttraumatic stress disorder, an option to go to the private sector?

Mr. SESSIONS. In fact, that is correct. What has previously been in the Defense Armed Services Committee, the policy that would allow men and women of the military who have TBI to be able to take these funds and be able to use them outside of the Department of Defense to what I would call private sector.

Mr. DICKS. What about TRICARE, which is a private company?

Mr. SESSIONS. They could take it where they choose to, not where they are designated to go by the Department of Defense; that would be correct.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SESSIONS. On May 26, 2011, during the NDAA debate, the House unanimously adopted an amendment to create a pilot program administered by the Department of Defense that would begin treating our troops coming back home from theater with TBI and PTSD. Today, Congress has the opportunity to appropriate funds that would be used to treat our active duty and veterans suffering from TBI and PTSD.

My amendment specifically moves \$10 million from the more than \$19 billion in the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Defense Program to increase the defense health program by \$10 million. Once again, this money will assist directly these soldiers and others in the military who have TBI-related injuries to be able to go to private sector facilities with the utilization of taxpayer dollars for them to get leading-edge treatments on these issues.

In April 2007, the Department of Veterans Affairs screened veterans who

were serving in Iraq and Afghanistan since 2001 for symptoms associated with TBI. More than 19 percent of these veterans screened positive for TBI symptoms. This is a big issue.

According to the U.S. Army, the number of soldiers leaving active duty service has increased by 64 percent from 2005 to 2009 due to brain health, whether it was TBI, PTSD, or a mental illness. A 2009 Rand study estimates that costs related to depression, PTSD, and TBI in our soldiers ranges from \$4 billion to \$6.2 billion over a 2-year period of time.

Today, health care providers all over this country are treating brain injury patients with new and innovative treatments with remarkable results. Unfortunately, many of these treatments are not available within military or veteran medical facilities for our heroes that I have previously discussed who are suffering from TBI.

Our troops put themselves on the line every day, and I think they deserve every opportunity to receive this treatment that is available for their recovery. This pilot program created in NDAA will provide for that treatment and recovery.

As has been talked about here on the floor of the House of Representatives, \$10 million out of \$19 billion should be allocated to this. I appreciate all of my colleagues not only learning more about this issue, also wanting to be a part of how we can help these men and women making groundbreaking treatments for our Nation's veterans and active duty soldiers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1610

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. We accept the amendment too.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION,  
DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the independent activities of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, in the direction and supervision of operational test and evaluation, including initial operational test and evaluation which is conducted prior to, and in support of, production decisions; joint operational testing and evaluation; and administrative expenses in connection therewith, \$191,292,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013.

TITLE V

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS  
DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For the Defense Working Capital Funds, \$1,575,010,000.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND

For National Defense Sealift Fund programs, projects, and activities, and for expenses of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, as established by section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. App. 1744), and for the necessary expenses to maintain and preserve a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States, \$1,100,519,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided in this paragraph shall be used to award a new contract that provides for the acquisition of any of the following major components unless such components are manufactured in the United States: auxiliary equipment, including pumps, for all shipboard services; propulsion system components (engines, reduction gears, and propellers); shipboard cranes; and spreaders for shipboard cranes: *Provided further*, That the exercise of an option in a contract awarded through the obligation of previously appropriated funds shall not be considered to be the award of a new contract: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive the restrictions in the first proviso on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

TITLE VI

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, for medical and health care programs of the Department of Defense as authorized by law, \$32,317,459,000; of which \$30,497,735,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed 1 percent shall remain available until September 30, 2013, and of which up to \$16,092,272,000 may be available for contracts entered into under the TRICARE program; of which \$632,518,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014, shall be for procurement; and of which \$1,187,206,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amount made available under this heading for research, development, test and evaluation, not less than \$8,000,000 shall be available for HIV prevention educational activities undertaken in connection with United States military training, exercises, and humanitarian assistance activities conducted primarily in African nations.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS  
DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with the provisions of section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521), and for the destruction of other chemical warfare materials that are not in the chemical weapon stockpile, \$1,554,422,000, of which \$1,147,691,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which no less than \$103,097,000 shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program, consisting of \$30,615,000, for activities on military installations and \$72,482,000, to remain

available until September 30, 2013, to assist state and local governments; and \$406,731,000 to remain available until September 30, 2013, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation, of which \$401,768,000 shall be only for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives (ACWA) Program.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG  
ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense, for transfer to appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military personnel of the reserve components serving under the provisions of title 10 and title 32, United States Code; for operation and maintenance; for procurement; and for research, development, test and evaluation, \$1,208,147,000: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for obligation for the same time period and for the same purpose as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act: *Provided further*, That \$23,000,000 may not be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Defense submits an implementation plan for the expansion of prescription drug testing to the congressional defense committees.

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT  
FUND  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the "Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund", \$220,634,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, for Staff and Infrastructure: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Director of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization to investigate, develop and provide equipment, supplies, services, training, facilities, personnel and funds to assist United States forces in the defeat of improvised explosive devices: *Provided further*, That not later than 60 days of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for the intended management and use of the amounts provided under this heading: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal quarter to the congressional defense committees providing assessments of the evolving threats, individual service requirements to counter the threats, the current strategy for predeployment training of members of the Armed Forces on improvised explosive devices, and details on the execution of the Fund: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein to appropriations for operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; and defense working capital funds to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That amounts transferred shall be merged with and available for the same purposes and time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses and activities of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$346,919,000, of which \$286,919,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed \$700,000 is available for emergencies and extraordinary expenses to be expended on the approval or authority of the Inspector General, and payments may be made on the Inspector General's certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes; of which \$1,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, shall be for procurement; and of which \$1,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013, shall be for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

TITLE VII  
RELATED AGENCIES

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT  
AND DISABILITY SYSTEM FUND

For payment to the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund, to maintain the proper funding level for continuing the operation of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, \$513,700,000.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT  
ACCOUNT

For necessary expenses of the Intelligence Community Management Account, \$458,225,000.

TITLE VIII  
GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 8001. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 8002. During the current fiscal year, provisions of law prohibiting the payment of compensation to, or employment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That salary increases granted to direct and indirect hire foreign national employees of the Department of Defense funded by this Act shall not be at a rate in excess of the percentage increase authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose pay is computed under the provisions of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, or at a rate in excess of the percentage increase provided by the appropriate host nation to its own employees, whichever is higher: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to Department of Defense foreign service national employees serving at United States diplomatic missions whose pay is set by the Department of State under the Foreign Service Act of 1980: *Provided further*, That the limitations of this provision shall not apply to foreign national employees of the Department of Defense in the Republic of Turkey.

SEC. 8003. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 8004. No more than 20 percent of the appropriations in this Act which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to obligations for support of active duty training of reserve components or summer camp training of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8005. Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed \$4,000,000,000 of working capital funds of the

Department of Defense or funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense for military functions (except military construction) between such appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided*, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority or any other authority in this Act: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds in this Act shall be available to prepare or present a request to the Committees on Appropriations for reprogramming of funds, unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which reprogramming is requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That a request for multiple reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section shall be made prior to June 30, 2012: *Provided further*, That transfers among military personnel appropriations shall not be taken into account for purposes of the limitation on the amount of funds that may be transferred under this section.

SEC. 8006. (a) With regard to the list of specific programs, projects, and activities (and the dollar amounts and adjustments to budget activities corresponding to such programs, projects, and activities) contained in the tables titled "Explanation of Project Level Adjustments" in the explanatory statement regarding this Act, the obligation and expenditure of amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act for those programs, projects, and activities for which the amounts appropriated exceed the amounts requested are hereby required by law to be carried out in the manner provided by such tables to the same extent as if the tables were included in the text of this Act.

(b) Amounts specified in the referenced tables described in subsection (a) shall not be treated as subdivisions of appropriations for purposes of section 8005 of this Act: *Provided*, That section 8005 shall apply when transfers of the amounts described in subsection (a) occur between appropriation accounts.

SEC. 8007. (a) Not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Department of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for fiscal year 2012: *Provided*, That the report shall include—

(1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation both by budget activity and program, project, and activity as detailed in the Budget Appendix; and

(3) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

(b) Notwithstanding section 8005 of this Act, none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for reprogramming or transfer until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional defense committees, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that such reprogramming or transfer is necessary as an emergency requirement.

## (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8008. During the current fiscal year, cash balances in working capital funds of the Department of Defense established pursuant to section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, may be maintained in only such amounts as are necessary at any time for cash disbursements to be made from such funds: *Provided*, That transfers may be made between such funds: *Provided further*, That transfers may be made between working capital funds and the "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense" appropriation and the "Operation and Maintenance" appropriation accounts in such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, except that such transfers may not be made unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress of the proposed transfer. Except in amounts equal to the amounts appropriated to working capital funds in this Act, no obligations may be made against a working capital fund to procure or increase the value of war reserve material inventory, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress prior to any such obligation.

SEC. 8009. Funds appropriated by this Act may not be used to initiate a special access program without prior notification 30 calendar days in advance to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8010. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available to initiate: (1) a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of \$20,000,000 in any one year of the contract or that includes an unfunded contingent liability in excess of \$20,000,000; or (2) a contract for advance procurement leading to a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of \$20,000,000 in any one year, unless the congressional defense committees have been notified at least 30 days in advance of the proposed contract award: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate a multiyear contract for which the economic order quantity advance procurement is not funded at least to the limits of the Government's liability: *Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate multiyear procurement contracts for any systems or component thereof if the value of the multiyear contract would exceed \$500,000,000 unless specifically provided in this Act: *Provided further*, That no multiyear procurement contract can be terminated without 10-day prior notification to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the execution of multiyear authority shall require the use of a present value analysis to determine lowest cost compared to an annual procurement: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act may be used for a multiyear contract executed after the date of the enactment of this Act unless in the case of any such contract—

(1) the Secretary of Defense has submitted to Congress a budget request for full funding of units to be procured through the contract and, in the case of a contract for procurement of aircraft, that includes, for any aircraft unit to be procured through the contract for which procurement funds are requested in that budget request for production beyond advanced procurement activities in the fiscal year covered by the budget, full funding of procurement of such unit in that fiscal year;

(2) cancellation provisions in the contract do not include consideration of recurring manufacturing costs of the contractor associated with the production of unfunded units to be delivered under the contract;

(3) the contract provides that payments to the contractor under the contract shall not be made in advance of incurred costs on funded units; and

(4) the contract does not provide for a price adjustment based on a failure to award a follow-on contract.

Funds appropriated in title III of this Act may be used for a multiyear procurement contract as follows:

UH-60M/HH-60M and MH-60R/MH-60S Helicopter Airframes; and MH-60R/S Mission Avionics and Common Cockpits.

SEC. 8011. Within the funds appropriated for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces, funds are hereby appropriated pursuant to section 401 of title 10, United States Code, for humanitarian and civic assistance costs under chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code. Such funds may also be obligated for humanitarian and civic assistance costs incidental to authorized operations and pursuant to authority granted in section 401 of chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code, and these obligations shall be reported as required by section 401(d) of title 10, United States Code: *Provided*, That funds available for operation and maintenance shall be available for providing humanitarian and similar assistance by using Civic Action Teams in the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands and freely associated states of Micronesia, pursuant to the Compact of Free Association as authorized by Public Law 99-239: *Provided further*, That upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that such action is beneficial for graduate medical education programs conducted at Army medical facilities located in Hawaii, the Secretary of the Army may authorize the provision of medical services at such facilities and transportation to such facilities, on a nonreimbursable basis, for civilian patients from American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, and Guam.

SEC. 8012. (a) During fiscal year 2012, the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense may not be managed on the basis of any end-strength, and the management of such personnel during that fiscal year shall not be subject to any constraint or limitation (known as an end-strength) on the number of such personnel who may be employed on the last day of such fiscal year.

(b) The fiscal year 2013 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2013 Department of Defense budget request shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress as if subsections (a) and (b) of this provision were effective with regard to fiscal year 2013.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to military (civilian) technicians.

SEC. 8013. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before the Congress.

SEC. 8014. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for the basic pay and allowances of any member of the Army participating as a full-time student and receiving benefits paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund when time spent as a full-time student is credited toward completion of a service commitment: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to those members who have reenlisted with this option prior to October 1, 1987: *Provided further*, That this section applies only to active components of the Army.

SEC. 8015. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to con-

vert to contractor performance an activity or function of the Department of Defense that, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is performed by Department of Defense civilian employees unless—

(1) the conversion is based on the result of a public-private competition that includes a most efficient and cost effective organization plan developed by such activity or function;

(2) the Competitive Sourcing Official determines that, over all performance periods stated in the solicitation of offers for performance of the activity or function, the cost of performance of the activity or function by a contractor would be less costly to the Department of Defense by an amount that equals or exceeds the lesser of—

(A) 10 percent of the most efficient organization's personnel-related costs for performance of that activity or function by Federal employees; or

(B) \$10,000,000; and

(3) the contractor does not receive an advantage for a proposal that would reduce costs for the Department of Defense by—

(A) not making an employer-sponsored health insurance plan available to the workers who are to be employed in the performance of that activity or function under the contract; or

(B) offering to such workers an employer-sponsored health benefits plan that requires the employer to contribute less towards the premium or subscription share than the amount that is paid by the Department of Defense for health benefits for civilian employees under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

(b)(1) The Department of Defense, without regard to subsection (a) of this section or subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 2461 of title 10, United States Code, and notwithstanding any administrative regulation, requirement, or policy to the contrary shall have full authority to enter into a contract for the performance of any commercial or industrial type function of the Department of Defense that—

(A) is included on the procurement list established pursuant to section 2 of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (section 8503 of title 41, United States Code);

(B) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or by a qualified nonprofit agency for other severely handicapped individuals in accordance with that Act; or

(C) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified firm under at least 51 percent ownership by an Indian tribe, as defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)), or a Native Hawaiian Organization, as defined in section 8(a)(15) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(15)).

(2) This section shall not apply to depot contracts or contracts for depot maintenance as provided in sections 2469 and 2474 of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike Section 8015.

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

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, within the last month, the House has voted to strike problematic and anticompetitive A-76 language from H.R. 2017, the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill, and from H.R. 2112, the

Agriculture appropriations bill. The same change and reversal of bad policy should be adopted in this legislation by striking section 8015.

My amendment does just that. As drafted, section 8015 prohibits the Department of Defense from contracting out any function unless it will save a minimum of \$10 million or 10 percent of the department's performance costs even if the contractor is less costly overall and can perform the work more efficiently.

Independent studies have found that public-private competitions lower costs by between 10 and 40 percent regardless of whether the competition is won by a private contractor or the government. Rather than stand in the way of public-private competitions, Congress should cut the redtape and make the use of this cost-saving process easier, not harder.

The requirements in section 8015 are largely codified in existing statute. Retaining section 8015 will obstruct and potentially nullify any current efforts to reform the system in ways that improve public-private competitions and bring much needed consistency and reliability to the process.

Instead of complicating the use of competitions that improve service and lower costs, we should be encouraging agencies to find the most efficient way to deliver services. This amendment will send that message by reducing restrictions on the Department of Defense and by making it easier to achieve reforms that will increase the availability of cost-saving competitions throughout the department.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, taxpayer-first amendment to H.R. 2219.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. This amendment would repeal section 8015 of the bill, which in various forms has been included in the bill for the past 14 years.

This section requires that, before work is contracted out, the Department of Defense must conduct a formal cost comparison to determine whether privatization would actually save money. The section also provides an exemption to ease contracting with businesses owned by disadvantaged persons, qualified nonprofit entities for disadvantaged persons, or businesses owned by Native Americans. In cases where outsourcing is appropriate, one of the fundamental reasons would be to lower government operating costs.

Requiring the DOD to actually conduct this analysis under the A-76 review is reasonable and should be included in this bill, so I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. I must say we have done these A-76 reviews across the country, and many times we find that the government entity reorganizes itself and can actually

do the work at a lesser cost than the private sector.

□ 1620

And the other problem with this whole thing is, once the private sector gets it, the costs go right through the roof.

So you need to have an analysis done after contracting out is done to make sure that you're not getting ripped off. So I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8016. Funds appropriated in title III of this Act for the Department of Defense Pilot Mentor-Protege Program may be transferred to any other appropriation contained in this Act solely for the purpose of implementing a Mentor-Protege Program developmental assistance agreement pursuant to section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note), as amended, under the authority of this provision or any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

SEC. 8017. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are manufactured in the United States from components which are substantially manufactured in the United States: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, the term "manufactured" shall include cutting, heat treating, quality control, testing of chain and welding (including the forging and shot blasting process): *Provided further*, That for the purpose of this section, substantially all of the components of anchor and mooring chain shall be considered to be produced or manufactured in the United States if the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured outside the United States: *Provided further*, That when adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis, the Secretary of the service responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

SEC. 8018. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense, herein and hereafter, may be used to demilitarize or dispose of M-1 Carbines, M-1 Garand rifles, M-14 rifles, .22 caliber rifles, .30 caliber rifles, or M-1911 pistols, or to demilitarize or destroy small arms ammunition or ammunition components that are not otherwise prohibited from commercial sale under Federal law, un-

less the small arms ammunition or ammunition components are certified by the Secretary of the Army or designee as unserviceable or unsafe for further use.

SEC. 8019. No more than \$500,000 of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used during a single fiscal year for any single relocation of an organization, unit, activity or function of the Department of Defense into or within the National Capital Region: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the congressional defense committees that such a relocation is required in the best interest of the Government.

SEC. 8020. In addition to the funds provided elsewhere in this Act, \$15,000,000 is appropriated only for incentive payments authorized by section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544): *Provided*, That a prime contractor or a subcontractor at any tier that makes a subcontract award to any subcontractor or supplier as defined in section 1544 of title 25, United States Code, or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code, shall be considered a contractor for the purposes of being allowed additional compensation under section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544) whenever the prime contract or subcontract amount is over \$500,000 and involves the expenditure of funds appropriated by an Act making Appropriations for the Department of Defense with respect to any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 1906 of title 41, United States Code, this section shall be applicable to any Department of Defense acquisition of supplies or services, including any contract and any subcontract at any tier for acquisition of commercial items produced or manufactured, in whole or in part, by any subcontractor or supplier defined in section 1544 of title 25, United States Code, or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code.

SEC. 8021. Funds appropriated by this Act for the Defense Media Activity shall not be used for any national or international political or psychological activities.

SEC. 8022. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense is authorized to incur obligations of not to exceed \$350,000,000 for purposes specified in section 2350j(c) of title 10, United States Code, in anticipation of receipt of contributions, only from the Government of Kuwait, under that section: *Provided*, That upon receipt, such contributions from the Government of Kuwait shall be credited to the appropriations or fund which incurred such obligations.

SEC. 8023. (a) Of the funds made available in this Act, not less than \$30,945,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation, of which—

(1) \$27,838,000 shall be available from "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force" to support Civil Air Patrol Corporation operation and maintenance, readiness, counter-drug activities, and drug demand reduction activities involving youth programs;

(2) \$2,190,000 shall be available from "Air-craft Procurement, Air Force"; and

(3) \$917,000 shall be available from "Other Procurement, Air Force" for vehicle procurement.

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force should waive reimbursement for any funds used by the Civil Air Patrol for counter-drug activities in support of Federal, State, and local government agencies.

SEC. 8024. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act are available to establish a new Department of Defense (department) federally funded research and development

center (FFRDC), either as a new entity, or as a separate entity administrated by an organization managing another FFRDC, or as a nonprofit membership corporation consisting of a consortium of other FFRDCs and other nonprofit entities.

(b) No member of a Board of Directors, Trustees, Overseers, Advisory Group, Special Issues Panel, Visiting Committee, or any similar entity of a defense FFRDC, and no paid consultant to any defense FFRDC, except when acting in a technical advisory capacity, may be compensated for his or her services as a member of such entity, or as a paid consultant by more than one FFRDC in a fiscal year: *Provided*, That a member of any such entity referred to previously in this subsection shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem as authorized under the Federal Joint Travel Regulations, when engaged in the performance of membership duties.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the department from any source during fiscal year 2012 may be used by a defense FFRDC, through a fee or other payment mechanism, for construction of new buildings, for payment of cost sharing for projects funded by Government grants, for absorption of contract overruns, or for certain charitable contributions, not to include employee participation in community service and/or development.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds available to the department during fiscal year 2012, not more than 5,750 staff years of technical effort (staff years) may be funded for defense FFRDCs: *Provided*, That of the specific amount referred to previously in this subsection, not more than 1,125 staff years may be funded for the defense studies and analysis FFRDCs: *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not apply to staff years funded in the National Intelligence Program (NIP) and the Military Intelligence Program (MIP).

(e) The Secretary of Defense shall, with the submission of the department's fiscal year 2013 budget request, submit a report presenting the specific amounts of staff years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense FFRDC during that fiscal year and the associated budget estimates.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for FFRDCs is hereby reduced by \$125,000,000.

SEC. 8025. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to procure carbon, alloy or armor steel plate for use in any Government-owned facility or property under the control of the Department of Defense which were not melted and rolled in the United States or Canada: *Provided*, That these procurement restrictions shall apply to any and all Federal Supply Class 9515, American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) or American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI) specifications of carbon, alloy or armor steel plate: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That these restrictions shall not apply to contracts which are in being as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8026. For the purposes of this Act, the term "congressional defense committees" means the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, the Armed Serv-

ices Committee of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 8027. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense may acquire the modification, depot maintenance and repair of aircraft, vehicles and vessels as well as the production of components and other Defense-related articles, through competition between Department of Defense depot maintenance activities and private firms: *Provided*, That the Senior Acquisition Executive of the military department or Defense Agency concerned, with power of delegation, shall certify that successful bids include comparable estimates of all direct and indirect costs for both public and private bids: *Provided further*, That Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 shall not apply to competitions conducted under this section.

SEC. 8028. (a)(1) If the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines that a foreign country which is party to an agreement described in paragraph (2) has violated the terms of the agreement by discriminating against certain types of products produced in the United States that are covered by the agreement, the Secretary of Defense shall rescind the Secretary's blanket waiver of the Buy American Act with respect to such types of products produced in that foreign country.

(2) An agreement referred to in paragraph (1) is any reciprocal defense procurement memorandum of understanding, between the United States and a foreign country pursuant to which the Secretary of Defense has prospectively waived the Buy American Act for certain products in that country.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SUTTON

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 60, line 9, insert after the period the following: "Such report shall also indicate whether such items or parts of such items are available for purchase in the United States."

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Chair, I rise today to shine a light on how America is spending defense dollars.

This week, we will vote on a \$530 billion Defense budget. Some of that money will go towards pay for our soldiers; some of that money will go towards ensuring our military families are cared for. But when it comes to buying everything from building materials to fighter jets, as much of that money as possible should go towards buying American. Every dollar we spend on a part or a piece of equipment manufactured overseas when we can easily build it at home is doing our men and women in uniform and our manufacturing base a disservice.

This is a clarifying amendment that will increase transparency within the Department of Defense by having the Department indicate whether parts

purchased overseas are available here in the United States.

Taxpayers deserve to know where the Defense dollars are going. They want to see their taxpayer dollars used to purchase quality products and materials produced right here in the United States by American workers; and when that doesn't happen, they want and deserve to know why.

Currently, the Department of Defense is granting tens of thousands of waivers to allow for taxpayer dollars to buy equipment made overseas. If our tax dollars are going to buy a part made overseas, taxpayers deserve to know if that part is available in Michigan or Ohio or anywhere else in the United States. My amendment simply uses the current Department of Defense data and the requirements set forth in this section and adds more transparency by highlighting areas where our government is sending money overseas instead of keeping it at home.

If we are truly to put Americans back to work, we must make sure that Congress is doing everything it can towards that end. This amendment is one small step that we can take right now. This clarifying amendment will only serve to shine a light on taxpayer dollars being invested in the wrong place and show where those funds can be diverted in a way that can make a difference for jobs here at home.

I encourage my colleagues to pass this commonsense clarifying amendment to ensure increased transparency for American taxpayers and encourage our Department of Defense to buy American, because that is what taxpayers want and that is what American workers deserve.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law." This amendment imposes additional duties.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to speak to the point of order?

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the point of order. This is simply a clarifying amendment. It clarifies information that is already being gathered in this section.

Since 2007, Congress has mandated that the Department of Defense begin tracking waivers that allow the Department to buy products from overseas. Currently, to qualify for a waiver from the Buy America requirements, the Department of Defense has to comply with one of eight criteria. One of those criteria is proving that there is



no domestic product available. This section of the bill already requires the Department of Defense to report back to Congress on the amount of their purchases from foreign entities and the dollar value of items for which the Buy American Act was waived.

My amendment simply uses the current Department of Defense data and the requirements set forth in this section and adds more transparency by highlighting areas where our government is sending money overseas instead of keeping it at home.

□ 1630

As I said, if we are truly to put Americans back to work, we must make sure that Congress is doing everything it can towards that end. It would seem ashamed for this objection to stand to an amendment that just ensures transparency in a section that is already being used to gather information.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to speak to the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

Section 8028 of the bill constitutes legislation. It has been permitted to remain in the bill by way of a waiver of that point of order. Under the precedents, it may be modified by a germane amendment, as long as the amendment does not contain additional legislation.

The amendment modifies the terms of a report required by section 8028(b) of the bill. It requires the inclusion in the report of certain information regarding domestic availability of certain products.

By requiring additional detail in the report, the amendment is not "merely perfecting" but, rather, proposes additional legislation. It therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I do so to make this announcement: that there are a number of points of order lying on amendments that we will be considering shortly. It will be my hope that we can reserve the point of order so that the Member propounding the amendment can also have their 5 minutes to explain the amendment. As long as that courtesy is not abused, I will continue to allow that, but if it does appear to be abused, then we will raise the point of order immediately.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report on the amount of Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities in fiscal year 2012. Such report shall separately indicate the dollar value of

items for which the Buy American Act was waived pursuant to any agreement described in subsection (a)(2), the Trade Agreement Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), or any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "Buy American Act" means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 8029. During the current fiscal year, amounts contained in the Department of Defense Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery Account established by section 2921(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) shall be available until expended for the payments specified by section 2921(c)(2) of that Act.

SEC. 8030. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Air Force may convey at no cost to the Air Force, without consideration, to Indian tribes located in the States of Nevada, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Oregon, Minnesota, and Washington relocatable military housing units located at Grand Forks Air Force Base, Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mountain Home Air Force Base, Ellsworth Air Force Base, and Minot Air Force Base that are excess to the needs of the Air Force.

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force shall convey, at no cost to the Air Force, military housing units under subsection (a) in accordance with the request for such units that are submitted to the Secretary by the Operation Walking Shield Program on behalf of Indian tribes located in the States of Nevada, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Oregon, Minnesota, and Washington. Any such conveyance shall be subject to the condition that the housing units shall be removed within a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) The Operation Walking Shield Program shall resolve any conflicts among requests of Indian tribes for housing units under subsection (a) before submitting requests to the Secretary of the Air Force under subsection (b).

(d) In this section, the term "Indian tribe" means any recognized Indian tribe included on the current list published by the Secretary of the Interior under section 104 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-454; 108 Stat. 4792; 25 U.S.C. 479a-1).

SEC. 8031. During the current fiscal year, appropriations which are available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than \$250,000.

SEC. 8032. (a) During the current fiscal year, none of the appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds shall be used for the purchase of an investment item for the purpose of acquiring a new inventory item for sale or anticipated sale during the current fiscal year or a subsequent fiscal year to customers of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds if such an item would not have been chargeable to the Department of Defense Business Operations Fund during fiscal year 1994 and if the purchase of such an investment item would be chargeable during the current fiscal year to appropriations made to the Department of Defense for procurement.

(b) The fiscal year 2013 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2013 Department of Defense budget shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress on the basis that any equipment which was classified as an end item and funded in a procurement appropria-

tion contained in this Act shall be budgeted for in a proposed fiscal year 2013 procurement appropriation and not in the supply management business area or any other area or category of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds.

SEC. 8033. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for the Reserve for Contingencies, which shall remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That funds appropriated, transferred, or otherwise credited to the Central Intelligence Agency Central Services Working Capital Fund during this or any prior or subsequent fiscal year shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That any funds appropriated or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for advanced research and development acquisition, for agent operations, and for covert action programs authorized by the President under section 503 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, shall remain available until September 30, 2013.

SEC. 8034. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this Act for the Defense Intelligence Agency may be used for the design, development, and deployment of General Defense Intelligence Program intelligence communications and intelligence information systems for the Services, the Unified and Specified Commands, and the component commands.

SEC. 8035. Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", not less than \$12,000,000 shall be made available only for the mitigation of environmental impacts, including training and technical assistance to tribes, related administrative support, the gathering of information, documenting of environmental damage, and developing a system for prioritization of mitigation and cost to complete estimates for mitigation, on Indian lands resulting from Department of Defense activities.

SEC. 8036. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be expended by an entity of the Department of Defense unless the entity, in expending the funds, complies with the Buy American Act. For purposes of this subsection, the term "Buy American Act" means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

(b) If the Secretary of Defense determines that a person has been convicted of intentionally affixing a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in America, the Secretary shall determine, in accordance with section 2410f of title 10, United States Code, whether the person should be debarred from contracting with the Department of Defense.

(c) In the case of any equipment or products purchased with appropriations provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that any entity of the Department of Defense, in expending the appropriation, purchase only American-made equipment and products, provided that American-made equipment and products are cost-competitive, quality-competitive, and available in a timely fashion.

SEC. 8037. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for a contract for studies, analysis, or consulting services entered into without competition on the basis of an unsolicited proposal unless the head of the activity responsible for the procurement determines—

(1) as a result of thorough technical evaluation, only one source is found fully qualified to perform the proposed work;

(2) the purpose of the contract is to explore an unsolicited proposal which offers significant scientific or technological promise, represents the product of original thinking, and was submitted in confidence by one source; or

(3) the purpose of the contract is to take advantage of unique and significant industrial accomplishment by a specific concern, or to ensure that a new product or idea of a specific concern is given financial support: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to contracts in an amount of less than \$25,000, contracts related to improvements of equipment that is in development or production, or contracts as to which a civilian official of the Department of Defense, who has been confirmed by the Senate, determines that the award of such contract is in the interest of the national defense.

SEC. 8038. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used—

(1) to establish a field operating agency; or  
(2) to pay the basic pay of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the department who is transferred or reassigned from a headquarters activity if the member or employee's place of duty remains at the location of that headquarters.

(b) The Secretary of Defense or Secretary of a military department may waive the limitations in subsection (a), on a case-by-case basis, if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate that the granting of the waiver will reduce the personnel requirements or the financial requirements of the department.

(c) This section does not apply to—

(1) field operating agencies funded within the National Intelligence Program; or

(2) an Army field operating agency established to eliminate, mitigate, or counter the effects of improvised explosive devices, and, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, other similar threats.

(3) an Army field operating agency established to improve the effectiveness and efficiencies of biometric activities and to integrate common biometric technologies throughout the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8039. The Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, acting through the Office of Economic Adjustment of the Department of Defense, may use funds made available in this Act under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide" to make grants and supplement other Federal funds in accordance with the guidance provided in the explanatory statement regarding this Act.

#### (RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 8040. Of the funds appropriated in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts:

"National Defense Sealift Fund", 2002/XXXX, \$20,444,000;

"National Defense Sealift Fund", 2003/XXXX, \$8,500,000;

"National Defense Sealift Fund", 2004/XXXX, \$6,500,000;

"Aircraft Procurement, Navy", 2010/2012, \$90,000,000;

"Aircraft Procurement, Navy", 2011/2013, \$55,000,000;

"Weapons Procurement, Navy", 2011/2013, \$35,427,000;

"Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps", 2011/2013, \$8,612,000;

"Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", 2011/2015, \$110,351,000;

"Aircraft Procurement, Air Force", 2011/2013, \$30,000,000;

"Missile Procurement, Air Force", 2011/2013, \$122,500,000;

"Other Procurement, Air Force", 2011/2013, \$90,000,000;

"Procurement, Defense-Wide", 2011/2013, \$45,000,000;

"Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy", 2011/2012, \$34,771,000;

"Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force", 2011/2012, \$105,000,000;

"Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide", 2011/2012, \$318,000,000.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds provided may be used for the construction of additional sealift capacity, as described under the heading "National Defense Sealift Fund" in Public Law 107-117, Public Law 107-248, and Public Law 108-87, or for the purposes described in section 115 of division H of Public Law 108-199, as amended by section 1017 of division A of Public Law 109-13.

SEC. 8041. None of the funds available in this Act may be used to reduce the authorized positions for military (civilian) technicians of the Army National Guard, Air National Guard, Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve for the purpose of applying any administratively imposed civilian personnel ceiling, freeze, or reduction on military (civilian) technicians, unless such reductions are a direct result of a reduction in military force structure.

SEC. 8042. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for assistance to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea unless specifically appropriated for that purpose.

SEC. 8043. Funds appropriated in this Act for operation and maintenance of the Military Departments, Combatant Commands and Defense Agencies shall be available for reimbursement of pay, allowances and other expenses which would otherwise be incurred against appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve when members of the National Guard and Reserve provide intelligence or counterintelligence support to Combatant Commands, Defense Agencies and Joint Intelligence Activities, including the activities and programs included within the National Intelligence Program and the Military Intelligence Program: *Provided*, That nothing in this section authorizes deviation from established Reserve and National Guard personnel and training procedures.

SEC. 8044. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to reduce the civilian medical and medical support personnel assigned to military treatment facilities below the September 30, 2003, level: *Provided*, That the Service Surgeons General may waive this section by certifying to the congressional defense committees that the beneficiary population is declining in some catchment areas and civilian strength reductions may be consistent with responsible resource stewardship and capitation-based budgeting.

SEC. 8045. (a) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

(b) None of the funds available to the Central Intelligence Agency for any fiscal year for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

SEC. 8046. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used for the procurement of ball and roller bearings other than those produced by a domestic source and of domestic origin: *Provided*, That the Secretary of

the military department responsible for such procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That this restriction shall not apply to the purchase of "commercial items", as defined by section 103 of title 41, United States Code, except that the restriction shall apply to ball or roller bearings purchased as end items.

SEC. 8047. None of the funds in this Act may be used to purchase any supercomputer which is not manufactured in the United States, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes that is not available from United States manufacturers.

SEC. 8048. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department of Defense who approves or implements the transfer of administrative responsibilities or budgetary resources of any program, project, or activity financed by this Act to the jurisdiction of another Federal agency not financed by this Act without the express authorization of Congress: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to transfers of funds expressly provided for in Defense Appropriations Acts, or provisions of Acts providing supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8049. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the Department of Defense for the current fiscal year may be obligated or expended to transfer to another nation or an international organization any defense articles or services (other than intelligence services) for use in the activities described in subsection (b) unless the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate are notified 15 days in advance of such transfer.

(b) This section applies to—

(1) any international peacekeeping or peace-enforcement operation under the authority of chapter VI or chapter VII of the United Nations Charter under the authority of a United Nations Security Council resolution; and

(2) any other international peacekeeping, peace-enforcement, or humanitarian assistance operation.

(c) A notice under subsection (a) shall include the following—

(1) A description of the equipment, supplies, or services to be transferred.

(2) A statement of the value of the equipment, supplies, or services to be transferred.

(3) In the case of a proposed transfer of equipment or supplies—

(A) a statement of whether the inventory requirements of all elements of the Armed Forces (including the reserve components) for the type of equipment or supplies to be transferred have been met; and

(B) a statement of whether the items proposed to be transferred will have to be replaced and, if so, how the President proposes to provide funds for such replacement.

SEC. 8050. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense under this Act shall be obligated or expended to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor to an employee when—

(1) such costs are for a bonus or otherwise in excess of the normal salary paid by the contractor to the employee; and

(2) such bonus is part of restructuring costs associated with a business combination.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8051. During the current fiscal year, no more than \$30,000,000 of appropriations made in this Act under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide" may be transferred to appropriations available for the pay of military personnel, to be merged with, and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred, to be used in support of such personnel in connection with support and services for eligible organizations and activities outside the Department of Defense pursuant to section 2012 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8052. During the current fiscal year, in the case of an appropriation account of the Department of Defense for which the period of availability for obligation has expired or which has closed under the provisions of section 1552 of title 31, United States Code, and which has a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance, an obligation or an adjustment of an obligation may be charged to any current appropriation account for the same purpose as the expired or closed account if—

(1) the obligation would have been properly chargeable (except as to amount) to the expired or closed account before the end of the period of availability or closing of that account;

(2) the obligation is not otherwise properly chargeable to any current appropriation account of the Department of Defense; and

(3) in the case of an expired account, the obligation is not chargeable to a current appropriation of the Department of Defense under the provisions of section 1405(b)(8) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, Public Law 101-510, as amended (31 U.S.C. 1551 note): *Provided*, That in the case of an expired account, if subsequent review or investigation discloses that there was not in fact a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance in the account, any charge to a current account under the authority of this section shall be reversed and recorded against the expired account: *Provided further*, That the total amount charged to a current appropriation under this section may not exceed an amount equal to 1 percent of the total appropriation for that account.

SEC. 8053. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau may permit the use of equipment of the National Guard Distance Learning Project by any person or entity on a space-available, reimbursable basis. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall establish the amount of reimbursement for such use on a case-by-case basis.

(b) Amounts collected under subsection (a) shall be credited to funds available for the National Guard Distance Learning Project and be available to defray the costs associated with the use of equipment of the project under that subsection. Such funds shall be available for such purposes without fiscal year limitation.

SEC. 8054. Using funds available by this Act or any other Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, pursuant to a determination under section 2690 of title 10, United States Code, may implement cost-effective agreements for required heating facility modernization in the Kaiserslautern Military Community in the Federal Republic of Germany: *Provided*, That in the City of Kaiserslautern and at the Rhine Ordnance Barracks area, such agreements will include the use of United States anthracite as the base load energy for municipal district heat to the United States

Defense installations: *Provided further*, That at Landstuhl Army Regional Medical Center and Ramstein Air Base, furnished heat may be obtained from private, regional or municipal services, if provisions are included for the consideration of United States coal as an energy source.

SEC. 8055. None of the funds appropriated in title IV of this Act may be used to procure end-items for delivery to military forces for operational training, operational use or inventory requirements: *Provided*, That this restriction does not apply to end-items used in development, prototyping, and test activities preceding and leading to acceptance for operational use: *Provided further*, That this restriction does not apply to programs funded within the National Intelligence Program: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8056. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to approve or license the sale of the F-22A advanced tactical fighter to any foreign government: *Provided*, That the Department of Defense may conduct or participate in studies, research, design and other activities to define and develop a future export version of the F-22A that protects classified and sensitive information, technologies and U.S. warfighting capabilities.

SEC. 8057. (a) The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, waive with respect to a foreign country each limitation on the procurement of defense items from foreign sources provided in law if the Secretary determines that the application of the limitation with respect to that country would invalidate cooperative programs entered into between the Department of Defense and the foreign country, or would invalidate reciprocal trade agreements for the procurement of defense items entered into under section 2531 of title 10, United States Code, and the country does not discriminate against the same or similar defense items produced in the United States for that country.

(b) Subsection (a) applies with respect to—  
(1) contracts and subcontracts entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) options for the procurement of items that are exercised after such date under contracts that are entered into before such date if the option prices are adjusted for any reason other than the application of a waiver granted under subsection (a).

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to a limitation regarding construction of public vessels, ball and roller bearings, food, and clothing or textile materials as defined by section 11 (chapters 50-65) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule and products classified under headings 4010, 4202, 4203, 6401 through 6406, 6505, 7019, 7218 through 7229, 7304.41 through 7304.49, 7306.40, 7502 through 7508, 8105, 8108, 8109, 8211, 8215, and 9404.

SEC. 8058. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support any training program involving a unit of the security forces or police of a foreign country if the Secretary of Defense has received credible information from the Department of State that the unit has committed a gross violation of human rights, unless all necessary corrective steps have been taken.

(b) The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall ensure that prior to a decision to conduct any training program referred to in subsection (a), full consideration is given to all credible information available to the Department of State relating to human rights violations by foreign security forces.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) if he determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances.

(d) Not more than 15 days after the exercise of any waiver under subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees describing the extraordinary circumstances, the purpose and duration of the training program, the United States forces and the foreign security forces involved in the training program, and the information relating to human rights violations that necessitates the waiver.

SEC. 8059. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or other Department of Defense Appropriations Acts may be obligated or expended for the purpose of performing repairs or maintenance to military family housing units of the Department of Defense, including areas in such military family housing units that may be used for the purpose of conducting official Department of Defense business.

SEC. 8060. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide" for any new start advanced concept technology demonstration project or joint capability demonstration project may only be obligated 30 days after a report, including a description of the project, the planned acquisition and transition strategy, and its estimated annual and total cost, has been provided in writing to the congressional defense committees: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying to the congressional defense committees that it is in the national interest to do so.

SEC. 8061. The Secretary of Defense shall provide a classified quarterly report beginning 30 days after enactment of this Act, to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, Subcommittees on Defense on certain matters as directed in the classified annex accompanying this Act.

SEC. 8062. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be used to provide support to another department or agency of the United States if such department or agency is more than 90 days in arrears in making payment to the Department of Defense for goods or services previously provided to such department or agency on a reimbursable basis: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply if the department is authorized by law to provide support to such department or agency on a nonreimbursable basis, and is providing the requested support pursuant to such authority: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8063. Notwithstanding section 12310(b) of title 10, United States Code, a Reserve who is a member of the National Guard serving on full-time National Guard duty under section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, may perform duties in support of the ground-based elements of the National Ballistic Missile Defense System.

SEC. 8064. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to transfer to any non-governmental entity ammunition held by the Department of Defense that has a center-fire cartridge and a United States military nomenclature designation of "armor penetrator", "armor piercing (AP)", "armor piercing incendiary (API)", or "armor-piercing incendiary-tracer (API-T)", except to an

entity performing demilitarization services for the Department of Defense under a contract that requires the entity to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Department of Defense that armor piercing projectiles are either: (1) rendered incapable of reuse by the demilitarization process; or (2) used to manufacture ammunition pursuant to a contract with the Department of Defense or the manufacture of ammunition for export pursuant to a License for Permanent Export of Unclassified Military Articles issued by the Department of State.

SEC. 8065. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, may waive payment of all or part of the consideration that otherwise would be required under section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, in the case of a lease of personal property for a period not in excess of 1 year to any organization specified in section 508(d) of title 32, United States Code, or any other youth, social, or fraternal nonprofit organization as may be approved by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, on a case-by-case basis.

SEC. 8066. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the support of any nonappropriated funds activity of the Department of Defense that procures malt beverages and wine with nonappropriated funds for resale (including such alcoholic beverages sold by the drink) on a military installation located in the United States unless such malt beverages and wine are procured within that State, or in the case of the District of Columbia, within the District of Columbia, in which the military installation is located: *Provided*, That in a case in which the military installation is located in more than one State, purchases may be made in any State in which the installation is located: *Provided further*, That such local procurement requirements for malt beverages and wine shall apply to all alcoholic beverages only for military installations in States which are not contiguous with another State: *Provided further*, That alcoholic beverages other than wine and malt beverages, in contiguous States and the District of Columbia shall be procured from the most competitive source, price and other factors considered.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8067. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Army", \$124,493,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to transfer such funds to other activities of the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into and carry out contracts for the acquisition of real property, construction, personal services, and operations related to projects carrying out the purposes of this section: *Provided further*, That contracts entered into under the authority of this section may provide for such indemnification as the Secretary determines to be necessary: *Provided further*, That projects authorized by this section shall comply with applicable Federal, State, and local law to the maximum extent consistent with the national security, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8068. Section 8106 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997 (titles I through VIII of the matter under subsection 101(b) of Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009-111; 10 U.S.C. 113 note) shall continue in effect to apply to disbursements that are made by the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2012.

SEC. 8069. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, \$4,000,000 is hereby ap-

propriated to the Department of Defense, to remain available for obligation until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, that upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that it shall serve the national interest, these funds shall be available only for a grant to the Fisher House Foundation, Inc., only for the construction and furnishing of additional Fisher Houses to meet the needs of military family members when confronted with the illness or hospitalization of an eligible military beneficiary.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8070. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the headings "Procurement, Defense-Wide" and "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide", \$235,700,000 shall be for the Israeli Cooperative Programs: *Provided*, That of this amount, \$110,500,000 shall be for the Short Range Ballistic Missile Defense (SRBMD) program, including cruise missile defense research and development under the SRBMD program, of which \$15,000,000 shall be for production activities of David Sling Weapon System missiles in the United States and in Israel to meet Israel's defense requirements, consistent with each nation's laws, regulations, and procedures, \$66,200,000 shall be available for an upper-tier component to the Israeli Missile Defense architecture, and \$59,000,000 shall be for the Arrow System Improvement Program including development of a long range, ground and airborne, detection suite: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this provision for production of missiles and missile components may be transferred to appropriations available for the procurement of weapons and equipment, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this provision is in addition to any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

SEC. 8071. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be obligated to modify command and control relationships to give Fleet Forces Command administrative and operational control of U.S. Navy forces assigned to the Pacific fleet: *Provided*, That the command and control relationships which existed on October 1, 2004, shall remain in force unless changes are specifically authorized in a subsequent Act.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8072. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", \$73,992,000 shall be available until September 30, 2012, to fund prior year shipbuilding cost increases: *Provided*, That upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer funds to the following appropriations in the amounts specified: *Provided further*, That the amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the appropriations to which transferred:

To:

Under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2005/2012": LPD-17 Amphibious Transport Dock Program \$18,627,000.

Under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2006/2012": LPD-17 Amphibious Transport Dock Program \$23,437,000.

Under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2008/2012": LPD-17 Amphibious Transport Dock Program \$31,928,000.

SEC. 8073. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the Secretary of Defense may exercise the provisions of section 7403(g) of title 38, United States Code, for occupations listed in section 7403(a)(2) of title 38, United States Code, as well as the following:

Pharmacists, Audiologists, Psychologists, Social Workers, Optometrists/Prosthetists, Occupational Therapists, Physical Therapists, Rehabilitation Therapists, Respiratory Therapists, Speech Pathologists, Dietitian/Nutritionists, Industrial Hygienists, Psychology Technicians, Social Service Assistants, Practical Nurses, Nursing Assistants, and Dental Hygienists:

(1) The requirements of section 7403(g)(1)(A) of title 38, United States Code, shall apply.

(2) The limitations of section 7403(g)(1)(B) of title 38, United States Code, shall not apply.

SEC. 8074. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2012 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

SEC. 8075. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that creates or initiates a new program, project, or activity unless such program, project, or activity must be undertaken immediately in the interest of national security and only after written prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8076. The budget of the President for fiscal year 2013 submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, shall include separate budget justification documents for costs of United States Armed Forces' participation in contingency operations for the Military Personnel accounts, the Operation and Maintenance accounts, and the Procurement accounts: *Provided*, That these documents shall include a description of the funding requested for each contingency operation, for each military service, to include all Active and Reserve components, and for each appropriations account: *Provided further*, That these documents shall include estimated costs for each element of expense or object class, a reconciliation of increases and decreases for each contingency operation, and programmatic data including, but not limited to, troop strength for each Active and Reserve component, and estimates of the major weapons systems deployed in support of each contingency: *Provided further*, That these documents shall include budget exhibits OP-5 and OP-32 (as defined in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation) for all contingency operations for the budget year and the two preceding fiscal years.

SEC. 8077. None of the funds in this Act may be used for research, development, test, evaluation, procurement or deployment of nuclear armed interceptors of a missile defense system.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8078. In addition to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act, \$44,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that it shall serve the national interest, he shall make grants in the amounts specified as follows: \$20,000,000 to the United Service Organizations and \$24,000,000 to the Red Cross.

SEC. 8079. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to reduce or disestablish the operation of the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron of the Air Force Reserve, if such action would reduce the WC-130 Weather Reconnaissance mission below the levels funded in this Act:

*Provided*, That the Air Force shall allow the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron to perform other missions in support of national defense requirements during the non-hurricane season.

SEC. 8080. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for integration of foreign intelligence information unless the information has been lawfully collected and processed during the conduct of authorized foreign intelligence activities: *Provided*, That information pertaining to United States persons shall only be handled in accordance with protections provided in the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution as implemented through Executive Order No. 12333.

SEC. 8081. (a) At the time members of reserve components of the Armed Forces are called or ordered to active duty under section 12302(a) of title 10, United States Code, each member shall be notified in writing of the expected period during which the member will be mobilized.

(b) The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements of subsection (a) in any case in which the Secretary determines that it is necessary to do so to respond to a national security emergency or to meet dire operational requirements of the Armed Forces.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8082. The Secretary of Defense may transfer funds from any available Department of the Navy appropriation to any available Navy ship construction appropriation for the purpose of liquidating necessary changes resulting from inflation, market fluctuations, or rate adjustments for any ship construction program appropriated in law: *Provided*, That the Secretary may transfer not to exceed \$100,000,000 under the authority provided by this section: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may not transfer any funds until 30 days after the proposed transfer has been reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate unless a response from the Committees is received sooner: *Provided further*, That any funds transferred pursuant to this section shall retain the same period of availability as when originally appropriated: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided by this section is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 8083. For purposes of section 7108 of title 41, United States Code, any subdivision of appropriations made under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy" that is not closed at the time reimbursement is made shall be available to reimburse the Judgment Fund and shall be considered for the same purposes as any subdivision under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy" appropriations in the current fiscal year or any prior fiscal year.

SEC. 8084. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to transfer research and development, acquisition, or other program authority relating to current tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (TUAVs) from the Army.

(b) The Army shall retain responsibility for and operational control of the MQ-1C Sky Warrior Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) in order to support the Secretary of Defense in matters relating to the employment of unmanned aerial vehicles.

SEC. 8085. Up to \$15,000,000 of the funds appropriated under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Navy" may be made available for the Asia Pacific Regional Initiative Program for the purpose of enabling the Pacific Command to execute Theater Security Cooperation activities such as humanitarian assistance, and payment of incremental and

personnel costs of training and exercising with foreign security forces: *Provided*, That funds made available for this purpose may be used, notwithstanding any other funding authorities for humanitarian assistance, security assistance or combined exercise expenses: *Provided further*, That funds may not be obligated to provide assistance to any foreign country that is otherwise prohibited from receiving such type of assistance under any other provision of law.

SEC. 8086. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for research and technology, which shall remain available until September 30, 2013.

SEC. 8087. For purposes of section 1553(b) of title 31, United States Code, any subdivision of appropriations made in this Act under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy" shall be considered to be for the same purpose as any subdivision under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy" appropriations in any prior fiscal year, and the 1 percent limitation shall apply to the total amount of the appropriation.

SEC. 8088. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not more than 35 percent of funds provided in this Act for environmental remediation may be obligated under indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity contracts with a total contract value of \$130,000,000 or higher.

SEC. 8089. The Director of National Intelligence shall include the budget exhibits identified in paragraphs (1) and (2) as described in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation with the congressional budget justification books.

(1) For procurement programs requesting more than \$10,000,000 in any fiscal year, the P-1, Procurement Program; P-5, Cost Analysis; P-5a, Procurement History and Planning; P-21, Production Schedule; and P-40, Budget Item Justification.

(2) For research, development, test and evaluation projects requesting more than \$5,000,000 in any fiscal year, the R-1, RDT&E Program; R-2, RDT&E Budget Item Justification; R-3, RDT&E Project Cost Analysis; and R-4, RDT&E Program Schedule Profile.

SEC. 8090. The Secretary of Defense shall create a major force program category for space for each future-years defense program of the Department of Defense submitted to Congress under section 221 of title 10, United States Code, during fiscal year 2012. The Secretary of Defense shall designate an official in the Office of the Secretary of Defense to provide overall supervision of the preparation and justification of program recommendations and budget proposals to be included in such major force program category.

SEC. 8091. (a) Not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit a report to the congressional intelligence committees to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities pursuant to section 8092 of this Act for fiscal year 2012: *Provided*, That the report shall include—

(1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation by Expenditure Center, project, and subproject; and

(3) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

(b) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this Act shall be available for reprogramming or transfer pursuant to section 8092 of this Act until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional intelligence committees, unless the Director of National Intelligence certifies in writing 15 days in advance to the congressional intelligence committees that such reprogramming or transfer is necessary as an emergency requirement.

SEC. 8092. (a) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this or any prior appropriations Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming or transfer of funds in accordance with section 102A(d) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403-1(d)) that—

(1) creates a new program, project, or subproject,

(2) eliminates a program, project, or subproject,

(3) increases funds or personnel by any means for any program, project, or subproject,

(4) for which funds have been denied or restricted,

(5) relocates an office or employees, or

(6) reorganizes or renames an office; unless the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(b) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this or any prior appropriations Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming or transfer of funds in accordance with section 102A(d) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403-1(d)) in excess of \$1,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, that—

(1) augments existing programs, projects, or subprojects,

(2) reduces by 10 percent funding for any existing program, project, or subproject or the number of personnel by 10 percent as approved by Congress, or

(3) results from any general savings, including savings from a reduction in personnel costs, which would result in a change in existing programs, projects, or subprojects as approved by Congress;

unless the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

SEC. 8093. The Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress each year, at or about the time that the President's budget is submitted to Congress that year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a future-years intelligence program (including associated annexes) reflecting the estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations included in that budget. Any such future-years intelligence program shall cover the fiscal year with respect to which the budget is submitted and at least the four succeeding fiscal years.

SEC. 8094. For the purposes of this Act, the term "congressional intelligence committees" means the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 8095. The Department of Defense shall continue to report incremental contingency operations costs for Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom on a monthly basis in the Cost of War Execution Report as prescribed in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation

Department of Defense Instruction 7000.14, Volume 12, Chapter 23 "Contingency Operations", Annex 1, dated September 2005.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8096. During the current fiscal year, not to exceed \$11,000,000 from each of the appropriations made in title II of this Act for "Operation and Maintenance, Army", "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", and "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force" may be transferred by the military department concerned to its central fund established for Fisher Houses and Suites pursuant to section 2493(d) of title 10, United States Code.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8097. Of the funds appropriated in the Intelligence Community Management Account for the Program Manager for the Information Sharing Environment, \$22,000,000 is available for transfer by the Director of National Intelligence to other departments and agencies for purposes of Government-wide information sharing activities: *Provided*, That funds transferred under this provision are to be merged with and available for the same purposes and time period as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the Office of Management and Budget must approve any transfers made under this section: *Provided further*, That the Director of National Intelligence shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate of such transfers pursuant to section pursuant to the reprogramming procedures established in sections 8091 and 8092.

SEC. 8098. Funds appropriated by this Act for operation and maintenance may be available for the purpose of making remittances to the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund in accordance with the requirements of section 1705 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8099. (a) Any agency receiving funds made available in this Act, shall, subject to subsections (b) and (c), post on the public website of that agency any report required to be submitted by the Congress in this or any other Act, upon the determination by the head of the agency that it shall serve the national interest.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to a report if—

(1) the public posting of the report compromises national security; or

(2) the report contains proprietary information.

(c) The head of the agency posting such report shall do so only after such report has been made available to the requesting Committee or Committees of Congress for no less than 45 days.

SEC. 8100. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be expended for any Federal contract for an amount in excess of \$1,000,000, unless the contractor agrees not to:

(1) enter into any agreement with any of its employees or independent contractors that requires, as a condition of employment, that the employee or independent contractor agree to resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention; or

(2) take any action to enforce any provision of an existing agreement with an employee or independent contractor that mandates that the employee or independent contractor resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including

assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be expended for any Federal contract unless the contractor certifies that it requires each covered subcontractor to agree not to enter into, and not to take any action to enforce any provision of, any agreement as described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), with respect to any employee or independent contractor performing work related to such subcontract. For purposes of this subsection, a "covered subcontractor" is an entity that has a subcontract in excess of \$1,000,000 on a contract subject to subsection (a).

(c) The prohibitions in this section do not apply with respect to a contractor's or subcontractor's agreements with employees or independent contractors that may not be enforced in a court of the United States.

(d) The Secretary of Defense may waive the application of subsection (a) or (b) to a particular contractor or subcontractor for the purposes of a particular contract or subcontract if the Secretary or the Deputy Secretary personally determines that the waiver is necessary to avoid harm to national security interests of the United States, and that the term of the contract or subcontract is not longer than necessary to avoid such harm. The determination shall set forth with specificity the grounds for the waiver and for the contract or subcontract term selected, and shall state any alternatives considered in lieu of a waiver and the reasons each such alternative would not avoid harm to national security interests of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall transmit to Congress, and simultaneously make public, any determination under this subsection not less than 15 business days before the contract or subcontract addressed in the determination may be awarded.

SEC. 8101. (a) PROHIBITION ON CONVERSION OF FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES TO CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE.—None of the funds appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may be used to begin or announce the competition to award to a contractor or convert to performance by a contractor any functions performed by Federal employees pursuant to a study conducted under Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-76.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to the award of a function to a contractor or the conversion of a function to performance by a contractor pursuant to a study conducted under Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-76 once all reporting and certifications required by section 325 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) have been satisfactorily completed.

□ 1650

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 8101.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Chairman, this month the House has voted twice to strike problematic and anti-competitive A-76 language from H.R. 2112, the Agriculture appropriations bill, and H.R. 2017, the Department of

Homeland Security appropriations bill. The same change and reversal of bad language should be adopted in legislation today by striking this anti-competitive language.

My amendment would strike section 8101 of this legislation, which as drafted prohibits the use of funds in the underlying bill to convert any functions performed by Federal employees to private competition pursuant to a study conducted under OMB Circular A-76.

A-76 cost competitions between the public and private sector bring the best value to the taxpayer. Lifting the current moratorium will reform the way the Department of Defense does business, allowing the flexibility to manage the most effective and efficient cost ways in supporting the mission of the Department of Defense. The role of government should be to govern, not to operate business inside the government.

Currently, the Federal Government employs some 2 million executive branch, nonpostal, full-time, and permanent employees; 850,000 of these employees hold jobs that are commercial in nature. The underlying principle of A-76 is that the government should consider private sector performance of commercial services where appropriate. This notion has been consistently embraced by administrations of both political parties for more than 60 years.

Over the past 2 years, the Obama administration has pushed for an insourcing campaign within DOD. Secretary Gates put a halt on that practice recently due to what Forbes magazine on March 7, 2011, called, and I quote, "a victim of bad planning and disappointing results." Two years of shutting out private competition resulted in zero taxpayer savings.

According to a Small Business Administration study, 71 percent of A-76 goes to small business. This work is important, and must be done well, but should be done also where the taxpayer sees results and the cost benefit. Any time Congress places a restriction on agencies' ability to implement A-76, such action denies opportunity for small business.

Our Nation's unemployment rate stands at 9.1 percent. We must allow the private sector the ability to create jobs without an unfair disadvantage. The A-76 process allows the private sector just this opportunity. If competition is deemed fair, it doesn't matter who wins. As long as both sides are allowed equal opportunity for the job, the taxpayer ultimately wins.

I urge all my colleagues to support this commonsense, taxpayer-first amendment, and to ensure that cost-saving competition is available throughout the Department of Defense.

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. The gentlemen's amendment strikes section 8101 from the bill. This section provides that the Defense Department must certify compliance with a fiscal year 2008 law which requires DOD to provide an inventory of its service contracts, review those contracts, and then integrate those results into the budget process before using the OMB Circular A-76 privatization process. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

This provision is included in the fiscal year 2012 budget request. It requires that DOD exercise responsible stewardship over its contractors by providing an inventory of such contractors, a review of associated contracts, and an explanation of how these contracts are integrated into the budget. The provision requires the Department of Defense to maintain better accountability of the thousands of contractors performing services for the Department every day, and therefore maintain better accountability of funds. Striking this section releases the Department from this responsibility.

And I must tell the gentleman from Texas, who is a good friend, that we had a terrific problem getting the Department of Defense to even be able to tell us how many contractors they have. We had this problem in Iraq, we had this problem in Afghanistan, and we are still struggling. Now they give us a quarterly report of how many contractors and how many contract employees there are.

I have always believed in the A-76 review process. In fact, I had an amendment probably 25 years ago that said after you do A-76, if you contract out to the private company—if they win the competition between the government unit and the private sector—that you have to keep on analyzing what has happened to the cost. And what we found was, as soon as the thing was contracted out, the prices started to go up until we had an auditing process that looked into it. That process was taken out I think in the nineties. So we didn't have this mechanism to ensure that we were getting the best deal. And there were problems associated with pensions. Could you compare government pensions with private sector pensions?

A lot of this was worked out. But the idea of not being accountable, not having these companies, not having the government, the Defense Department know how many service contractors it has and how much. And if we are going to reduce spending, we have got to know that. We have got to understand that. And I hope that we could continue to work on this problem, because the idea that Congress doesn't get the information that is necessary to know how many people we have contracted out to is, I think, ridiculous. And I think Congress has to insist that we get this information.

Mr. SESSIONS. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield, of course.

Mr. SESSIONS. I think the gentleman brings up not only very pertinent questions that the gentleman has dealt with throughout his career about how do we effectively utilize taxpayer dollars, but I would like to suggest to you we are talking about commercial activities, mowing grass, painting buildings, lots of other things too, but doing things which are very essential to the upkeep and operation, but that within the Department of Defense the base commander has a good grasp on this.

Those people that are in the architecture group, those people that are in the operations group, they know who they're getting. And they're getting regular people who can come in and do the jobs that are specified, then leave; not have full-time employees that change oil, mow grass, do the painting, do all these things. And not in every location is it advantageous, but in some it is. And we're talking about where they can use it to their advantage. That's where this would be utilized.

So Norm, I'd like to spend a little time with you, but where it's an advantage for the Department, we're giving them the opportunity. That's what this amendment's about.

I thank the gentleman, and I yield back.

Mr. DICKS. I think the A-76 process has been a worthy one. Sometimes the contractor wins, and sometimes the unit of government reorganizes itself, and they compete, and it comes out that the government wins. So I think the A-76 process has worked. I hate to see us get rid of that.

Now, the other thing is, I think the Department has to do a better job of accountability, of being able to report how many civilian employees, how many military employees, how many contractors.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DICKS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DICKS. That is what I am trying to get to. I think the idea that they can submit their budget but not be able to tell us how many contractors there are, how many contract employees there are, is just ridiculous.

Mr. SESSIONS. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. SESSIONS. If you want to get your grass mowed at a big base, where you have a lot going on, do you care how many employees, or just that you have the guy that's supposed to cut the grass, you hold him accountable even if he has 80 people working for him? That's the point that we're trying to make. You don't have to know how many employees. You have to know that it got done at the right price. We're not doing away with the A-76 process. Your points are well made. The gentleman is dead on, and I appreciate him yielding.

Mr. DICKS. I agree with the gentleman. If we can get a better deal, let's try to get a better deal. If we can do it less expensively, we can do it less expensively.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I am sort of surprised by this amendment. It seems to me that if we want to have control over the contracts in the procurement process, if we want Congress to be able to know what is going on, if we want to be able to save money, which is what we keep talking about, you want the process that we have here.

Perhaps you want an improved process, but you want an inventory. I mean, certainly no one will deny that some, perhaps many, of the private contracts that the Pentagon lets have been wasteful. Many have not been, but certainly an inventory so that Congress can keep a closer eye on it is calculated to reduce the waste, to reduce the wasteful expenditures, to enable us to have better oversight.

So why you would want to change that? And I am given to understand that this provision originated with the Republican Congresses during the Bush administration, and, frankly, it was a good innovation. Congress ought to be able to watch more closely what any government agency that is spending the kind of money the Pentagon is spending, hundreds of billions of dollars, much of it to private contractors—we ought to be able to watch what they're doing, watch what they're doing more closely, keep an eye on it, and be able to rein it in and say, hey, wait a minute, that contract is being well administered but that one isn't; that contract we have a lot of questions about. So why would we want to eliminate that provision that has worked well?

Now, granted, it hasn't worked as well as we have wanted. Granted, we ought to improve it. Perhaps some of you can come up with an amendment with some language that would improve it.

But to get rid of it, to say we don't need that oversight, we don't need that inventory of contracts, let the Pentagon do that in the dark of night, let the Pentagon have their contracts, let their contracts and no one look at it? It seems to me rather unfrugal, rather wasteful, and not calculated to save the taxpayers money. Why would we want to do that? I don't know; so I have to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8102. (a)(1) No National Intelligence Program funds appropriated in this Act may be used for a mission critical or mission essential business management information technology system that is not registered with the Director of National Intelligence. A system shall be considered to be registered with that officer upon the furnishing notice of the system, together with such information concerning the system as the Director of the Business Transformation Office may prescribe.

(2) During the fiscal year 2012 no funds may be obligated or expended for a financial management automated information system, a mixed information system supporting financial and non-financial systems, or a business system improvement of more than \$3,000,000, within the intelligence community without the approval of the Business Transformation Investment Review Board.

(b) This section shall not apply to any programmatic or analytic systems or programmatic or analytic system improvements.

SEC. 8103. None of the funds made available under this Act may be distributed to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) or its subsidiaries.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8104. Within the funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program in this Act, up to \$132,200,000, shall be available for transfer to the Joint Department of Defense—Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, Public Law 111-84: *Provided*, That for purposes of section 1704(b), the facility operations funded are operations of the integrated Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, consisting of the North Chicago Veterans Affairs Medical Center, the Navy Ambulatory Care Center, and supporting facilities designated as a combined Federal medical facility as described by section 706 of Public Law 110-417: *Provided further*, That additional funds may be transferred from funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program to the Joint Department of Defense—Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund upon written notification by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 8105. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Directors of the Defense Agencies and Field Activities (in coordination with the appropriate Principal Staff Assistant), in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, shall report to the congressional defense committees within 60 days of enactment of this Act their plan for documenting the number of full-time contractor employees (or its equivalent), as required by United States Code title 10, section 2330a.

SEC. 8106. Section 310(b) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111-32; 124 Stat. 1871), as amended by Public Law 112-10, is amended by striking “2 years” both places it appears and inserting “3 years”.

SEC. 8107. The Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall not employ more

Senior Executive and General Schedule 15 equivalent employees than are specified in the classified annex: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall select individuals for Senior Executive positions in a manner consistent with all requirements established in statute and all Office of Personnel Management regulations, guidance and procedures governing the appointment of individuals to the Senior Executive Service for other Federal agencies: *Provided further*, That the Director of National Intelligence shall certify within 90 days of enactment of this Act to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, has revised its selection process for Senior Executive positions to conform with Office of Personnel Management regulations, requirements, and procedures: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2012, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall not appoint any individual to a Senior Executive position if that person was not serving in a Senior Executive position in fiscal year 2011 until the Director of National Intelligence has submitted its new policies and procedures to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 8108. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to pay a retired general or flag officer to serve as a senior mentor advising the Department of Defense unless such retired officer files a Standard Form 278 (or successor form concerning public financial disclosure under part 2634 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations) to the Office of Government Ethics.

SEC. 8109. Appropriations available to the Department of Defense may be used for the purchase of heavy and light armored vehicles for the physical security of personnel or for force protection purposes up to a limit of \$250,000 per vehicle, notwithstanding price or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.

SEC. 8110. Of the amounts appropriated for Military Personnel under title I of the Act, not to exceed 1 percent of each appropriation shall remain available until September 30, 2013.

SEC. 8111. Of the amounts appropriated for “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide”, \$33,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, acting through the Office of Economic Adjustment of the Department of Defense, to make grants, conclude cooperative agreements, and supplement other Federal funds, to remain available until expended, to assist the civilian population of Guam in response to the military buildup of Guam, to include addressing the need for vehicles and supplies for civilian student transportation, preservation and repository of artifacts unearthed during military construction, and construction of a mental health and substance abuse facility.

SEC. 8112. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Defense to operate more than 1,000 parking spaces provided by the combination spaces provided by the BRAC 133 project and the lease of spaces in the immediate vicinity of the BRAC 133 project.

SEC. 8113. (a) None of the funds provided in this title for Operation and Maintenance may be available for obligation or expenditure to relocate Air Force program offices, or acquisition management functions of major weapons systems, to a central location, or to any location other than the Air Force Material Command site where they are

currently located until 30 days after the Secretary of the Air Force submits the initial report under subsection (b).

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report which includes the following: a listing of all Air Force Material Command functions to be transferred and an identification of the locations where these functions will be transferred from and to; a listing of all Air Force Material Command personnel positions to be transferred and an identification of the locations these positions will be transferred from and to; and the cost benefit analysis and the life-cycle cost analysis underpinning the Secretary of the Air Forces decisions to relocate Air Force Material Command functions and personnel.

SEC. 8114. Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall resume monthly reporting of the numbers of civilian personnel end strength by appropriation account for each and every appropriation account used to finance federal civilian personnel salaries to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8115. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, \$10,000,000 is hereby appropriated, for an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army”, to remain available until September 30, 2013. Such funds may be available for the Secretary of the Army to conduct research on alternative energy resources for deployed forces.

SEC. 8116. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act for the National Intelligence Program or the Military Intelligence Program are available to establish a new federally funded research and development center (FFRDC), either as a new entity, or as a separate entity administered by an organization managing another FFRDC, or as a nonprofit membership corporation consisting of a consortium of other FFRDCs and other nonprofit entities.

(b) No member of a Board of Directors, Trustees, Overseers, Advisory Group, Special Issues Panel, Visiting Committee, or any similar entity of a defense or intelligence FFRDC, and no paid consultant to any defense or intelligence FFRDC, except when acting in a technical advisory capacity, may be compensated for his or her services as a member of such entity, or as a paid consultant by more than one FFRDC in a fiscal year: *Provided*, That a member of any such entity referred to previously in this subsection shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem as authorized under the Federal Joint Travel Regulations, when engaged in the performance of membership duties.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to a National Intelligence Program or Military Intelligence Program from any source during fiscal year 2012 may be used by a defense or intelligence FFRDC, through a fee or other payment mechanism, for construction of new buildings, for payment of cost sharing for projects funded by Government grants, for absorption of contract overruns, or for certain charitable contributions, not to include employee participation in community service and/or development.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds available to the National Intelligence Program or Military Intelligence Program during fiscal year 2012, the total level of funding and staff years of technical effort (staff years) for FFRDCs shall not exceed the allocation included in the classified annex accompanying this Act.

(e) The Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence shall, with the submission of the fiscal year 2013 budget request, submit a report presenting the specific amounts of staff years of technical effort to be allocated for each FFRDC during



that fiscal year and the associated budget estimates for the National Intelligence Programs and Military Intelligence Programs: *Provided*, That such information shall be provided in a classified manner.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for National Intelligence Program and Military Intelligence Program FFRDCs is hereby reduced by the amount specified in the classified annex.

SEC. 8117. The Secretary of Defense shall study and report to the Congressional Defense Committees the feasibility of using commercially available telecommunications expense management solutions across the Department of Defense by March 1, 2012.

SEC. 8118. None of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used to plan, prepare for, or otherwise take any action to undertake or implement the separation of the National Intelligence Program budget from the Department of Defense budget.

SEC. 8119. None of the funds appropriated in title II in this Act for "Operation and Maintenance" may be used for Information Operations/Military Information Support Operations activities.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8120. Upon a determination by the Director of National Intelligence that such action is necessary and in the national interest, the Director may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed \$1,000,000,000 of the funds made available in this Act to the intelligence community and the associated Agencies for intelligence functions (except military construction) between such appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided*, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen intelligence requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That such transfers shall be made only in accordance with sections 8091 and 8092 of the Act: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds in this Act shall be available to prepare or present a request to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate for reprogramming of funds, unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which reprogramming is requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That a request for multiple reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section shall be made prior to June 30, 2012.

SEC. 8121. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, to reflect savings from revised economic assumptions, the total amount appropriated in title II of this Act is hereby reduced by \$501,800,000, the total amount appropriated in title III of this Act is hereby reduced by \$484,800,000, and the total amount appropriated in title IV of this Act is hereby reduced by \$323,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall allocate this reduction proportionally to each budget activity, activity group, subactivity group, and each program, project, and activity, within each appropriation account.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8122. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, there is appropriated \$250,000,000, for an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", to be available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds shall only be available

to the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Office of Economic Adjustment of the Department of Defense, or for transfer to the Secretary of Education, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to make grants, conclude cooperative agreements, or supplement other Federal funds to construct, renovate, repair, or expand elementary and secondary public schools on military installations in order to address capacity or facility condition deficiencies at such schools: *Provided further*, That in making such funds available, the Office of Economic Adjustment or the Secretary of Education shall give priority consideration to those military installations with schools having the most serious capacity or facility condition deficiencies as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8123. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces; and

(2) is or was held on or after June 24, 2009, at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8124. (a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to the custody or effective control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity unless the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress the certification described in subsection (b) by not later than 30 days before the transfer of the individual.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any action taken by the Secretary of Defense to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to effectuate an order affecting the disposition of the individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction. The Secretary of Defense shall notify Congress promptly upon issuance of any such order.

(b) The certification described in this subsection is a written certification made by the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, that the government of the foreign country or the recognized leadership of the foreign entity to which the individual detained at Guantanamo is to be transferred—

(1) is not a designated state sponsor of terrorism or a designated foreign terrorist organization;

(2) maintains effective control over each detention facility in which an individual is to be detained if the individual is to be housed in a detention facility;

(3) is not, as of the date of the certification, facing a threat that is likely to substantially affect its ability to exercise control over the individual;

(4) has agreed to take effective steps to ensure that the individual cannot take action to threaten the United States, its citizens, or its allies in the future;

(5) has taken such steps as the Secretary determines are necessary to ensure that the individual cannot engage or reengage in any terrorist activity; and

(6) has agreed to share any information with the United States that—

(A) is related to the individual or any associates of the individual; and

(B) could affect the security of the United States, its citizens, or its allies.

(7) has agreed to allow appropriate agencies of the United States to have access to the individual, if requested.

(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (3), none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to the custody or effective control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity if there is a confirmed case of any individual who was detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, at any time after September 11, 2001, who was transferred to the foreign country or entity and subsequently engaged in any terrorist activity.

(2) The Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibition in paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that such a transfer is in the national security interests of the United States and includes, as part of the certification described in subsection (b) relating to such transfer, the determination of the Secretary under this paragraph.

(3) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any action taken by the Secretary to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to effectuate an order affecting the disposition of the individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction. The Secretary shall notify Congress promptly upon issuance of any such order.

(d) For the purposes of this section:

(1) The term "individual detained at Guantanamo" means any individual who is located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(A) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(B) is—

(i) in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; or

(ii) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(2) The term "foreign terrorist organization" means any organization so designated by the Secretary of State under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

SEC. 8125. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used to modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual described in subsection (c) for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) An individual described in this subsection is any individual who, as of June 24, 2009, is located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

SEC. 8126. (a) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds made available to the Department of Defense under "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide" in title II, \$1,000,000 shall be available to the Department to commission through a competitive, independent, private sector entity that is an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code, and has recognized credentials and expertise in military affairs, to

conduct a forward-looking, independent assessment of the current and prospective situation on the ground in Afghanistan and Pakistan, its impact on the surrounding region, and its consequences for United States interests. The entity shall examine 4 broad topic areas to include the strategic environment in and around Afghanistan and Pakistan, as well as security, political, and economic and reconstruction developments in those 2 countries.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entity described in subsection (a) shall submit to the President and the Congress a report on the assessment conducted under subsection (a), including relevant policy recommendations relating thereto.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the entity described in subsection (a) should be modeled on the Iraq Study Group.

SEC. 8127. Not more than \$200,000,000 of the funds made available by this Act may be expended for military musical units (as defined in section 974 of title 10, United States Code).

□ 1710

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. CARTER

Mr. CARTER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 8127 (page 122, lines 6 through 9), relating to military musical units.

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

Mr. CARTER. Madam Chair, I rise to address an issue that I think is very important to the patriotic men and women who fight and defend our country.

Representative MCCOLLUM, in good graces, asked that we restrict the military band funding by \$120 million in an attempt to save money, but the Congressional Budget Office has informed us that this reduction, this \$120 million reduction, will not save the American taxpayers one red cent, nor will it reduce the overall DOD spending.

The facts about our bands are that they are an integral part of the patriotism that keeps our soldiers' hearts beating fast. For example, over 10,000 funerals are held per year, and these bands attend these funerals. And many of us, unfortunately, in this body have had to attend military funerals in the past, and they know how much that music means to the parents of the loved ones of our lost heroes.

I have had the real great pleasure of being at welcome home celebrations at Fort Hood, which are very dramatic. The buses pull up at night across the parade ground in the dark, and then the band strikes up military music and out of the dark comes marching our soldiers into the parade ground. And the tears flow. And parents and children of the soldiers and the loved ones of the soldiers, tears come to their eyes. And that music is an integral part of it. The concerts, the ceremonies, the funerals, and the welcome home celebrations are all part of what makes our military the patriotic body that it is.

The individual bands performed as many as 1,200 musical missions during the 12- to 15-month deployments. Military bands also perform at USO and other places. The number of bands right now in the Army is 132 active duty, 51 National Guard, and 17 Reserve; Air Force, 24; the Navy, 14; and the Marines, 14.

And speaking of the Marines, Friday before last I had the first time opportunity to go to the parade at the Marine barracks here in Washington, D.C., and everyone, every red-blooded American should attend that, and every Member of Congress should attend it. And it was my first chance to do it. And that is the most patriotic-striking thing you will ever experience. And to lose something like that will be a tragedy for this country.

The total cost for the bands is \$320 million, and 282 million of those dollars is personnel cost. Now, something that many don't understand is these band members that perform, and at least two of the services I'm familiar with, the Army and the Marine Corps, have other duties. Some of them in the Marine Corps are riflemen, just like every marine is a rifleman. In the Army, most of these people work in security or military police. And if the bands were not performing, they would still be in the military. They would still have personnel costs, housing costs, and other things that would be part of the DOD expenses. So this is no extra that we are doing here. These people are still going to be employed by the military, and they're still going have to those costs. So that's why there is no real savings here.

But we are saving something that's important to this country and that is this is what makes patriotic people join the military. This is what causes young men and women to have their hearts beat fast on behalf of their country. And to lose our military bands would be a tragedy. And therefore I am asking that we adopt this amendment and that we replace these funds for these military bands so that we are able to continue this long tradition that goes back to the beginning of our country, to having bands play to celebrate military events.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, the gentleman's amendment supports the position of the subcommittee, and I support the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. And I do this very reluctantly, but I'm glad that the sponsor of the amendment has arrived, and we will let her talk about this.

Section 8127 limits spending for military bands to \$200 million for fiscal year 2012. Now, that is a lot of money and I'm a person who believes in music, believes in our bands. I have been at Fort Lewis out in my part of the country, now Joint Base Lewis-McChord, for many ceremonies. And there's no question about it; the music really does add to the whole event. But we are in a very tough fiscal period here.

During the full committee markup, this was agreed to by a voice vote. The amendment parallels similar language included in section 599(c) in the House-passed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012. So we've had the authorization committee look at it, we've had the Appropriations Committee look at it, and I think that we ought to support the position that came out of the full committee.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. MCCOLLUM. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Fellow Members, this amendment was adopted by voice in committee, and this amendment was not one that I lightly came up with. At a time when we are cutting back on WIC, which is supplements for children, at a time when we are cutting back on education and health care expenses, I kind of felt I had a duty as an appropriator to look at opportunities in which we could cut back on spending. And so I have come up with a few ideas, and I know that they, at times, haven't been the most popular. But one of them was cutting back on the amount of money we spend on military bands.

And I enjoy military bands. I have listened to a lot of them since birth. But the Army alone has over 100 bands, employing 4,600 professional musicians and support staff. The Air Force and Navy and Marines and the National Guard have dozens of bands with professional musicians we all take great pride in.

Congress needs to conduct oversight on this portion of the budget. It has grown substantially over the years. And I think we need to figure out what is the right note to have with military bands.

So that's why this amendment that I offer that was adopted in full committee did cut, but it also continued to provide \$200 million for the Pentagon to continue this fine tradition.

As families and communities across this country see critical services being reduced or eliminated, including music in public education schools all across this country, I think it is time that we ask the Pentagon to make a small sacrifice in its musical budget. And so I would ask the committee to support the original language of the bill and to reject the Carter amendment.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. NADLER. I will be brief.

First of all, I'm told that the amount in the bill here, \$200 million, is essentially the amount that is being spent now; so this is not really a reduction.

□ 1720

Secondly, I just want to add one thing to what the gentlelady from Minnesota said. Over the break we just had, I went to a food pantry operated by a church on Coney Island. There was a line out the door of about 70 or 80 people. They were giving food packets 3 days out of every month; 3 days out of every month, and trying to figure out how to scrounge enough money to give food packets 4 days out of every month. And, of course, we are cutting the budget for Women, Infants and Children. We are cutting the budget for food aid. We are cutting the budget for food stamps. We can maintain the military bands and not expand them. We have to keep this in perspective.

Yes, I love John Philip Sousa. I love military bands. I love marching bands. But people have to eat. And we are being savaged in the budget that we are passing and in the negotiations on the debt ceiling. We are being savaged on things for people to eat.

This seems the least we can do.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NADLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I hear what you're saying about these good programs that are being cut and reduced. And if this actually put money in the pockets of those programs, it would be one thing. But the facts are that the cuts that we do here do not change any amount of spending that the DOD does. These people continue to have military jobs, and they continue to get a paycheck.

Mr. NADLER. Reclaiming my time, the limitation in the bill will simply make sure that it doesn't expand. The fact is that with all of the negotiations going on and the debt ceiling and everything else, there is going to be pressure to cut everything. This amendment simply says we can expand here even though we are cutting far more important things. I think the language in the bill is sufficient. The committee did a wise job. 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 Texas (Mr. CARTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER) having assumed the chair, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, 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. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### 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.

□ 1730

#### REAFFIRMING COMMITMENT TO NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT OF ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 268) reaffirming the United States commitment to a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 268

Whereas the policy of the United States since 2002 has been to support a two-state solution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict;

Whereas a true and lasting peace between Israel and the Palestinians can only be achieved through direct negotiations between the parties and acceptance of each other's right to exist;

Whereas Palestine Liberation Organization Chair Yassir Arafat pledged in a letter to Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin on September 9, 1993, that "all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved through negotiations" a pledge that served as a critical basis for the Israeli-PLO Declaration of Principles signed 4 days later;

Whereas the unity agreement signed by Fatah and Hamas on May 4, 2011, was reached without Hamas being required to renounce violence, accept Israel's right to exist, and accept prior agreements made by the Palestinians (the "Quartet conditions");

Whereas Hamas, an organization responsible for the death of more than 500 innocent civilians, including 24 United States citizens, has been designated by the United States Government as a Foreign Terrorist Organization and a specially designated terrorist organization;

Whereas Hamas kidnapped and has held Israeli sergeant Gilad Shalit in captivity in violation of international norms since June 25, 2006;

Whereas Hamas continues to forcefully reject the possibility of peace with Israel;

Whereas Israel's Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has accepted a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and has consistently advocated for immediate direct negotiations with the Palestinians, who, in

turn, have prevented negotiations by insisting on unprecedented pre-conditions;

Whereas, on April 22, 2009, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton stated, "We will not deal with nor in any way fund a Palestinian government that includes Hamas unless and until Hamas has renounced violence, recognized Israel and agreed to follow the previous obligations of the Palestinian Authority";

Whereas United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Susan Rice, stated on February 18, 2011, that it was "unwise" for the United Nations to attempt to resolve key issues between the Israelis and Palestinians;

Whereas Palestinian leaders are pursuing a coordinated strategy to seek recognition of a Palestinian state within the United Nations and directly from foreign governments;

Whereas, on December 15, 2010, the House adopted House Resolution 1765, which reaffirmed that the House of Representatives supports a negotiated solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict resulting in two states, a democratic, Jewish state of Israel and a viable, democratic Palestinian state, living side-by-side in peace, security, and mutual recognition and opposes any attempt to establish or seek recognition of a Palestinian state outside of an agreement negotiated between Israel and the Palestinians;

Whereas current United States law precludes assistance to a Palestinian Authority which shares power with Hamas unless that Authority publicly accepts Israel's right to exist and adheres to all prior agreements and understandings with the United States and Israel;

Whereas the United States annually provides more than \$550 million annually and has provided more than \$3.5 billion cumulatively in direct bilateral assistance to the Palestinians, who are among the world's largest recipients of foreign aid per capita;

Whereas United States aid to the Palestinians is predicated on a good faith commitment from the Palestinians to the peace process including direct negotiations with Israel;

Whereas Palestinian abandonment of the Quartet conditions and inclusion of Hamas in a government would jeopardize the positive steps the Palestinian Authority has taken in building institutions and improving security in the West Bank in recent years; and

Whereas efforts to form a unity government without accepting the Quartet conditions, to bypass negotiations and unilaterally declare a Palestinian state, or to appeal to the United Nations or other international forums, or directly to foreign governments for recognition of a Palestinian state, violate the underlying principles of the Oslo Accords, the Road Map, and other relevant Middle East peace process agreements, all of which require resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through direct negotiations only: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms its strong support for a negotiated solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict resulting in two states, a democratic, Jewish state of Israel and a viable, democratic Palestinian state, living side-by-side in peace, security, and mutual recognition;

(2) states its firm belief that any Palestinian unity government must publicly and formally forswear terrorism, accept Israel's right to exist, and reaffirm previous agreements made with Israel;

(3) reiterates its strong opposition to any attempt to establish or seek recognition of a Palestinian state outside of an agreement negotiated between Israel and the Palestinians;

(4) urges Palestinian leaders to—

(A) ensure that any Palestinian government will seek peace with Israel;

(B) cease all efforts at circumventing the negotiation process, including through a unilateral declaration of statehood or by seeking recognition of a Palestinian state from other nations or the United Nations;

(C) resume direct negotiations with Israel immediately and without preconditions; and

(D) take appropriate measures to counter incitement to violence and fulfill all prior Palestinian commitments, including dismantling the terrorist infrastructure embodied in Hamas;

(5) supports the Administration's opposition to a unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state and its use of the veto at the United Nations Security Council on February 18, 2011, the most recent example of a longstanding United States policy of vetoing unbalanced United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Israel and the Israeli-Palestinian peace process;

(6) calls upon the Administration to announce that it will veto any resolution on Palestinian statehood that comes before the United Nations Security Council which is not a result of agreements reached between Israel and the Palestinians;

(7) calls upon the Administration to lead a diplomatic effort to oppose a unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state and to oppose recognition of a Palestinian state by other nations, within the United Nations, and in other international forums prior to achievement of a final agreement between Israel and the Palestinians;

(8) affirms that Palestinian efforts to circumvent direct negotiations and pursue recognition of statehood prior to agreement with Israel will harm United States-Palestinian relations and will have serious implications for the United States assistance programs for the Palestinians and the Palestinians Authority;

(9) supports the position taken by Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton on April 22, 2009, that the United States "will not deal with or in any way fund a Palestinian government that includes Hamas unless and until Hamas has renounced violence, recognized Israel and agreed to follow the previous obligations of the Palestinian Authority.";

(10) urges the administration to consider suspending assistance to the Palestinian Authority pending a review of the unity agreement; and

(11) reaffirms the United States statutory requirement precluding assistance to a Palestinian Authority that includes Hamas unless that Authority and all its ministers publicly accept Israel's right to exist and all prior agreements and understandings with the United States and Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Resolution 268.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 268, sponsored by Majority Leader CANTOR and Minority Whip HOYER, and would like to thank them for their leadership in bringing this important resolution to the floor today.

We face a perilous juncture in the history of the Middle East. Our adversaries are far from dormant, and are focused on an international effort to isolate and demonize Israel. That is why it is all the more important for the United States to stand by our democratic ally at this critical time. So let's get the facts straight, Madam Speaker.

As even Secretary Clinton noted, this Israeli Government has made unprecedented concessions in pursuit of peace. Israel has always been willing and able to make the tough sacrifices. Israel has proven its commitment to peace. Unfortunately, Israel does not have a partner for peace and security as the Palestinian leadership continues to never miss an opportunity to miss an opportunity.

Abu Mazen can utter all the right words to the Obama administration and the Europeans, who appear gullible enough to believe him; but the problem is, whenever the Palestinian leadership, past and present, has actually been asked to sign a peace agreement with Israel, it has always refused. Abu Mazen also continues to refuse to recognize Israel as a Jewish state, yet demands that Israel recognize a Palestinian state; and the media he controls through the Palestinian Authority publishes a nonstop barrage of anti-Semitic propaganda.

The Palestinian Authority has rejected every offer of peace from Israel. The PA has refused to negotiate directly with Israel. The PA has refused to recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state. It has failed to crack down on violent extremism and anti-Israel incitement. Indeed, it has even tolerated and encouraged such behavior. It has also supported boycotts of Israeli goods, and the Palestinian Authority Prime Minister, whom some consider to be a moderate, even participated in a mass burning of such goods.

Instead of negotiating directly with Israel, the Palestinian Authority is pursuing unilateral recognition of a Palestinian state, from various foreign governments, with an eye to recognition of such a state by the U.N. this fall. Palestinian leaders also keep threatening violence to extract concessions.

Abu Mazen has not only failed to recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state, but recently signed a coalition agreement with Hamas, which is committed to Israel's destruction.

To demonstrate that they are true partners for peace, what Palestinian leaders must do is simple, Madam Speaker—the opposite of what they

have been doing: sit down and negotiate directly with Israel, without preconditions; encourage Palestinians to accept Israel instead of tolerating and encouraging violent extremism and anti-Israel incitement; and recognize Israel's right to exist as a democratic Jewish state.

We must no longer demand that Israel take actions or make additional unilateral concessions that would compromise our democratic ally's safety and security.

Recent calls for Israel to return to the 1967 borders are unacceptable and dangerous. Continuing to provide assistance to the Palestinians—assistance amounting to \$2.5 billion in the last 5 years alone—is certainly not the answer. Congress must not agree to the administration's 2012 budget request, which would provide yet another \$400 million bailout to the West Bank and Gaza, including another \$200 million directly to the PA.

There are also many other steps that Congress and the administration can and must take to support our ally Israel and to encourage the advancement of peace and security in the region:

The U.S. could show its support for the Jewish state's sovereignty and right to exist by moving our Embassy to Jerusalem, Israel's eternal and undivided capital. We should demand that the United Nations stop its relentless activities to demonize Israel and the Jewish people, and put our money where our mouth is.

The most recent example of this bias is a cartoon posted by Richard Falk, which was apparently taken down just minutes ago. The U.N. Human Rights Council has appointed Mr. Falk as an "expert" to investigate and condemn Israel. I'm sure that the viewers could see or they could pull it up on the Internet what this cartoon depicts. It depicts Americans and Jews as blood-thirsty dogs.

This is not the first time that Mr. Falk has spread such venom. He has compared Israel's treatment of the Palestinians to the Holocaust, and has questioned the veracity of the 9/11 attacks, but he continues to work for the U.N. Human Rights Council, with over 20 percent of his expenses and staff support paid for by U.S. taxpayers.

Has the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights ever condemned Falk and demanded that he resign his U.N. post? Never. To the contrary, her office has published an attack by Falk on his critics. I understand that he says now that his account was hacked into and that he has taken that drawing down, but I say enough is enough.

The administration should withdraw from the biased Human Rights Council, and Congress should withhold funding from the council and other U.N. bodies that do not advance our national security interests and condition U.S. contributions on real reforms. What a concept.

Finally, Madam Speaker, instead of dealing directly with the Muslim

Brotherhood, which seeks Israel's destruction and condemned the killing of bin Laden, the U.S. should deny all legitimacy to that group no matter what fake name or label it now uses as it tries to camouflage itself into a legitimate political party in Egypt.

I am glad that this body is doing the right thing today, Madam Speaker. We have much more to do to defend our national security interests and our indispensable ally, Israel.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia, our distinguished majority leader, for authoring this important resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. I rise in strong support of H. Res. 268, the Cantor-Hoyer resolution, and I yield myself 4 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I believe negotiations are the only path to a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. For this reason, the United States Congress has every reason to be concerned about efforts by the Palestinian Authority leadership to attain recognition of statehood while bypassing the accepted negotiation process. These efforts run counter to the Palestinians' own internationally witnessed commitments at the 1991 Madrid Conference and under the 1993 Oslo agreement and the 2003 Roadmap.

That is but one reason I am deeply disappointed by the Palestinian leadership's recent push to seek recognition of an independent state at the United Nations. Indeed, even some Palestinian officials have acknowledged that such U.N. recognition of statehood gives the Palestinians nothing but an empty symbolic victory.

One thing is clear: There will be no recognition of Palestinian statehood by the Security Council, where I feel confident that the United States would use its veto, just as it has in the past, to prevent the passage of an unbalanced, anti-Israel resolution.

And what exactly would the U.N. General Assembly recognition of a Palestinian state do for the Palestinians? Absolutely nothing. It would not solve the Palestinians' need for recognized borders nor would it solve sensitive issues like the status of Jerusalem, water rights, or Palestinian refugees.

□ 1740

It would not enhance their prospect for successful negotiations. In fact, it would be seen by Israel and many others as an act of bad faith, creating yet another obstacle to successful talks.

As President Obama said in May, "For the Palestinians, efforts to delegitimize Israel will end in failure. Symbolic actions to isolate Israel at the United Nations in September won't create an independent state." A glance at recent history shows that he's right. In 1988, Yasser Arafat declared a state

and garnered recognition from more than 100 nations. Now, 23 years later, there is still no Palestinian state. The Palestinian people don't want a bunch of declarations of statehood; they want a state—and they should have one through the only means possible for attaining one, negotiations with Israel.

I believe that Palestinian Authority President Abbas and Prime Minister Fayyad are committed to a peaceful resolution of their conflict with Israel. So I hope they will return to the negotiating table and abandon their flawed U.N. strategy.

The Congress has been very generous in its support of the Palestinian Authority's worthy efforts to build institutions and the economy in the West Bank. In fact, I believe we are the most generous nation in the world in that regard. So I think our Palestinian friends should understand that if they persist in pursuing a unilateralist path, inevitably, and however regrettably, there will be consequences for U.S.-Palestinian relationships.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this important pro-negotiations, pro-peace resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am so pleased to yield 1 minute to our esteemed majority leader and co-author of this resolution, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentlelady, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I thank the leadership of the gentleman from California as well in support of this resolution.

Madam Speaker, we call today on Hamas and the Palestinian Authority to renounce the path they have set in planning to announce statehood in the upcoming United Nations session. By threatening to sidestep the principles of the Oslo Accords, the Palestinian Authority is beginning to dismantle the framework of future peace process agreements.

We have seen the death and destruction that Hamas perpetrated against both Israeli civilians and the Palestinian people in the Gaza Strip, yet Hamas refuses to accept responsibility for its actions or rein in terrorists called to strike at the heart of the Israeli people.

Today, we ask and call upon the Palestinian Authority to return to the negotiating table and join the Israelis in direct discussions to end this conflict. Furthermore, we call on the leadership of the Palestinian Authority to renounce the violence Hamas condones and teaches to its followers.

This resolution, Madam Speaker, directs the Palestinian Authority to be responsible actors on the world stage and to return to negotiations. For far too long, the Palestinian Authority has not acted on behalf of its people. Cor-

ruption has caused many to discredit its legitimacy. The people of the region deserve an honest broker that accepts and respects the state of Israel.

Israel has stood by America in its fights against extremist ideology. Madam Speaker, we stand by Israel as our most valued ally in a region in need of more who respect freedom of speech and the free assembly of people, a region that, frankly, must follow the example set by Israel in its work in promotion of human progress.

It is time for the Palestinian Authority to accept a peaceful solution to this conflict and teach their children that violence is never the answer to their problems. The Palestinian Authority must understand that peace is only achievable when they are willing to recognize the legitimacy of Israel to exist as a Jewish state. And they must understand that the solution to this conflict will only come through direct negotiations with the Israelis, and not by circumventing the peace process through international parliamentary gimmickry.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the minority whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank Mr. BERMAN for yielding. I thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN for bringing this resolution to the floor. And I am pleased to join my colleague and friend, Mr. CANTOR, in strong support of this resolution.

I believe there is only one lasting solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, a future of two states for two peoples living in security and peace with one another. Such a solution is in the best interests of regional peace and in the best interests of both parties. That is why I strongly believe that ensuring the long-term viability of the Jewish democratic State of Israel also requires supporting a homeland for the Palestinian people.

History teaches us that in conflicts such as this, one peace must be negotiated. It cannot and will not be imposed from outside or else it will rest on an unstable and temporary foundation. That is why I strongly oppose Palestinian efforts to impose a solution to the conflict at the United Nations, as well as Palestinian efforts to unilaterally declare statehood. I am concerned that a unilateral declaration will only encourage both sides to dig in and put a lasting negotiated peace further at risk.

As President Obama said, and as Mr. BERMAN has quoted—and I want to quote a little more of the President's remarks, but I will repeat some of what Mr. BERMAN said because I think it is relevant—I quote the President of the United States: "For the Palestinians, efforts to delegitimize Israel will end

in failure. Symbolic actions to isolate Israel at the United Nations in September won't create an independent state. Palestinian leaders will not achieve peace or prosperity if Hamas insists on a path of terror and rejection. And Palestinians will never realize their independence by denying the right of Israel to exist."

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

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

Mr. HOYER. I believe the President is absolutely correct. By passing this resolution, the House will make it clear that it agrees that a real peace can only come through negotiations between the two sides. That peace will only last if both sides buy into it. We all know that those negotiations have been and are now relatively nonexistent, and they will be difficult even having been entered into. They will be painful. They will require courage and sacrifice on both sides. But the hard way is also the right way. And if there is to be any hope of peace, as surely all of us pray there is, both sides must return to the table without preconditions.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. And I will continue to urge America's allies to stand against quick, unilateral, and ultimately unstable solutions to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

I thank the gentleman and the chair for bringing this resolution to the floor.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am so honored to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who is also the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Middle East and South Asia.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the distinguished chair for yielding. Israel has no greater friend than ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN from Florida.

Despite some progress that has been made toward ensuring Israel's continued security, critical challenges still exist. Rejectionist elements within the Palestinian leadership still refuse to sit and negotiate in good faith even as Israel repeatedly expresses its commitment to the establishment of a Palestinian state. These elements spurn Israeli overtures and seek to establish a Palestinian state unilaterally through a vote of the U.N. General Assembly.

Although short-term security may be achievable unilaterally, peace is not. Palestinian rejectionism, whether by Hamas or Fatah, must be abandoned. U.S. taxpayer money should, under no circumstances, go to the Palestinian government, whose members do not all abide by the Three Quartet principles: recognizing the state of Israel's right to exist; renouncing terrorism; and abiding by previous agreements.

□ 1750

And just as the U.S. should not support a Palestinian government whose

very composition is anathema to peace, so, too, should it not support an institution that offers an easy alternative to genuine peace through negotiations. That is why I recently introduced a resolution calling on the administration to cut all funding to the U.N. General Assembly should it vote to recognize a Palestinian state in direct defiance of the U.N. Security Council and the U.N. Charter. True Israeli-Palestinian peace will only be made between two peoples, Israelis and Palestinians, and not the 191 other members of the General Assembly.

Israel, like the United States, welcomes those who would make peace even as it fights those who would make war. Time and again, Israel has demonstrated its commitment to a Palestinian state living as its neighbor in peace and security, but there are no shortcuts on the path to this outcome, and there is no getting around the hard concessions that will have to be made. The U.S. must now stand with Israel and against those who would obstruct rather than advance the cause of peace.

I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. BERMAN. I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, which reaffirms support for a solution to the Israel-Palestinian conflict reached through negotiations between the Palestinians and the Israelis, and our opposition to any unilateral declaration of Palestinian statehood, or recognition of such a declaration by the United Nations.

How can a dispute between two peoples ever be resolved by the unilateral decision of one? The path to peace has been clear for many years, and provided for by Security Council resolutions and by the 1993 Oslo Accords signed by the Israelis and the Palestinians. All these agreements provide for settlement negotiated between the parties, a settlement that will result in two states, a Jewish state of Israel and a state of Palestine.

Unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state is a way of avoiding negotiations on the tough issues: final borders, secure borders, Jerusalem, and the status of the Palestinian refugees of 1948 and their descendants. It is an attempt by the Palestinians to delegitimize Israel, to impose indefensible borders unilaterally, and to get their state while retaining the ability to keep fighting Israel and to use the refugees' alleged "right of return" to undermine the survival of Israel as Jewish state.

The Palestinian Authority should instead explain to its people that a Palestinian state can be achieved only by conceding the right of a Jewish state to live in peace and security next door. And, for that to happen, there must be a negotiated agreement recognizing two states for two peoples. Evading a negotiated agreement is a formula for future war.

I urge all Members to support this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who is also the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 268, and deeply appreciate Majority Leader CANTOR; STENY HOYER; obviously the chairwoman, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN; and Mr. BERMAN, the ranking member, for authoring this resolution reaffirming the U.S. commitment to a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations.

H. Res. 268 speaks in very clear, unambiguous language about what this means: It means settlement through direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations rather than through a highly misguided, counterproductive, unilateral Palestinian declaration of statehood, or by Palestinians seeking recognition from other states or through the United Nations, sadly, the latter, a haven of anti-Israel and even sometimes anti-Semitic activity.

Direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations have been a keystone of U.S. and Israeli policy toward the region for decades, and even PLO Chair Yasser Arafat pledged to accept this way back in 1993. Unfortunately, Hamas in its 2011 unity agreement with Fatah did not accept this commitment, nor did it renounce violence.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 268 also outlines what a negotiated settlement should entail: negotiations in which each accepts the other's right to exist, and which are aimed at a two-state solution. Again, these have been key points of U.S. and Israeli policy, but Hamas, a State Department foreign terrorist organization, has rejected them.

The fact is, Madam Speaker, that U.S. law precludes foreign assistance to a P.A. which shares power with Hamas unless the P.A. publicly accepts Israel's right to exist and adheres to all prior agreements between Israel and the PLO. The U.S. Government has been extremely generous to the P.A., providing over \$550 million annually.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. So the resolution wisely reaffirms this law and urges the administration to consider suspending assistance to the P.A. pending a review of the unity agreement between Fatah and Hamas.

It is our policy, and it is Israel's policy, Madam Speaker, to promote a realistic, sustainable peace process, one that entails negotiations between the two parties to the conflict, represented by groups that seek a two-state solution, and renounces violence. Hamas has shown none of that.

Mr. BERMAN. I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentledady from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 268.

This important resolution reaffirms our Nation's unwavering commitment to a negotiated settlement of the Israel-Palestinian conflict, which can only be achieved through direct Israeli-Palestinian peace talks.

Since 1948, when the United States became the first country to recognize the Jewish State of Israel, we have always stood by her side as a strong ally and friend. This resolution is no exception. As each day brings a new set of complex changes to the Middle East, it is more vital than ever that we protect and strengthen that friendship. From insisting that Hamas reject terrorism and accept Israel's right to exist, to supporting the Obama administration's opposition to the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state, H. Res. 268 reaffirms the sense of the Congress and the Obama administration that we must continue to stand strong with our democratic ally against hostile enemies and attempts at delegitimization.

In doing so, we continue to demonstrate our stalwart support that we have provided as a country for more than six decades.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, it is indeed an honor to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida, my colleague, Colonel West, an American hero.

Mr. WEST. I thank the gentledady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I stand today in support of House Resolution 268, which does reaffirm the strong support of this body politic to a negotiated solution for Israel and Palestine.

The important thing that we have to see happen, though, is to urge the Palestinian leaders to first and foremost ensure that any Palestinian government will seek peace with Israel, as we sat here and listened to Prime Minister Netanyahu say, "There will not be peace until we have a dedicated peace partner."

The second thing, we must make sure that the leaders of the Palestinian people cease all efforts at circumventing the negotiation process, including through a unilateral declaration of statehood or by seeking recognition of a Palestinian state from other nations or the United Nations.

But third, and probably most important, that the Palestinian leaders must take appropriate measures to counter the incitement to violence and fulfill all prior Palestinian commitments, including dismantling the terrorist infrastructure that is embodied with Hamas.

Israel is a bright and shining beacon which is in a sea of despots, dictators, theocrats, and autocrats. The Palestinian leaders can choose to be a part of this light.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank the ranking member.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 268 that affirms the United States' support for a negotiated solution to the Israel-Palestinian conflict.

Setting preconditions on negotiations is just an excuse to maintain the status quo. If President Abbas is serious about peace, then he should focus all of his energies and all the energies of his people on negotiations with Israel. An agreement won't be easy, but the outlines of an agreement are well-known. All that is really necessary now is leadership from both sides.

So this leadership sets firmly U.S. policy. We are a rock solid friend of Israel, and anyone else who seeks peace with them. But this also means that we stand against those who seek to circumvent the peace process by running to the U.N. General Assembly for a declaration that may score political points but is going to set back the peace process for years.

Now more than ever, Madam Speaker, with turmoil on every border of Israel, we need to stand with them as an ally. We want peace. Israel wants peace. Peace can only happen with negotiations. All we are missing is a true Palestinian partner.

□ 1800

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I would like to yield 2 minutes to another Florida colleague (Mrs. ADAMS), a veteran of the U.S. Air Force.

Mrs. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 268, which would reaffirm America's commitment to a negotiated solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict resulting in two states: a democratic Jewish State of Israel and a democratic Palestinian state living in peace and mutual recognition.

For six decades, throughout 12 American Presidents and 12 Israeli Prime Ministers, Israel has stood as a beacon of democracy in an unstable region and has remained a loyal and committed friend to the United States. As Americans, we must continue to honor the promise of democracy and liberty around the world—we owe no less than that to our closest friend in the Middle East. This is why we'll continue to stand with Israel, continue to honor our friendship, and to continue my commitment to encouraging a negotiated peace that both the Israelis and the Palestinians have agreed to—not one that is imposed upon them.

The United States should not and cannot dictate how peace can be reached with the Palestinians, especially when they are willing to allow Hamas, a terrorist organization, to participate in any of their elections. This is why I strongly disagree with

the President's strategy to force Israel into a peace they have not negotiated.

Again, I want to rise in support of H. Res. 268. I believe that the only peace will be a negotiated peace between Israel and the Palestinians without any influence of terrorists.

Mr. BERMAN. I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to my friend and partner in so many of these efforts, the gentledady from New York, the ranking member of the House Foreign Operations Subcommittee of Appropriations, Mrs. LOWEY.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution, and I thank the ranking member for his leadership, and the chair.

Last week I traveled to Israel, where I saw the determination, ingenuity, and resourcefulness of that young nation. In a volatile region, Israel is a strong democracy. Despite many setbacks, the country still longs for peace. Yet unilateral actions by the Palestinian Authority diminish prospects for negotiations and threaten progress.

We must do everything within our power to stand by our ally Israel, to persuade the Palestinians to abandon their efforts in the U.N., break with the terrorist group Hamas, and return to the negotiating table with Israel without preconditions. This resolution is a strong statement in support of peace. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

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

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 268.

This resolution reaffirms congressional support for direct negotiations between Israeli and Palestinian leaders in an effort to achieve peace in this over six-decade-long struggle.

While the Palestinian pursuit of a state is understandable, the attempt to bypass the peace process by going first to the United Nations is inappropriate. It is a disgrace and an offense to the U.N. Charter and all acceptable norms of international law to create or recognize a state that itself will not first forsake terrorism, violence, ethnic hatred, and genocide.

If a vote for Palestinian statehood comes to the U.N. Security Council, the U.S. must veto and do so until a peace agreement is achieved and maintained between the Israelis and the Palestinians.

Now is not the time for either party to remove themselves from the negotiating table. Peace will not be attained with only one side seeking it. I urge my colleagues to reassert American commitment to direct negotiations by supporting H. Res. 268.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, may I ask for the time remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentlelady from Florida has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BERMAN. I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. DEUTCH.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank the ranking member from California, and I thank the chair of the committee.

Madam Speaker, I rise to support House Resolution 268, reaffirming our Nation's unyielding support for our great ally Israel. Madam Speaker, the lack of progress in the peace process thus far stems from the Palestinians' refusal to negotiate despite historic Israeli concessions. They could choose dialogue, they could choose peace—instead they have chosen violence and hatred by partnering with Hamas.

Israel cannot be expected to negotiate with an organization that refuses to accept the internationally recognized Quartet principles, continues to murder innocent Israelis, and refuses to free Israeli soldier Gilad Shalit.

This resolution comes to us as the PA pursues plans to avoid direct negotiations altogether and unilaterally declare statehood at the United Nations.

Madam Speaker, just weeks ago here in this Chamber, Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu reminded us what we clearly already know—that peace cannot be imposed; peace must be negotiated. By passing this resolution, Congress will uphold this principle, will reaffirm our commitment to Israel's security, and will express our unyielding support for the Israeli people in their quest for a true and lasting peace. I urge a "yes" vote on this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished member of our committee, the ranking member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I rise in strong support of the resolution.

I come from the premise that if you want to work out a disagreement, you sit face to face at the negotiating table and negotiate. That's what happened in Ireland, and it should happen in the Middle East.

But the Palestinians are playing their cute little games. They want to establish a lot of preconditions, they want to make excuses not to sit and talk with Israel, and they think they can impose this at the U.N. and impose statehood without face-to-face negotiations.

So I say "no" to excuses, "no" to 1967 lines, "no" to all kinds of preconditions before Palestinians will even sit down and talk.

The only way, if the Palestinians are truly wanting peace, they have a willing partner in Israel. As Prime Minister Netanyahu said, There is no Palestinian state not because we don't

support one; it's because the Palestinians won't recognize the Jewish State.

So I believe in two states side by side: a Jewish State of Israel and an Arab-Palestinian state. And, again, that can only happen with face-to-face negotiations. No preconditions. Let the parties sit down and talk.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas, a former member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. GREEN.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague, the ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Committee, for allowing me to speak.

I rise in strong support of H. Res. 268, a resolution reaffirming our Nation's commitment to a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

As cochair of the Democratic Israel Working Group, I would like to thank my colleagues, both Republican Leader ERIC CANTOR and our Democratic Whip STENY HOYER, for bringing this important bipartisan resolution to the floor.

I have been to Israel and the West Bank on numerous occasions. I can personally vouch for the desire of the people of Israel and the Palestinian territories to come to a peaceful settlement that will end decades of discord and violence.

A negotiated two-state settlement between the Israelis and Palestinians is the keystone of the peace process. It is the official policy of the U.S. government, the Israeli government, and, until recently, the Palestinian Authority.

Only through direct negotiations can difficult compromises be reached on core issues like borders, water, refugees, the status of Jerusalem, and security. Attempts to bypass direct negotiations and seek recognition of a unilaterally declared Palestinian state by the U.N. General Assembly will not help the Palestinian people. Instead, such a declaration will undermine the peace process and endanger the security and well-being of the very people it claims to support.

□ 1810

A unilaterally declared Palestinian state will lead to a greater height in tensions, turn the region into a powder keg, and invite terrorist groups such as Hamas and Hezbollah to take advantage. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to a member of the committee, the ranking member of the Oversight Committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN).

Mr. CARNAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 268 and call upon my colleagues to strongly support this resolution.

It reaffirms the long-held U.S. commitment to Israel and the negotiated settlement by and between the Israelis

and Palestinians. The future of Israel is inextricably linked to that of its neighbors in the Middle East and North Africa. With gas prices rising, conflicts in that region have a direct impact on Americans here at home.

I have long supported a two-state solution to the conflict, with Israel as the recognized home of the Jewish people and a strong Palestinian state to promote the well-being of the Palestinians as well.

The U.S. and our allies must support this process. We must allow the two parties to come together and negotiate a settlement. This is the best avenue to achieve a lasting peace. I want to say that I strongly oppose Palestinian attempts for unilateral recognition through the U.N. that would delegitimize this peace process.

A fellow Missourian, Harry Truman, recognized Israel within minutes of its declaration of independence. We must continue this kind of support for Israel and for our allies striving for peace together. I urge support of this resolution and look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on this issue in the months ahead.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank my very good friend from California for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, the Middle East peace process is at risk of collapse, and I believe that only American leadership can save it. Both sides can and should do more to restart negotiations.

House Resolution 268, despite the fact that it has virtually unanimous support from this body and includes a laudable reaffirmation of the United States' commitment to a negotiated solution to the conflict, in fact falls short of the kind of leadership that I believe is needed. This resolution chastises the Palestinians for seeking to bridge the divide in their own community and for pursuing recognition of their state at the United Nations.

On the first point, I think we should give the Palestinian Authority, which has done an impressive job of developing institutions and its economy in the West Bank, some credit. They have tried to provide the leadership to pursue the goals that we have encouraged them to do; and they have, I think, done so in terms of developing democratic institutions in a way that we should be proud of because we had a role in that, a major role.

There is no indication they have any inclination to allow Hamas to jeopardize those gains that have been achieved in the West Bank. And thus far the reconciliation agreement between Hamas and Fatah has yet to yield any progress on a unity government. In fact, at this point it is unclear that it really will. So in many ways, the purpose for bringing forth this resolution is moot.



Should Hamas be invited to join a Palestinian unity government without accepting the conditions of The Quartet, the European Union, the United Nations, United States, Russia, those are the internationally designated bodies that have come forward with an agreement we have agreed to, if they invite Hamas to join a coalition government without accepting the conditions that we insist upon, it will have very serious implications for our relationship. And that should be the reason why we should cut off financial aid.

In 2006, Palestinian elections, which in fact were advanced by the Bush administration, are what brought Hamas into power. In reaction, the United States, as well as The International Quartet, suspended assistance to the Palestinian Authority. And the Obama administration is continuing that policy. There is no aid going to Gaza.

We need to recognize that Palestinian unity is crucial to a long-term peace. Gaza's separation from the West Bank, though, has made it impossible to advance meaningful negotiations with Israel.

Madam Speaker, there is insufficient time to lay out the other argument.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, there is insufficient time to lay out the other side to what has been presented. I don't particularly have strong disagreement with many of the points that have been made, but I do think there is another perspective to this. It ought to be advanced in this body.

I thank my good friend for yielding me the time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 45 seconds.

Mr. BERMAN. There are two important issues raised by this one resolution. One seems a little more distant than it did at the time it was introduced, and that was the possibility of a unity government that included an organization that is on our terrorist list, that subscribes to violence, to the elimination of the State of Israel, and refuses to recognize past agreements in a unity government. Hopefully, that agreement, the chances of it are diminishing.

The second point is a strategy which violates the Palestinians' own commitments that they made in Madrid, that they made part of the roadmap, that were made in the context of the Oslo agreements that they will negotiate directly with the Israelis to resolve this conflict. I think it is all appropriate to point out that should they pursue that course, the assistance that we have very generously given them, that they have put to good use, might well be terminated.

I urge an "aye" vote on this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), who is also the chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe and Eurasia in our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank my chairman for yielding.

Israel's right to exist, Madam Speaker, should be guaranteed. And Israel has tried to work out over the years a peace agreement with the Palestinians so that there could be a two-state solution. In fact, twice, once during the term of Prime Minister Barak and again during the term of Prime Minister Olmert, Israel offered the Palestinians a very generous and fair final settlement. Both times those offers were flatly rejected and met with violence.

And what have the Palestinian Authority and the Palestinians done recently? They went and signed an agreement with Hamas. Hamas is a terrorist organization that has been lobbing bombs and missiles into Israel, trying to destroy the Israeli state. They are committed to the destruction of Israel. And the Palestinians have signed an agreement on May 4 of this year to work with them.

Israel went that extra step when they allowed Gaza to be turned open. And what happened right after that took place? Hamas came in there and took over and started attacking Israel day after day. Innocent women and children were running constantly from bombs being dropped on them because Gaza had been set in a position where they could open up to Hamas.

And so you have got a constant demand by the terrorists—Hamas, Hezbollah and others—to destroy the State of Israel. And Israel has been a great ally of the United States since its inception in 1948.

□ 1820

We need to send a very strong signal—I think we are doing it right now today—a very strong signal that this country, this Congress, and the Senate supports the State of Israel and does not want the Palestinians to go to the United Nations and try to have a unilateral settlement made by that body. This is something that has to be worked out at the conference table between Israel and the Palestinians and not at the United Nations.

So I would just like to conclude by saying that Israel is our best friend and ally in the Middle East. They are a stable element in the Middle East. We need to support them and make absolutely sure that Hamas, Hezbollah, and the other terrorist organizations do not have their way and destroy the State of Israel.

We are committed to that, this Congress is committed to that, and this whole debate has shown very clearly that almost unanimously the people of the United States stand with Israel.

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 268, reaffirming the United States' commitment to a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations.

We all know that the only way to achieve a true and lasting peace between Israel and the Palestinians is through direct negotiations between the parties. But the Palestinians have been refusing to negotiate with Israel for over a year, using excuse after excuse to stay away from the bargaining table. The Israelis, meanwhile, have accepted the principle of a two-state solution and have pushed for immediate, direct negotiations with the Palestinians.

If I were the Palestinian leadership, which claims simply to want an independent state, I would be clamoring for immediate, direct negotiations. Nothing could stop me from sitting down at the negotiating table and finding a lasting settlement to these issues so that my people could finally achieve statehood.

But while Israel waits for a partner at the bargaining table, the Palestinians have turned away and instead asked that the United Nations prematurely recognize a Palestinian state, though its borders have not been determined, the status of Jerusalem has not been settled and the Palestinians still insist on an unprecedented "right of return" for refugees. Further, Israel still faces real threats to its security in the form of terror attacks: between April and July of this year alone, Israel was on the receiving end of hundreds of missiles fired from Gaza. The Palestinians' end-run around the negotiations is just another attempt by the Palestinians to gain the upper hand and embarrass Israel rather than finding a peaceful solution to this tragic conflict.

Complicating matters further is the agreement signed between Fatah and Hamas, a terrorist organization, to form a unity government within the Palestinian Authority. Israel cannot be expected to negotiate with terrorists, and no one should ask them to do so. And yet, PA president Mahmoud Abbas decided to cast his lot not with the moderates but with the extremists and terrorists who seek Israel's destruction, rather than a peaceful solution to the conflict.

The United Nations and the world community must reject Hamas as a legitimate representative of the Palestinians and must turn back any Palestinian attempts to avoid the negotiating table. We must insist on immediate, direct negotiations as the only path to peace. I therefore urge strong support for this resolution.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I do not intend to oppose this measure because I agree with its basic premise: that the United States Congress strongly supports a negotiated two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and opposes any action that will make such an outcome harder to achieve.

However, I have serious reservations about several of the assertions this resolution makes—as well as those it doesn't make—about recent developments in, and U.S. policy toward, Israel and the Palestinian territories. These concerns are more than abstract: at a time of generational change in the Middle East, the positions that this Congress takes on an issue of such vital importance will have lasting implications for our nation's goals and interests in the region.

For two decades, irrespective of which party has controlled the White House or Congress,

the central aim of U.S. policy toward the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has been to encourage a negotiated resolution based on the principle of a democratic, Jewish state of Israel living side by side in peace and security with a viable, democratic Palestinian state. Republican and Democratic presidents alike have affirmed that such an outcome will only be achieved through direct negotiations between the two parties, and have opposed any action by either side that undermines or diminishes the prospects for a negotiated peace.

To be sure, the Palestinian leadership's intent to pursue diplomatic recognition at the United Nations qualifies as such an action, and on this point I agree with the sponsors of this resolution. I also share their concerns about the prospect of a Palestinian unity government that does not recognize Israel's right to exist or renounce violence against innocent civilians. Either development would represent a major setback for the peace process as we know it, and Congress is right to warn Palestinian leaders about the consequences of their course of action.

But as usual, the resolution before us today tells only half the story. It says nothing about Israel's responsibility to act as a serious negotiating partner and abide by its previous commitments under the Road Map and other agreements. It says nothing about Israel's refusal to halt settlement construction in order to allow direct negotiations to resume—even when the Obama Administration offered a lavish package of aid and assurances for Israel to do something that was manifestly in its own interest to begin with. It condemns the Palestinian president for his unilateral actions while failing to comprehend that it has been Israel's intransigence that has led him to view the United Nations as his only recourse. And as usual, the resolution has been rushed to the floor without any serious debate or any opportunity for input from the many members of this body who care about this critical issue.

This resolution is also being considered at a pivotal moment in the history of the peace process, as well as the history of the broader Middle East. After years of false starts and broken promises, the prospects for a negotiated peace appear as dim today as at any time in recent memory, and may grow dimmer still as the political winds in the Arab world shift in unpredictable ways. Now, perhaps more than ever before, strong and decisive U.S. leadership is needed to persuade both sides of the urgency of the moment and bring them back to the negotiating table. It is only a matter of time before there is no table left around which to negotiate.

Yet instead of urging the President to redouble his commitment to the pursuit of peace, we are urging him to lead a diplomatic initiative to oppose Palestinian recognition. Instead of encouraging him to bring the full weight of American ideas, influence, and resources to bear on this critical issue, we are asking him to suspend U.S. assistance to the Palestinian Authority—the very assistance that has been so essential to laying the foundations for a future Palestinian state. Instead of congratulating him for his efforts to revive the stalled negotiations by outlining his ideas for the boundaries of a future Palestinian state, too many of my colleagues seem more interested in manufacturing a controversy for political gain. Unfortunately, the current Israeli prime minister seems all too willing to play along,

despite the fact that the two previous U.S. presidents—not to mention at least two former Israeli prime ministers—have advocated positions nearly identical to that outlined by President Obama.

So while I will cast my vote in favor of H. Res. 28, I am reminded of the story of Nero playing the fiddle as Rome burns. The Middle East is transforming before our eyes, and the window of opportunity for the United States to achieve a just and lasting resolution to this age-old conflict may be closing rapidly. We should seize this moment of opportunity and recommit ourselves to the pursuit of peace before it is too late.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. While I certainly share the hope for peace in the Middle East and a solution to the ongoing conflict, I do not believe that peace will result if we continue to do the same things while hoping for different results. The U.S. has been involved in this process for decades, spending billions of dollars we do not have, yet we never seem to get much closer to a solution. I believe the best solution is to embrace non-interventionism, which allows those most directly involved to solve their own problems.

This resolution not only further entangles the U.S. in the Israeli/Palestinian dispute, but it sets out the kind of outcome the United States would accept in advance. While I prefer our disengagement from that conflict, I must wonder how the U.S. expects to be seen as an "honest broker" when it dictates the term of a solution in such a transparently one-sided manner. In the resolution before us, all demands are made of only one side in the conflict. Do supporters of this resolution really believe the actors in the Middle East and the rest of the world do not notice? We do no favors to the Israelis or to the Palestinians when we involve ourselves in such a manner and block any negotiations that may take place without U.S. participation. They have the incentives to find a way to live in peace and we must allow them to find that solution on their own. As always, congressional attitudes toward the peace process in the Middle East reveal hubris and self-importance. Only those who must live together in the Middle East can craft a lasting peace between Israel and Palestine.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 268.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### BELARUS DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 2011

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and

pass the bill (H.R. 515) to reauthorize the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 515

*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 "Belarus Democracy and Human Rights Act of 2011".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS; STATEMENT OF POLICY.

Sections 2 and 3 of the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004 (Public Law 109-480; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note) is amended to read as follows:

#### "SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

"Congress finds the following:

"(1) The Government of Belarus has engaged in a pattern of clear and uncorrected violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

"(2) The Government of Belarus has engaged in a pattern of clear and uncorrected violations of basic principles of democratic governance, including through a series of fundamentally flawed presidential and parliamentary elections undermining the legitimacy of executive and legislative authority in that country.

"(3) The Government of Belarus has subjected thousands of pro-democratic political activists to harassment, beatings, and jailings, particularly as a result of their attempts to peacefully exercise their right to freedom of assembly and association.

"(4) The Government of Belarus has attempted to maintain a monopoly over the country's information space, targeting independent media, including independent journalists, for systematic reprisals and elimination, while suppressing the right to freedom of speech and expression of those dissenting from the dictatorship of Aleksandr Lukashenka, and adopted laws restricting the media, including the Internet, in a manner inconsistent with international human rights agreements.

"(5) The Government of Belarus continues a systematic campaign of harassment, repression, and closure of nongovernmental organizations, including independent trade unions and entrepreneurs, and this crackdown has created a climate of fear that inhibits the development of civil society and social solidarity.

"(6) The Government of Belarus has subjected leaders and members of select ethnic and religious minorities to harassment, including the imposition of heavy fines and denying permission to meet for religious services, sometimes by selective enforcement of the 2002 Belarus religion law.

"(7) The Government of Belarus has attempted to silence dissent by persecuting human rights and pro-democracy activists with threats, firings, expulsions, beatings and other forms of intimidation, and restrictions on freedom of movement and prohibition of international travel.

"(8) The dictator of Belarus, Aleksandr Lukashenka, established himself in power by orchestrating an illegal and unconstitutional referendum that enabled him to impose a new constitution, abolishing the duly elected parliament, the 13th Supreme Soviet, installing a largely powerless National Assembly, extending his term in office, and removing applicable term limits.

"(9) The Government of Belarus has failed to make a convincing effort to solve the cases of disappeared opposition figures Yuri Zakharenka, Viktor Gonchar, and Anatoly Krasovsky and journalist Dmitry Zavadsky, even though credible allegations and evidence links top officials of the Government to these disappearance.

“(10) The Government of Belarus has restricted freedom of expression on the Internet by requiring Internet Service Providers to maintain data on Internet users and the sites they view and to provide such data to officials upon request, and by creating a government body with the authority to require Internet Service Providers to block Web sites.

“(11) On December 19, 2010, the Government of Belarus conducted a presidential election that failed to meet the standards of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) for democratic elections.

“(12) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election the Government of Belarus responded to opposition protests by beating scores of protestors and detaining more than 600 peaceful protestors.

“(13) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election the Government of Belarus jailed seven of the nine opposition presidential candidates and abused the process of criminal prosecution to persecute them.

“(14) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election, the Government of Belarus disrupted independent broadcast and Internet media, and engaged in repressive actions against independent journalists.

“(15) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election, Belarusian security services and police conducted raids targeting civil society groups, individual pro-democracy activists, and independent media.

“(16) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election, Belarusian officials refused to extend the mandate of the OSCE Office in Minsk.

“(17) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election, opposition candidates and activists have been persecuted and detainees have been physically mistreated, and denied access to family, defense counsel, medical treatment, and open legal proceedings.

“(18) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election, lawyers representing those facing criminal charges related to the post-election protest have been subjected to the revocation of licenses, disbarment, and other forms of pressure.

“(19) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election, the Government of Belarus has convicted political detainees to harsh prison sentences.

“(20) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election, the United States and European Union imposed targeted travel and financial sanctions on an expanded list of officials of the Government of Belarus.

“(21) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election, the United States fully restored sanctions against Belarus's largest state-owned petroleum and chemical conglomerate and all of its subsidiaries.

“(22) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election, the United States has engaged in assistance efforts to provide legal and humanitarian assistance to those facing repression and preserving access to independent information, and has pledged resources to support human rights advocates, trade unions, youth and environmental groups, business associations, think-tanks, democratic political parties and movements, independent journalists, newspapers and electronic media operating both inside Belarus and broadcasting from its neighbors, and to support access of Belarusian students to independent higher education and expand exchange programs for business and civil society leaders.

“(23) The Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, and other executive branch agencies have heretofore made effective use of this Act to promote the purposes of this Act, as stated in section 3 of this Act.

### “SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

“It is the policy of the United States to—  
“(1) condemn the conduct of the December 19, 2010, presidential election and crackdown on opposition candidates, political leaders, and activists, civil society representatives, and journalists;

“(2) continue to call for the immediate release without preconditions of all political prisoners in Belarus, including all those individuals detained in connection with the December 19, 2010, presidential election;

“(3) continue to support the aspirations of the people of Belarus for democracy, human rights, and the rule of law;

“(4) continue to support the aspirations of the people of Belarus to preserve the independence and sovereignty of their country;

“(5) continue to support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in Belarus, which empower the people of Belarus to end tyranny in their country;

“(6) continue to refuse to accept the results of the fundamentally flawed December 19, 2010, presidential election held in Belarus, and to support calls for new presidential and parliamentary elections, conducted in a manner that is free and fair according to OSCE standards;

“(7) continue to call for the fulfillment by the Belarusian government of Belarus's freely undertaken obligations as an OSCE participating state;

“(8) continue to call for a full accounting of the disappearances of opposition leaders and journalists in Belarus, including Victor Gonchar, Anatoly Krasovskiy, Yuri Zakharenka, and Dmitry Zavadsky, and the prosecution of those individuals who are in any way responsible for the disappearance of those opposition leaders and journalists;

“(9) continue to work closely with the European Union and other countries and international organizations, to promote the conditions necessary for the integration of Belarus into the European family of democracies;

“(10) call on the International Ice Hockey Federation to suspend its plan to hold the 2014 International World Ice Hockey championship in Minsk until the Government of Belarus releases all political prisoners; and

“(11) remain open to reevaluating United States policy toward Belarus as warranted by demonstrable progress made by the Government of Belarus consistent with the aims of this Act as stated in this section.”

### SEC. 3. RADIO AND TELEVISION BROADCASTING TO BELARUS.

Section 5 of the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004 (Public Law 109-480; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note) is amended to read as follows:

#### “SEC. 5. RADIO, TELEVISION, AND INTERNET BROADCASTING TO BELARUS.

“It is the sense of Congress that the President should continue to support radio, television, and Internet broadcasting to the people of Belarus in languages spoken in Belarus, by Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, the Voice of America, European Radio for Belarus, and Belsat.”

### SEC. 4. SANCTIONS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF BELARUS.

Section 6 of the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004 (Public Law 109-480; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “or expression, including those individuals jailed based on political beliefs or expression in connection with repression that attended the presidential election of December 19, 2010” before the period at the end;

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, including politically motivated legal charges made in connection with repression that attended the presidential election of December 19, 2010” before the period at the end;

(C) in paragraph (5), by inserting “and violations of human rights, including violations of human rights committed in connection with the presidential election of December 19, 2010” before the period at the end; and

(D) in paragraph (7), by striking “internationally recognized observers” and inserting “OSCE observers”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “subparagraph (A)” and inserting “paragraph (1)”; and

(ii) by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(4) is a member of any branch of the security or law enforcement services of Belarus and has participated in the violent crackdown on opposition leaders, journalists, and peaceful protestors that occurred in connection with the presidential election of December 19, 2010; or

“(5) is a member of any branch of the security or law enforcement services of Belarus and has participated in the persecution or harassment of religious groups, human rights defenders, democratic opposition groups, or independent media or journalists.”;

(3) in subsection (e), by striking “of each international financial institution to which” and inserting “at each international financial institution of which”;

(4) in subsection (f)(2)(B)(ii), by striking “(as defined in section 40102 of title 49, United States Code)”.

### SEC. 5. REPORT.

Section 8(a) of the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004 (Public Law 109-480; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “this Act” and inserting “the Belarus Democracy and Human Rights Act of 2011”;

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking “sale or delivery of weapons or weapons-related technologies” and inserting “sale or delivery or provision of weapons or weapons-related technologies or weapons-related training”;

(3) in paragraph (2), by striking “involved in the sale” and inserting “or weapons-related training involved in the sale or delivery or provision”;

(4) in paragraph (3), by inserting “or weapons-related training described in paragraph (1)” before the period at the end; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) The cooperation of the Government of Belarus with any foreign government or organization for purposes related to the censorship or surveillance of the Internet, or the purchase or receipt by the Government of Belarus of any technology or training from any foreign government or organization for purposes related to the censorship or surveillance of the Internet.”

### SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

Section 9 of the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004 (Public Law 109-480; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “Committee on International Relations” and inserting “Committee on Foreign Affairs”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “and prosecutors” and inserting “, prosecutors, and heads of professional associations and educational institutions”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “Lukashenka regime” and inserting “Government of Belarus”.

### SEC. 7. FUNDING FOR REPORT.

The requirement to prepare and transmit the report required under section 8 of the

Belarus Democracy Act of 2004 (Public Law 109-480; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note), as amended by section 5 of this Act, shall be performed within current levels of authorized and appropriated funding.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I ask that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 515.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank Chairman SMITH and Chairman BACHUS for their cooperation in allowing this bill to proceed so swiftly to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 515, the Belarus Democracy and Human Rights Act of 2011.

I would like to thank my distinguished colleague and friend, Mr. SMITH, for introducing this timely and important measure.

Belarus has been correctly deemed the last dictatorship of Europe. Under the iron hand of Lukashenko, the Belarusian people have endured the systemic denial and violation of their basic freedoms and human rights.

The authorities in Belarus have severely restricted free speech and independent media. Prodemocracy political activists are subject to beatings and imprisonment. The regime's heavy-handed tactics were fully utilized in last December's fraudulent election for president.

According to our own Department of State's Human Rights Report: "Authorities denied citizens the right to change their government, manipulating the December 19 presidential election to ensure that the president would not be seriously challenged.

"Security forces beat detainees and protesters, used excessive force to disperse peaceful demonstrators, and reportedly used torture during investigations.

"A crackdown on post-election demonstrations led to the arrest of over 700 activists, including criminal charges against five presidential candidates and numerous activists and journalists."

Unfortunately, the regime, despite its repeated promises of reform, continues this campaign of repression against its own people.

In response to the rumors that peaceful protesters were planning to gather on Belarusian Independence Day, July 3, just recently, to show their opposition to the regime by clapping their hands, the dictator stated, "Stomping, clapping, bellowing and roaring on squares and streets cannot solve problems. The state has the resources and power to pacify those who violate the law and the constitution."

We have now seen Lukashenko did indeed use the state's power to pacify

the demonstrators. How? He ordered the authorities to start by firing tear gas at the protesters, followed by the violent beating and imprisonment of those who dared to clap their hands. Over 300 activist were arrested and today 140 were convicted on such dubious charges as being hooligans or participating in unsanctioned demonstrations.

This unrelenting persecution of the Belarusian people by the regime is simply unacceptable. The U.S. and other responsible nations must support the prodemocracy forces in Belarus and hold the authoritarian regime in Minsk accountable for its growing abuses.

That's why I am pleased to support this important measure which, among other things, condemns the conduct of the recent presidential elections and the crackdown on opposition candidates and activists, expresses a sense of Congress that the President should continue to support radio, television and Internet broadcasting to the people of Belarus and expand on existing sanctions, including the denial of visas to any member of the Belarusian Government who participated in the crackdown on opposition leaders, journalists, and peaceful protesters that occurred in connection with the December elections.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, May 5, 2011.

Hon. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN,  
Chairman, House Committee on Foreign Affairs,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROS-LEHTINEN: I am writing in response to your letter concerning H.R. 515, the "Belarus Democracy Reauthorization Act of 2011," which the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported favorably. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 515 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, we are able to agree to discharging our Committee from further consideration of this bill in order that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 515 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

I appreciate your including our exchange of letters on this matter in your committee report, or in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during floor consideration of H.R. 515.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,  
Washington, DC, May 5, 2011.

Hon. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN,  
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Wash-  
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROS-LEHTINEN: On April 14, 2011, the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported H.R. 515, the Belarus Democracy Reauthorization Act of 2011, by a unanimous re-

corded vote of 34 to 0. As you know, the Committee on Financial Services was granted an additional referral upon the bill's introduction pursuant to the Committee's jurisdiction under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives over international financial and monetary organizations, banks and banking.

Upon review of H.R. 515, it is clear that the legislation will not alter the current statutory directives pertaining to the votes of the U.S. Executive Directors at the Multilateral Development Banks. Since no policy change is being made with respect to the narrow matter within the jurisdiction of the Financial Services Committee, I will waive consideration of the bill by the Financial Services Committee so that it may be considered expeditiously by the House. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Financial Services Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 515. In addition, I do so with the understanding that this will not prejudice the Committee on Financial Services with respect to its prerogatives on this or similar legislation. Further, the Committee on Financial Services reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Financial Services for conferees on H.R. 515 or related legislation.

Lastly, I request that you include this letter and your response as part of your committee's report on the bill and insert them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

SPENCER BACHUS,  
Chairman.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), be allowed to manage the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey will control the balance of the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I will be the only speaker to speak from our side on this resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. On December 19 of last year, Belarus' President, Alexander Lukashenko, staged a fraudulent election. Immediately afterward, he had the opposition candidates arrested, and this May almost all of them were sentenced to prison.

The Lukashenko regime has continued to harass members of opposition political parties, human rights activists, civil society and to suppress Belarusians' access to free press and information. Over the past month, an increasing number of Belarusians have gathered to protest against Lukashenko and the deteriorating economic situation there.

The Obama administration has reacted strongly to the fraudulent elections and post-election crack down. On February 2, the U.S. significantly expanded the list of Belarusian officials subject to travel sanctions and to have their assets blocked and restored full

U.S. sanctions against Belarus's large state-owned oil and gas concern.

On July 2, Secretary Clinton met with activists from Belarus during her visit to Lithuania for a meeting of the Community of Democracies and repeated her demand that Belarus release political prisoners and embark on the path of democratic reform. In coordination with the European Union, the administration has significantly expanded democracy assistance to Belarus for this year from \$11 million to \$15 million.

We must continue to call for the re-opening of the OSCE office in Minsk and for the Government of Belarus to fully cooperate with an OSCE fact-finding mission requested by 14 participating states under the Moscow mechanism.

And we must continue to demand the release of many heroic individuals still languishing in Belarusian prisons without access to their families or legal counsel. Europe's last dictatorship should not be allowed to stand unchallenged.

I support this legislation and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

First of all, let me thank Chairwoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN for her leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today, the majority leader and the Speaker for scheduling it, and to HOWARD BERMAN for his strong support of it as well and his very eloquent statement just a moment ago.

□ 1830

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 515, the Belarus Democracy and Human Rights Act of 2011. The bill demonstrates our strong and sustained promotion of human rights, democracy, and the rule of law in Belarus through targeted sanctions against this brutal dictatorship of Alexander Lukashenko.

H.R. 515 reinforces earlier law, the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004 and the Belarus Democracy Reauthorization Act of 2006, both of which passed the House and Senate with overwhelming bipartisan support and were signed into law.

This legislation is timely and necessary. The fraudulent December 19 elections in 2010 in Belarus and the ongoing crackdown on democracy activists and independent journalists by the Lukashenko dictatorship underscore the need for democracy-promoting legislation. Immediately after the election, the government responded to peaceful protests against electoral fraud with savage mass beatings and large-scale detentions—over 700 people.

Later on, Madam Speaker, I will put in the RECORD the list of many of the activists, many of whom were already in jail, their sentences—and these are men and women whose only crime was asking that Belarus matriculate from dictatorship to a democracy.

Of those charged, 40 have been convicted, with some receiving very harsh sentences—up to 6 years. And, of course, after those 6 years are over, what Lukashenko and his cronies usually do is find some reason to extend those jail sentences. So these sentences are awful indeed.

As ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN pointed out a moment ago, the chairwoman of our committee, this also includes five of the nine Presidential candidates who ran against Lukashenko, their families, lawyers, journalists, and democratic activists who continue to be harassed and intimidated. It is the worst political crackdown in Europe in over a decade. And it's ongoing, Madam Speaker.

The repressive regime in Belarus was in full force earlier this week as police broke up protesters attempting to mark their country's independence day. Hundreds were detained, and 140 already received administrative sentences or fines, including independent journalists reporting on rallies held across the country.

The post-election has followed the pattern of repression that has characterized Lukashenko's 17-year rule. Through a series of rigged elections, large-scale intimidation and suppression of independent media and civil society, the dictator has long since consolidated his control over virtually all national institutions. This dictatorship, as has been said, is the worst of any in Europe today.

Perhaps most significantly about the legislation, the bill supports targeted sanctions. It expresses the sense of the Congress to deny the privilege of visiting our country to senior Belarus officials, their immediate families and others involved in human rights violations and anti-democracy actions, including those involved in the December 19 post-election crackdown. Likewise, it has provisions prohibiting U.S. Government financing, except for humanitarian goods and agricultural products or medical products and nonhumanitarian loans from international financial institutions to the Belarusian Government; and blocking assets owned by the Belarusian Government's senior leadership or their families and others involved in antidemocratic actions. These sanctions are aimed at the senior leadership of a dictatorship that displays utter contempt for the dignity and rights of the Belarusian people, and with these sanctions we stand with the Belarusian people against their oppressors.

H.R. 515 requires the State Department to issue a new report to Congress on the sale, delivery or provision of weapons or weapons-related technologies or training, Lukashenko's personal wealth and assets, and cooperation by the Belarusian government with any foreign government or organizations related to censorship or surveillance of the Internet.

H.R. 515 states a U.S. government policy of strong support for the Belarusian people in their struggle against the Lukashenko dictatorship, aspiring to live in a free and independent

country where their human rights are respected, they can choose their government, and officials apply just laws that they themselves are subject to.

This bill encourages those struggling for decency and basic rights against the overwhelming pressures from the anti-democratic regime. It calls for the immediate and unconditional release of all political prisoners in Belarus, including those detained in the post-election crackdown and refuses to recognize the results of the flawed elections. It calls for a full accounting of the 1999–2000 disappearances of opposition leaders and a journalist in Belarus and the prosecution of those responsible. At the same time it explicitly opens the door to the re-evaluation of U.S. policy towards the Belarusian government should it take significant steps toward democracy and respect for human rights.

H.R. 515 supports radio, television and Internet broadcasting to Belarus, specifically Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Voice of America, European Radio for Belarus and the satellite television station Belsat.

Madam Speaker, this bill comes to the floor as the Belarusian people are increasingly taking to the streets in protest against the dictatorship, and the EU Council is ramping up sanctions on Belarus. The Belarusian people deserve far better than the Lukashenko dictatorship—this bill is an act of support of their heroic struggle for human rights and democracy and is an act of profound respect and friendship for the people of Belarus.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to add to my earlier remarks in support of this legislation that, as part of a Helsinki Commission visit in to Minsk in June 2009, I had the opportunity to press Lukashenko directly on his dismal human rights record and denial of democratic freedoms.

While making clear our support for Belarus' independence, I and other members of the delegation reiterated the long-standing U.S. message that the only way to improve relations between our two countries was and is for him to take steps to increase political freedom and respect human rights. We told Lukashenko that the ball was in his court. There were even small, tentative steps in the right direction, but since December 19 any hopes for change have been crushed.

The December 19, 2010 fraudulent election, which the OSCE condemned as not having met international standards, and the continuing crackdown on democracy activists and independent journalists by the Lukashenko regime underscore the need for this legislation and our continued attention to the further deterioration of human rights and freedoms in Europe's remaining dictatorship. This ongoing repression is the harshest we have seen in Europe in more than a decade and a stark illustration that Belarus remains an anomaly—a pariah state—in today's Europe.

Peaceful protests against electoral fraud were met with mass beatings and detentions. Some of the jailed were abused and even tortured. Their families, lawyers, journalists and democratic activists have been harassed and intimidated. Students have been expelled from universities. Belarus now has more political prisoners than at any time under Lukashenko's rule, as the Belarusian tyrant has squelched dissent by convicting nearly 40 activists within the last few months on charges of mass rioting and disturbing the public order.

Some, including several opposition leaders who ran against Lukashenka in December and other political activists and civil society leaders, received severe, completely unjustified prison sentences of up to six years. Their trials were a politically motivated farce, in which policemen sometimes were not even able to identify the defendants, and which saw unexplained discrepancies between witness testimony favoring the defendants, and the judges return of guilty verdicts.

The now-6-month-long crackdown only magnifies the pattern of repression and gross and systematic human rights violations that has characterized Lukashenka's 17-year rule. He has systematically consolidated power over virtually all institutions through a series of rigged presidential and parliamentary elections, repeated violations of fundamental freedoms and the suppression of independent media and civil society, creating a climate of fear that pervades the country.

Thanks to this dictator's misrule, Belarus has the worst democracy and human rights record in Europe. Furthermore, Belarus's Soviet-style, structurally unreformed state-dominated economy is facing its worst crisis since Lukashenka came to power. Russian cut offs of energy subsidies and the explosion of the country's budget deficit following heavy state spending ahead of December's presidential elections in a populist bid to increase Lukashenka's waning popularity have contributed. Since then, Belarus has witnessed devaluation of its currency, a jump in inflation and increase in unemployment, and, in recent weeks, growing public protests.

Notwithstanding the almost universal condemnation and punitive measures by the U.S. and EU, Alexander Lukashenka continues to turn a deaf ear to the international community, and, more importantly, to the Belarusian people. The Belarusian autocrat has clearly manifested his profound mistrust of—and contempt for—the long-suffering Belarusian people at whose expense he has enriched himself for the past 17 years.

Clearly, the need for a sustained U.S. commitment to foster democracy and respect for human rights, and sanction Lukashenka and his cronies remains. I want to stress that both the Bush and Obama administrations have made good use of the previous Belarus Democracy Acts, of 2004 and 2006, reinforcing to the Belarusian government that the elected representatives of the American people—by overwhelming bipartisan majorities—support the policy of condemning and sanctioning the Belarusian government for its brutal human rights violations.

The visa bans and targeted financial and economic sanctions instituted by President Bush in response to the earlier legislation have been maintained, and in some ways expanded by President Obama since December 19th. Most recently, on May 27 President Obama issued a statement in which he condemned the conviction and sentencing of five opposition candidates, asserting that the United States considers these candidates, along with the other courageous activists arrested and charged in the crackdown, as political prisoners. The President also pledged to pursue new sanctions against select Belarusian state-owned enterprises, which H.R. 515 strongly encourages.

Unfortunately, two decades after the demise of the Soviet Union, Belarus remains in a time

warp—unreconstructed politically and economically and isolated from its European roots, due to one man's dictatorial rule. His tactics are a chilling reminder of a darker time, more than two decades ago when the Soviet KGB hounded dissidents. It is a tragedy for the Belarusian people—who have suffered so much over the course of the last century—that Lukashenka is yet again choosing the path of self-isolation and squelching the desire for freedom. He is, yet again, making a mockery of Belarus' freely undertaken OSCE obligations.

The Belarusian people wish to live in a country where human rights are respected, democracy flourishes and the rule of law is the norm. I remain convinced that the time will soon come when Belarus will be integrated with the family of democratic nations. We must continue to resolutely stand at their side as they struggle to lift themselves from the yoke of this oppressive regime.

**BELARUS—CANDIDATES OR ACTIVISTS UNDER CRIMINAL CHARGES RELATED TO THE DECEMBER 19-20 POST-ELECTION DEMONSTRATION**

Persons charged with organizing and participating in mass disturbances (article 293 para 1 and 2 of the Criminal Code, penalties of up to 15 years in jail)

**Detainees, In detention, Trial date, Conviction and charge:**

1. Andrey Sannikau, European Belarus coalition coordinator, Charter97, presidential candidate, Yes, April 27–May 14, Five years in a high security jail; organization of mass disturbances.

2. Mikalay Statkevich, Narodnaya Hramada Social Democratic party leader, presidential candidate, Yes, May 11–18, May 26, Six years in a high security jail; organization of mass disturbances.

3. Ales Mikhalevich, For Modernization NGO, presidential candidate, No (abroad).

4. Dzmitry Us, presidential candidate, Yes, May 11–18, May 26, Five years and six months in a high security jail; organization of mass disturbances.

5. Alyaksandr Atroshchankau, Sannikau's spokesperson, Yes; appeal denied April 5, March 01–02, Four years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

6. Natallya Radzina, Charter97 editor, No (abroad).

7. Anatol Lyabedzka, United Civic Party chair, No.

8. Alyaksandr Klaskouski, former police officer, Yes, May 11–18, May 26, Five years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances, insult of an official, unauthorized assumption of rank or powers of an official.

9. Uladzimir Kobets, Sannikau's campaign team leader, No.

10. Alyaksandr Arastovich, Statkevich's aid, No.

11. Anatol Paulau, Ramanchuk's aid, No.

12. Aleh Korban, Ramanchuk's aid, No.

13. Ivan Haponau, a Russian citizen, No, February 22, March 10, 10,500,000-ruble fine (\$3,450); participation in mass disturbances.

14. Artsyom Breus, a Russian citizen, No, February 22, March 10, 10,500,000-ruble fine (\$3,450); participation in mass disturbances.

15. Mikita Likhavid, For Freedom movement activist, Yes, March 22–23, March 29, Three years and six months in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

16. Dzmitry Novik, BPF member, Yes; appeal denied April 5, March 01–02, Three years and six months in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

17. Aleh Fedarkevich, a demonstration participant, Yes, May 5–12, Three years and six months in jail; participation in mass disturbances.

18. Uladzimir Khamichenka, a demonstration participant, Yes, April 27–May 5, Three years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

19. Dzmitry Myadzvedz, a demonstration participant, No, March 01, March 10, Partial house arrest that requires regular reporting to police and restricts travel without prior permission from authorities; participation in mass disturbances.

20. Uladzimir Loban, a demonstration participant, Yes, May 5–12, Three years in jail; participation in mass disturbances.

21. Pavel Vinahradau, "Tell the truth" activist, Yes, April 27–May 05, Four years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

22. Andrey Paznyak, a demonstration participant, No, May 11–18, May 26, Three years of partial house arrest; participation in mass disturbances.

23. Alyaksandr Malchanau, a demonstration participant, Yes; appeal denied April 5, March 01–02, Three years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances and desecration of state symbols.

24. Ilya Vasilevich, a youth activist, Yes, April 27–May 14, Three years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

25. Dzmitry Bulanau, a demonstration participant, Yes, May 11–18, May 26, Three years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

26. Alyaksandr Kvyatkevich, a demonstration participant, Yes, May 11–18, May 26, Three years and six months in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

27. Vasil Parfyankou, "Tell the Truth" activist, Yes; appeal denied March 25, February 17, Four years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

28. Artsyom Hrybkou, a demonstration participant, Yes, May 11–18, May 26, Four years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

29. Fyodar Mirzayanau, a demonstration participant, Yes, April 27–May 14, Three years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

30. Ales Kirkevich, Malady Front activist, Yes, April 27–May 5, Four years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

31. Dzmitry Drozd, Sannikau's campaign team member, Yes, April 27–May 5, Three years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

32. Syarhey Kazakou, European Belarus activist, Yes, May 5–12, Three years in jail; participation in mass disturbances.

33. Uladzimir Yaromenka, Malady Front activist, Yes, April 27–May 14, Three years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

34. Dzmitry Daronin, a demonstration participant, Yes, May 5–12, Three years and six months in jail; participation in mass disturbances.

35. Andrey Pratasenya, Ramanchuk's campaign team volunteer, Yes, April 27–May 5, Three years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

36. Aleh Hnedchyk, Nyaklyaeu's campaign activist, Yes, April 27–May 14, Three years and six months in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

37. Vital Matsukevich, a demonstration participant, Yes, May 5–12, Three years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

38. Yauhen Sakret, Sannikau's campaign activist, Yes, May 5–12, Three years in jail; participation in mass disturbances.

Persons charged with organizing, arranging, and actively participating in activities that severely violate public order (article 342 para 1 of the Criminal Code, penalties up to three years in jail)

1. Uladzimir Nyaklyaeu, “Tell the Truth” campaign leader, presidential candidate, No, May 5–20, Two years suspended sentence.

2. Vital Rymasheuski, Belarusian Christian Democracy co-chair, presidential candidate, No, May 5–20, Two years suspended sentence.

3. Alyaksandr Fyaduta, Nyaklyaeu’s aid, No, May 5–20, Two years suspended sentence.

4. Andrey Dzmitryeu, Nyaklyaeu’s campaign team leader, No, May 5–20, Two years suspended sentence.

5. Syarhey Vaznyak, Nyaklyaeu’s aid, No, May 5–20, Two years suspended sentence.

6. Nasta Palazhanka, Malady Front deputy chair, No, May 5–20, One year suspended sentence.

7. Pavel Sevryarnets, Belarusian Christian Democracy co-chair, Rymasheuski’s aid, No, May 11–16, Three years of “khimiya,” a form of internal exile.

8. Zmitser Bandarenka, European Belarus coalition coordinator, Charter97, Yes, April 26–27, Two years in jail.

9. Syarhey Martsaleu, Statkevich’s aid, No, May 11–16, Two years suspended sentence.

10. Iryna Khalip, independent journalist, Sannikau’s wife, No, May 11–16, Two years suspended sentence.

Persons suspected of organizing and participating in mass riots (article 293 para 1 and 2 of the Criminal Code, penalties of up to 15 years in jail)

1. Ryhor Kastuseu, BPF deputy, presidential candidate, No.

2. Anton Davydenka, a demonstration participant, No.

3. Usevalad Kavalenka, a demonstration participant, No.

4. Syarhey Klyueu, “Tell the truth” activist, No.

5. Mikita Krasnou, a youth activist, No (abroad).

6. Dzmitry Apishau, a demonstration participant, No.

7. Leanid Navitski, Sannikau’s aid, No (abroad).

8. Andrey Mikalayeu, a demonstration participant, No.

9. Alyaksandr Vasileuski, a demonstration participant, No.

10. Dzyanis Shydouski, a demonstration participant, No.

11. Alyaksey Sharstou, a demonstration participant, No.

12. Dzmitry Huseltsau, a demonstration participant, No.

13. Vital Stazharau, a demonstration participant, No (abroad).

Persons convicted of severe hooliganism committed by a group of individuals inflicting bodily harm (article 339 para 2 and 3, penalties of up to ten years in jail); detained December 18

1. Zmitser Dashkevich, Malady Front leader, Yes, March 22–24, Two years in jail; severe hooliganism (para 2).

2. Eduard Lobau, Malady Front activist, Yes, March 22–24, Four years in a high security jail; severe hooliganism (para 3 involving armaments).

Students Expelled after December 19 (for political reasons).

Belarusian Committee for defense of the repressed “Salidarnasc” reports ten expelled students:

1. Yauheni Bely, Belarusian State University.

2. Uladzimir Syarheyeu, Belarusian State University.

3. Alyaksandr Lukashou, Belarusian State University.

4. Katsyaryna Davydzik, Belarusian State University.

5. Katsyaryna Klimko, Institute of Journalism, Belarusian State University.

6. Aleh Anufyenka, Institute of Journalism, Belarusian State University.

7. Viktorya Petrakouskaya, Maxim Tank Belarusian State Pedagogical University.

8. Viktoryia Kruchkova, Maxim Tank Belarusian State Pedagogical University.

9. Tatsiana Hrybouskaya, Maxim Tank Belarusian State Pedagogical University.

10. Andrey Luhin, Maxim Tank Belarusian State Pedagogical University.

11. Artsyom Khvastysyuk, Belarusian State University of Informatics and Radioelectronics.

12. Uladzimir Yaromenak\* Belarusian State University of Informatics and Radioelectronics.

13. Ilya Zhakhavets, Belarusian Institute of Law.

14. Yauhen Tsarykau, Minsk State High Radiotechnical College.

15. Illya Vasilevich\* Minsk State Polytechnic College.

16. Boris Zakharchuk, Hrodna State University named after Kupala.

17. Yauhen Busko, Hrodna State University named after Kupala.

18. Arseni Asmanau, Homyel State University named after Skaryna.

19. Mikita Likhavid\* Minsk Institute of Entrepreneurship.

20. Fyodar Mirzayanau\* Belarusian State Economic University.

\*Tried and Sentenced to terms in prison

Other sources report (unconfirmed):

1. Ales Krot (Member of Studentskaya Rada [independent Student Council], Belarusian National Technical University.

2. Anna Baraban, Belarusian State University.

3. Alina Litvinchuk, Brest State University.

4. Syarhey Sadouski, Belarusian State University of Informatics and Radioelectronics.

According to “Salidarnasc”, one student was expelled before December 19 (for political reasons).

1. Mikhail Mikulich Maxim Tank Belarusian State Pedagogical University.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 515, the “Belarus Democracy Reauthorization of 2011.” In recent years the Belarusian government, lead by Alexander Lukashenko, has engaged in atrocious human rights violations against opposition leaders and journalists. I believe that it is time that the United States call for an end of these practices and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 515.

Seven years ago the “Belarus Democracy Act of 2004” was passed into law as a measure to help promote the values of democracy, human rights, and to end the violations of fundamental freedoms in the Republic of Belarus. Since this time, the Belarusian dictator, Alexander Lukashenko, has continued to harass and persecute pro-democracy political dissenters and regularly engages in human rights violations against his people. The “Belarus Democracy Reauthorization Act of 2011” calls for Lukashenko to cease all persecution and urges the Belarusian government to work to promote the conditions required for integration of Belarus into the European family of democracies.

This legislation carries a larger significance as it is coming to a vote on the eve of a poignant time in Belarus’s involvement within the global community. The International Ice Hockey Federation’s (IIHF) 2014 World Ice Hockey Championship has recently been awarded to Belarus and will be hosted in Minsk resulting in fanfare and praise. It is my belief that the IIHF should suspend this great honor until the iron grip of Lukashenko’s police state is lifted and all political prisoners are re-

leased. The United States Senate unanimously, passed a resolution in April of 2011 expressing the dire need for a moratorium on the 2014 World Ice Hockey Championships in Belarus until justice has been brought to Lukashenko’s victims.

It is with sincere urgency that I ask my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 515, “Belarus Democracy Reauthorization Act of 2011.” We must continue the strong tradition of promoting democratic values around the world and let Alexander Lukashenko know that his behavior will not be condoned or tolerated by the United States of America.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the “Belarus Democracy Act” reauthorization. This title of this bill would have amused George Orwell, as it is in fact a U.S. regime-change bill. Where does the United States Congress derive the moral or legal authority to determine which political parties or organizations in Belarus—or anywhere else—are to be U.S.-funded and which are to be destabilized? How can anyone argue that U.S. support for regime-change in Belarus is somehow “promoting democracy”? We pick the parties who are to be supported and funded and somehow this is supposed to reflect the will of the Belarusian people? How would Americans feel if the tables were turned and a powerful foreign country demanded that only a political party it selected and funded could legitimately reflect the will of the American people?

I would like to know how many millions of taxpayer dollars the U.S. government has wasted trying to overthrow the government in Belarus. I would like to know how much money has been squandered by U.S. government-funded front-organizations like the National Endowment for Democracy, the International Republic Institute, Freedom House, and others meddling like the old Soviet Union in the internal politics of a country that has neither threatened nor attacked the United States. It is the arrogance of our foreign policy and we call it “democracy.” We wonder why we are no longer loved and admired overseas.

Finally, I strongly object to the sanctions that this legislation imposes on Belarus. We must keep in mind that sanctions and blockades of foreign countries are considered acts of war. Do we need to continue war-like actions yet another country? Can we afford it.

I wish to emphasize that I take this position not because I am in support of the regime in Belarus, or anywhere else. I take this position because it is dangerous folly to be the Nation that arrogates to itself the right to determine the leadership of the rest of the world. As we teeter closer to bankruptcy, it should be more obvious that we need to change our foreign policy to one of constructive engagement rather than hostile interventionism. And though it scarcely should need to be said, I must remind my colleagues today that we are the U.S. House of Representatives, and not some sort of world congress. We have no constitutional authority to intervene in the wholly domestic affairs of Belarus or any other sovereign nation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 515, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2354, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012**

Mr. WEBSTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-135) on the resolution (H. Res. 337) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 320 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2219.

□ 1836

**IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. BISHOP of Utah (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 31, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 122, line 9.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR**

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 23 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

An amendment by Mr. KUCINICH of Ohio.

Amendment No. 21 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. WELCH of Vermont.

Amendment No. 22 Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment No. 62 by Mr. AMASH of Michigan.

An amendment by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas.

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

**AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA**

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

**RECORDED VOTE**

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 241, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 495]

**AYES—175**

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

**NOES—241**

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

**NOT VOTING—15**

Blumenauer	Guinta	Roe (TN)
Bono Mack	Hinchey	Speier
Cantor	Keating	Towns
Culberson	Mack	Watt
Giffords	McIntyre	Young (AK)

□ 1900

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mrs. LUMMIS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."



Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Messrs. BRADY of Pennsylvania, HOLDEN, and CLEAVER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 87, noes 328, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 496]

AYES—87

Adams	Goodlatte	Poe (TX)
Amash	Gowdy	Polis
Bachmann	Graves (GA)	Pompeo
Barton (TX)	Griffith (VA)	Price (GA)
Bass (NH)	Gutierrez	Reed
Benishek	Hensarling	Renacci
Brady (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Rohrabacher
Braley (IA)	Huelskamp	Rokita
Broun (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Royce
Buerkle	Hultgren	Ryan (WI)
Burgess	Hurt	Schilling
Burton (IN)	Johnson (IL)	Schrader
Campbell	Labrador	Schwartz
Chabot	Lance	Schweikert
Clarke (NY)	Lee (CA)	Scott (SC)
Coble	Lummis	Sensenbrenner
Conyers	Manzullo	Sessions
DeFazio	McClintock	Southerland
Duffy	Miller (FL)	Stearns
Duncan (SC)	Miller (MI)	Stivers
Duncan (TN)	Mulvaney	Stutzman
Edwards	Murphy (PA)	Terry
Filner	Myrick	Tierney
Flake	Nugent	Tonko
Frank (MA)	Paul	Upton
Garamendi	Paulsen	Walsh (IL)
Garrett	Payne	Waters
Gibbs	Petri	Westmoreland
Gibson	Pitts	Woodall

NOES—328

Ackerman	Boren	Clay
Aderholt	Boswell	Cleaver
Akin	Boustany	Clyburn
Alexander	Brady (PA)	Coffman (CO)
Altmire	Brooks	Cohen
Andrews	Brown (FL)	Cole
Austria	Bucshon	Conaway
Baca	Butterfield	Connolly (VA)
Bachus	Calvert	Cooper
Baldwin	Camp	Costa
Barletta	Canseco	Costello
Barrow	Cantor	Courtney
Bartlett	Capito	Cravaack
Bass (CA)	Capps	Crawford
Becerra	Capuano	Crenshaw
Berg	Cardoza	Critz
Berkley	Carnahan	Crowley
Berman	Carney	Cuellar
Biggert	Carson (IN)	Cummings
Bilbray	Carter	Davis (CA)
Bilirakis	Cassidy	Davis (IL)
Bishop (GA)	Castor (FL)	Davis (KY)
Bishop (NY)	Chaffetz	DeGette
Bishop (UT)	Chandler	DeLauro
Black	Chu	Denham
Blackburn	Cicilline	Dent
Bonner	Clarke (MI)	DesJarlais

Deutch	Kinzinger (IL)
Diaz-Balart	Kissell
Dicks	Kline
Dingell	Kucinich
Doggett	Lamborn
Dold	Landry
Donnelly (IN)	Langevin
Doyle	Lankford
Dreier	Larsen (WA)
Ellison	Larson (CT)
Ellmers	Latham
Emerson	LaTourette
Engel	Latta
Eshoo	Levin
Farenthold	Lewis (CA)
Farr	Lewis (GA)
Fattah	Lipinski
Fincher	LoBiondo
Fitzpatrick	Loeb sack
Fleischmann	Loftgren, Zoe
Fleming	Long
Flores	Lowey
Forbes	Lucas
Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer
Fox	Lujan
Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel E.
Frelinghuysen	Lynch
Fudge	Maloney
Gallegly	Marchant
Gardner	Marino
Gerlach	Markey
Gingrey (GA)	Matheson
Gohmert	Matsui
Gonzalez	Gosar
Gosar	McCarthy (CA)
Granger	McCarthy (NY)
Graves (MO)	McCaul
Green, Al	McCollum
Green, Gene	McCotter
Griffin (AR)	McDermott
Grijalva	McGovern
Grimm	McHenry
Guthrie	McKeon
Hall	McKinley
Hanabusa	McMorris
Hanna	Rodgers
Harper	McNerney
Harris	Meehan
Hartzler	Meeks
Hastings (FL)	Mica
Hastings (WA)	Michaud
Heck	Miller (NC)
Heinrich	Miller, Gary
Hergert	Miller, George
Higgins	Moore
Himes	Moran
Hinojosa	Murphy (CT)
Hirono	Nadler
Hochul	Napolitano
Holden	Neal
Holt	Neugebauer
Honda	Noem
Hoyer	Nunes
Hunter	Nunnelee
Inslee	Olson
Israel	Oliver
Issa	Owens
Jackson (IL)	Palazzo
Jackson Lee	Pallone
(TX)	Pascrell
Jenkins	Pastor (AZ)
Johnson (GA)	Pearce
Johnson (OH)	Pelosi
Johnson, Sam	Pence
Jones	Perlmutter
Jordan	Peters
Kaptur	Peterson
Kelly	Pingree (ME)
Kildee	Platts
Kind	Posey
King (IA)	Price (NC)
King (NY)	Quayle
Kingston	Quigley
	Rahall

NOT VOTING—16

Blumenauer	Hinchey	Towns
Bono Mack	Johnson, E. B.	Watt
Buchanan	Keating	Wilson (FL)
Culberson	Mack	Young (AK)
Giffords	McIntyre	
Guinta	Roe (TN)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1906

Ms. EDWARDS and Mr. GUTIERREZ changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 496 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 152, noes 266, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 497]

AYES—152

Andrews	Gonzalez	Napolitano
Baca	Green, Al	Neal
Baldwin	Grijalva	Oliver
Bass (CA)	Gutierrez	Pallone
Becerra	Hanabusa	Pascarell
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Berman	Heinrich	Paulsen
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Perlmutter
Boswell	Hinojosa	Peters
Brady (PA)	Hirono	Pingree (ME)
Braley (IA)	Holt	Polis
Brown (FL)	Honda	Quigley
Butterfield	Hoyer	Reyes
Capps	Inslee	Richardson
Capuano	Israel	Richmond
Carnahan	Jackson (IL)	Rigell
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Royal-Ballard
Castor (FL)	(TX)	Rush
Chandler	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Johnson (IL)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Clarke (MI)	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schrader
Clay	Kind	Schwartz
Cleaver	Kissell	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Kucinich	Scott, David
Connolly (VA)	Langevin	Serrano
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Sewell
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Crowley	Latham	Sires
Cummings	Lee (CA)	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Levin	Stark
Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Sutton
DeFazio	Lipinski	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Loeb sack	
DeLauro	Loftgren, Zoe	
Deutch	Lujan	
Dingell	Lynch	
Doggett	Maloney	
Doyle	Markey	
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	
Ellison	McDermott	
Engel	McGovern	
Farr	McNerney	
Fattah	Meeks	
Filner	Michaud	
Forbes	Miller, George	
Frank (MA)	Moore	
Fudge	Moran	
Garamendi	Murphy (CT)	
Gibson	Nadler	

NOES—266

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

NOT VOTING—13

Blumenauer Hinchey Towns  
 Bono Mack Keating Watt  
 Culberson Mack Young (AK)  
 Giffords McIntyre  
 Quinta Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1909

So the amendment was rejected.  
 The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chair, on July 6, 2011, I missed 3 recorded votes because my return flight from Tennessee to Washington was significantly delayed.

I take my voting responsibility very seriously. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on recorded vote numbers 495, 496, and 497.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 253, noes 167, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 498]

AYES—253

Ackerman Costello Gutierrez  
 Altmire Courtney Hanabusa  
 Amash Critz Hanna  
 Andrews Crowley Harris  
 Baca Cuellar Hartzler  
 Bachmann Cummings Hastings (FL)  
 Baldwin Davis (CA) Heck  
 Barrow Davis (IL) Heinrich  
 Bass (CA) DeFazio Herrera Beutler  
 Becerra DeGette Higgins  
 Berkeley DeLauro Himes  
 Berman Dent Hinchey  
 Bilirakis Deutch Hinojosa  
 Bishop (NY) Dicks Hirono  
 Boren Dingell Hochul  
 Boswell Doggett Holden  
 Brady (PA) Donnelly (IN) Holt  
 Braley (IA) Doyle Honda  
 Brown (FL) Duffy Hoyer  
 Burgess Edwards Huelskamp  
 Burton (IN) Ellison Hurt  
 Butterfield Engel Inslee  
 Calvert Eshoo Israel  
 Camp Farr Jackson (IL)  
 Capps Fattah Jackson Lee  
 Capuano Filner (TX)  
 Cardoza Fincher Johnson (GA)  
 Carnahan Fitzpatrick Johnson (IL)  
 Carney Fortenberry Johnson (OH)  
 Carson (IN) Frank (MA) Johnson, E. B.  
 Castor (FL) Fudge Jones  
 Chabot Gallegly Kaptur  
 Chandler Garamendi Kildee  
 Chu Gardner Kind  
 Cicilline Gibson Kinzinger (IL)  
 Clarke (MI) Gonzalez Kissell  
 Clarke (NY) Goodlatte Kucinich  
 Clay Labrador Langevin  
 Cleaver Green, Al Larsen (WA)  
 Clyburn Hayworth Griffith (VA) Larson (CT)  
 Coble Cohen Grijalva Latham  
 Cohen Conolly (VA) Grimm Lee (CA)  
 Conyers Guthrie Lee (CA)

Levin Pascrell Scott, David  
 Lewis (CA) Pastor (AZ) Sensenbrenner  
 Lewis (GA) Paul Serrano  
 Lipinski Paulsen Sessions  
 LoBiondo Payne Sewell  
 Loeb sack Pelosi Sherman  
 Lofgren, Zoe Perlmutter Sires  
 Lowey Peters Slaughter  
 Lujan Peterson Smith (NJ)  
 Lummis Petri Smith (WA)  
 Lungren, Daniel E. Pingree (ME) Southerland  
 Lynch Poe (TX) Speier  
 Maloney Polis Stark  
 Manzullo Price (GA) Stearns  
 Markey Price (NC) Sutton  
 Matheson Rahall Terry  
 Matsui Rangel Thompson (CA)  
 McCarthy (NY) Reichert Thompson (MS)  
 McCollum Renacci Tierney  
 McDermott Reyes Tipton  
 McGovern Richardson Tonko  
 McMorris Richmond Turner  
 Rodgers Roe (TN) Upton  
 McNeerney Van Hollen  
 Meehan Ross (AR) Velázquez  
 Meeks Rothman (NJ) Visclosky  
 Michaud Roybal-Allard Walden  
 Miller (MI) Runyan Walz (MN)  
 Miller (NC) Ruppertsberger Wasserman  
 Miller, George Rush Schultz  
 Moore Ryan (OH) Waters  
 Moran Sanchez, Linda Waxman  
 Mulvaney T. Welch  
 Murphy (CT) Sanchez, Loretta West  
 Nadler Sarbanes Westmoreland  
 Napolitano Schakowsky Wilson (FL)  
 Neal Schiff Wilson (SC)  
 Olver Schilling Woodall  
 Owens Schrader Woolsey  
 Palazzo Schwartz Wu  
 Pallone Scott (VA) Yarmuth

NOES—167

Adams Fleming Murphy (PA)  
 Aderholt Flores Myrick  
 Akin Forbes Neugebauer  
 Alexander Foxx Noem  
 Austria Franks (AZ) Nugent  
 Bachus Frelinghuysen Nunes  
 Barletta Garrett Nunnallee  
 Bartlett Gerlach Olson  
 Barton (TX) Gibbs Pearce  
 Bass (NH) Gingrey (GA) Pence  
 Benishkek Gohmert Pitts  
 Berg Gowdy Platts  
 Biggert Granger Pompeo  
 Bilbray Graves (GA) Posey  
 Bishop (GA) Graves (MO) Quayle  
 Bishop (UT) Griffin (AR) Reed  
 Black Hall Rehberg  
 Blackburn Harper Hastings (WA)  
 Bonner Bonner Riggle  
 Boustany Boustany Hayworth  
 Brady (TX) Brady (TX) Hensarling  
 Brooks Brooks Herger  
 Brown (GA) Brown (GA) Huizenga (MI)  
 Buchanan Buchanan Hultgren  
 Bucshon Bucshon Hunter  
 Buerkle Buerkle Issa  
 Campbell Campbell Jenkins  
 Canseco Canseco Johnson, Sam  
 Cantor Cantor Kelly  
 Capito Capito King (IA)  
 Carter Carter King (NY)  
 Cassidy Cassidy Kingston  
 Chaffetz Chaffetz Kline  
 Coffman (CO) Coffman (CO) Lamborn  
 Cole Cole Lamborn  
 Conaway Conaway Landry  
 Cooper Cooper Lankford  
 Costa Costa LaTourette  
 Cravaack Cravaack Latta  
 Crawford Crawford Long  
 Crenshaw Crenshaw Lucas  
 Critz Critz Luetkemeyer  
 Cuellar Cuellar Marchant  
 Davis (KY) Davis (KY) Marino  
 Denham Denham McCarthy (CA)  
 Dent Dent Stivers  
 DesJarlais DesJarlais Stutzman  
 Diaz-Balart Diaz-Balart Sullivan  
 Dicks Dicks Thompson (PA)  
 Dold Dold Thornberry  
 Donnelly (IN) Donnelly (IN) Tiberi  
 Dreier Dreier Tipton  
 Duffy Duffy Turner  
 Duncan (SC) Duncan (SC) McKeon  
 Duncan (TN) Duncan (TN) McKinley  
 Ellmers Ellmers Walsh (IL)  
 Emerson Emerson West  
 Eshoo Eshoo Miller (FL)  
 Farenthold Farenthold Miller (MI)  
 Fincher Fincher Miller (NC)  
 Fitzpatrick Fitzpatrick Miller, Gary  
 Flake Flake Mulvaney  
 Fleischmann Fleischmann Murphy (PA)  
 Fleming Fleming Myrick  
 Flores Flores Neugebauer  
 Fortenberry Fortenberry Noem  
 Foxx Foxx Nugent  
 Franks (AZ) Franks (AZ) Nunes  
 Frelinghuysen Frelinghuysen Nunnallee  
 Gallegly Gallegly Olson  
 Gardner Gardner Stivers  
 Gardner Gardner Stutzman  
 Garrett Garrett Sullivan  
 Gerlach Gerlach Thompson (PA)  
 Gibbs Gibbs Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Walberg  
 Walsh (IL)  
 Webster  
 Whitfield

Wittman Young (FL)  
Wolf Yoder Young (IN)

Blumenauer Guinta Towns  
Bono Mack Keating Watt  
Culberson Mack Young (AK)  
Giffords McIntyre

NOT VOTING—11

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1914

Mr. CHABOT changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”  
So the amendment was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENTS NO. 21 AND 22 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on amendment Nos. 21 and 22, to the end that they stand disposed of by the voice votes thereon.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate each amendment.  
The Clerk redesignated the amendments.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection?

Without objection, the requests for a recorded vote are withdrawn and amendment Nos. 21 and 22 stand as not adopted.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 98, noes 322, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 499]

AYES—98

Amash Duncan (TN) Jones  
Baldwin Edwards Kind  
Bass (CA) Ellison Kucinich  
Becerra Eshoo Labrador  
Benishek Farr Lee (CA)  
Boswell Filner Lewis (GA)  
Bralley (IA) Frank (MA) Loeb sack  
Campbell Fudge Lofgren, Zoe  
Capps Gibson Lummis  
Capuano Graves (GA) Lynch  
Carson (IN) Green, Gene Maloney  
Chu Griffith (VA) Markey  
Clarke (NY) Grijalva Matsui  
Cohen Gutierrez McDermott  
Conyers Harris McGovern  
Crowley Higgins Michaud  
Cummings Hirono Miller, George  
DeFazio Mulvaney  
DeGette Honda Nadler  
Deutch Inslee Napolitano  
Doyle Jackson (IL) Neal  
Duffy Johnson, E. B. Oliver

Pallone Roybal-Allard Tierney  
Paul Ryan (OH) Tonko  
Payne Sarbanes Tsongas  
Pelosi Schakowsky Velázquez  
Peters Schrader Waters  
Petri Sensenbrenner Waxman  
Pingree (ME) Serrano Welch  
Polis Slaughter Wilson (FL)  
Quigley Speier Woolsey  
Rahall Stark Yarmuth  
Reed Thompson (CA)

NOES—322

Ackerman Donnelly (IN) Larson (CT)  
Adams Dreier Latham  
Aderholt Duncan (SC) LaTourette  
Akin Ellmers Latta  
Alexander Emerson Levin  
Altmire Engel Lewis (CA)  
Andrews Farenthold Lipinski  
Austria Patah LoBiondo  
Baca Fincher Long  
Bachmann Fitzpatrick Lowey  
Bachus Flake Lucas  
Barletta Fleischmann Luetkemeyer  
Barrow Fleming Luján  
Bartlett Flores Lungren, Daniel  
Barton (TX) Forbes E.  
Bass (NH) Fortenberry Manzullo  
Berg Foss Marchant  
Berkley Franks (AZ) Marino  
Berman Frelinghuysen Matheson  
Biggert Gallegly McCarthy (CA)  
Biliray Garamendi McCarthy (NY)  
Bilirakis Gardner McCaul  
Bishop (GA) Garrett McClintock  
Bishop (NY) Gerlach McCollum  
Bishop (UT) Gibbs McCotter  
Black Gingrey (GA) McHenry  
Blackburn Gohmert McKeon  
Bonner Gonzalez McKinley  
Boren Goodlatte McMorris  
Boustany Gosar Rodgers  
Brady (PA) Gowdy McNerney  
Brady (TX) Granger Meehan  
Brooks Graves (MO) Meeks  
Broun (GA) Green, Al Mica  
Brown (FL) Griffin (AR) Miller (FL)  
Buchanan Grimm Miller (MI)  
Bucshon Guthrie Miller (NC)  
Buerkle Hall Miller, Gary  
Burgess Hanabusa Moore  
Burton (IN) Hanna Moran  
Butterfield Harper Murphy (CT)  
Calvert Hartzler Murphy (PA)  
Camp Hastings (FL) Myrick  
Canseco Hastings (WA) Neugebauer  
Cantor Hayworth Noem  
Capito Heck Nugent  
Cardoza Heinrich Nunes  
Carnahan Hensarling Nunnelee  
Carney Herger Olson  
Carter Herrera Beutler Owens  
Cassidy Himes Palazzo  
Castor (FL) Hinchey Pascrell  
Chabot Hinojosa Pastor (AZ)  
Chaffetz Hochul Paulsen  
Chandler Holden Pearce  
Cicilline Hoyer Pence  
Clarke (MI) Huelskamp Perlmutter  
Coble Huizenga (MI) Peterson  
Coffman (CO) Issa Price (GA)  
Cole Conaway Connolly (VA) Price (NC)  
Cooper Jenkins Quayle  
Costa Johnson (GA) Rangel  
Costello Johnson (IL) Rehberg  
Courtney Johnson (OH) Reichert  
Cravaack Johnson, Sam Renacci  
Crawford Jordan Reyes  
Crenshaw Kaptur Ribble  
Critz Kelly Richardson  
Cuellar Kildee Richmond  
Davis (CA) King (IA) Rigell  
Davis (IL) King (NY) Rivera  
Davis (KY) Kingston Roby  
DeLauro Kinzinger (IL) Roe (TN)  
Dent Kissell Rogers (AL)  
DesJarlais Kline Rogers (KY)  
Diaz-Balart Lamborn Rogers (MI)  
Dicks Landry Rohrabacher  
Dingell Landry Rokita  
Doggett Landrevin Rooney  
Dold Lankford Ros-Lehtinen  
Larsen (WA) Larsen (WA) Roskam

Ross (AR) Sewell Turner  
Ross (FL) Sherman Upton  
Rothman (NJ) Shimkus Van Hollen  
Royce Shuler Visclosky  
Runyan Shuster Walberg  
Ruppersberger Simpson Walden  
Rush Sires Walsh (IL)  
Ryan (WI) Smith (NE) Walz (MN)  
Sánchez, Linda Smith (NJ) Wasserman  
T. Smith (TX) Schultz  
Sanchez, Loretta Smith (WA) Webster  
Scalise Southerland West  
Schiff Stearns Westmoreland  
Schilling Stivers Whitfield  
Schmidt Stutzman Wilson (SC)  
Schock Sullivan Wittman  
Schwartz Sutton Wolf  
Schweikert Terry Womack  
Scott (SC) Thompson (MS) Woodall  
Scott (VA) Thompson (PA) Wu  
Scott, Austin Thornberry Yoder  
Scott, David Tiberi Young (FL)  
Sessions Tipton Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Blumenauer Guinta Towns  
Bono Mack Keating Watt  
Culberson Mack Young (AK)  
Giffords McIntyre

□ 1920

Mr. PASCRELL changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. SPEIER changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 212, noes 208, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 500]

AYES—212

Adams Calvert Flake  
Aderholt Camp Fleischmann  
Akin Campbell Fleming  
Alexander Canseco Flores  
Amash Cantor Forbes  
Austria Capito Fortenberry  
Bachmann Carter Foss  
Bachus Cassidy Franks (AZ)  
Barletta Chabot Frelinghuysen  
Bartlett Chaffetz Gallegly  
Barton (TX) Coble Gardner  
Bass (NH) Coffman (CO) Garrett  
Benishek Conaway Gibbs  
Berg Cravaack Gibson  
Biggert Crawford Gingrey (GA)  
Bilirakis Davis (KY) Gohmert  
Black Denham Goodlatte  
Blackburn Dent Gosar  
Bonner DesJarlais Gowdy  
Boustany Diaz-Balart Granger  
Brady (TX) Rogers (AL) Dold  
Brooks Dreier Graves (MO)  
Broun (GA) Duffy Griffin (VA)  
Buchanan Duncan (SC) Griffith (AR)  
Bucshon Duncan (TN) Guthrie  
Buerkle Ellmers Hall  
Burgess Farenthold Hanna  
Burton (IN) Fincher Harper

Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Lankford  
Latham  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
Long  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel E.  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCauley  
McClintock

McCotter  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Palazzo  
Paul  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pence  
Petri  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Robby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita

Rooney  
Roskam  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stearns  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Webster  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

## NOES—208

Ackerman  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bass (CA)  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Bilbray  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Boren  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Cole  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummins  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro

Deutch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Fitzpatrick  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Gerlach  
Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Gutierrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heinrich  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchesy  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Insee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Kildee  
Kind  
Kissell  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)  
LaTourette  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebsack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Lujan  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Olver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Platts  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Richmond

Rogers (AL)  
Ross-Lehtinen  
Ross (AR)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin

Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tiberi  
Tierney

## NOT VOTING—11

Blumenauer  
Bono Mack  
Culberson  
Giffords

Guinta  
Keating  
Mack  
McIntyre

Towns  
Watt  
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
One minute remains in the vote.

□ 1925

Mr. CONYERS and Ms. JACKSON  
LEE of Texas changed their vote from  
“aye” to “no.”

Messrs. TURNER and NUGENT  
changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”  
So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS)  
on which further proceedings were  
postponed and on which the ayes pre-  
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 217, noes 204,  
not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 501]

## AYES—217

Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Amash  
Austria  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (NH)  
Benishek  
Berg  
Biggart  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Bucshon  
Buerkle

Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Conaway  
Connolly (VA)  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Davis (KY)  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)

Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Guthrie  
Gutierrez  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Lankford  
Latham  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
Long  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel E.  
Manzullo

Marchant  
Marino  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Paul  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pence  
Petri  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Robby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stearns  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Webster  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

## NOES—204

Ackerman  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bass (CA)  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Bilbray  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Boren  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Cole  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummins  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro

Deutch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Fitzpatrick  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heinrich  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchesy  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Insee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Kildee  
Kind  
Kissell  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)  
LaTourette  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebsack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Lujan  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Olver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Platts  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel

Reyes	Scott (VA)	Tierney
Richardson	Scott, David	Tonko
Richmond	Serrano	Tsongas
Rogers (AL)	Sewell	Turner
Ross (AR)	Sherman	Van Hollen
Rothman (NJ)	Shimkus	Velázquez
Roybal-Allard	Shuler	Vislosky
Ruppersberger	Sires	Walz (MN)
Rush	Slaughter	Wasserman
Ryan (OH)	Smith (NJ)	Schultz
Sánchez, Linda	Smith (WA)	Waters
T.	Speier	Waxman
Sanchez, Loretta	Stark	Welch
Sarbanes	Sullivan	Wilson (FL)
Schakowsky	Sutton	Wolf
Schiff	Thompson (CA)	Woolsey
Schrader	Thompson (MS)	Wu
Schwartz	Tiberi	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Blumenauer	Guinta	Watt
Bono Mack	Keating	Young (AK)
Culberson	Mack	
Giffords	Towns	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1930

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8123. Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the approximately \$100,000,000,000 in efficiency savings identified by the military departments in the defense budget covering fiscal years 2012 through 2016 that are to be reinvested in the priorities of the military departments. Such report shall include an analysis of—

(1) each savings identified by the military departments, including—

(A) the budget account from which such savings will be derived;

(B) the number of military personnel and full-time civilian employees of the Federal Government affected by such savings;

(C) the estimated reductions in the number and funding of contractor personnel caused by such savings; and

(D) a specific description of activities or services that will be affected by such savings, including the locations of such activities or services; and

(2) each reinvestment planned to be funded with such savings, including—

(A) with respect to such reinvestment in procurement and research, development, test and evaluation accounts, the budget account to which such savings will be reinvested, including, by line item, the number of items to be procured, as shown in annual P-1 and R-1 documents;

(B) with respect to such reinvestment in military personnel and operation and maintenance accounts, the budget account and the subactivity (as shown in annual—1 and O-1 budget documents) to which such savings will be reinvested;

(C) the number of military personnel and full-time civilian employees of the Federal Government affected by such reinvestment;

(D) the estimated number and funding of contractor personnel affected by such reinvestment; and

(E) a specific description of activities or services that will be affected by such reinvestment, including the locations of such activities or services.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of amendments to this title that cut funds, reduce our military footprint, and move to bring our troops home from Afghanistan. And I rise in opposition to the underlying bill.

I want to commend the ranking member of the committee, Congressman NORM DICKS from Washington, for his leadership in calling for a fresh look at how we carry out military operations in Afghanistan and the need for a strategy that brings our troops home sooner rather than later.

Mr. Chairman, I just returned from a trip to Afghanistan. I cannot describe how impressed I am with the commitment, the dedication, and the work carried out every single day by our men and women in uniform, and those in the civilian services. I met and spoke with them in Kabul, Marja, at large bases like Bagram Air Force Base, and in small villages. Quite simply, Mr. Chairman, they are incredible.

But over and over and over again I heard the same message: This is not sustainable. The strategy that we are pursuing in Afghanistan is not sustainable. And it is costing us too much in human lives and financial resources to continue. It can't continue for another 18 months, as called for by the President, let alone even longer.

I stand here tonight more convinced than ever that it is time to forge a new path, a new strategy, built upon past and present accomplishments, but more aggressively focused on more rapidly reducing the U.S. military footprint in Afghanistan than the plan described last month by the President, accelerating the transition of combat operations to Afghanistan authorities, and an intense international and regional effort to secure a political solution to the Afghan conflict and define a genuine regional coordinated effort that safeguards the region and the world from terrorist threats.

While I was in Afghanistan, General Petraeus invited me and two Members I was traveling with, Congressman ALLEN WEST and DUNCAN HUNTER, Jr., to attend a ramp ceremony. We may not always agree on policy, but we were united in how respectful, emotional, and moving we found the ceremony honoring the fallen soldiers who were being transported by the C-130 on their final journey home.

Mr. Chairman, 1,650 American service men and women have sacrificed their lives in the Afghanistan war. While I was in Afghanistan, six more were killed. It was a reminder of the enormous sacrifice that our soldiers are paying. 2010 was the deadliest year of conflict to date in the Afghanistan war for U.S. and coalition forces, and for Afghan civilians. This year, 2011, is on pace to be the deadliest year of the war. We need to end the war, not sustain it, Mr. Chairman.

We are borrowing \$8 billion to \$10 billion each month for military operations alone. Borrowing, Mr. Chairman, borrowing. We know we can't sustain that. And we know that the Afghan Government and security forces don't have the resources or the political will to sustain that level of resources once we leave. We need to find a new strategy and purpose to help bring this conflict to an end.

The President and congressional leaders are in negotiations, grappling with how to deal with the national debt. It can't be done if we don't find the means and the political will to end this war sooner rather than later. According to CBO, we could save \$1.3 trillion by ending these wars. That's trillion with a "t," Mr. Chairman. We have spent approximately \$3.7 trillion since 9/11 in Iraq and Afghanistan. We cannot afford another decade like the last one. It is simply not sustainable.

We need to also understand that jobs and economic security and economic strength are central parts of our national security. While we serve as an ATM machine for a corrupt government in Kabul, we tell our own people that we have no money for roads, and bridges, and schools, and teachers, and police, and firefighters, and jobs here at home. Enough. I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support amendments that reduce our spending and military footprint in Afghanistan, help bring our troops home sooner rather than later, and call for a new strategy and a new direction in Afghanistan.

Mr. Chairman, I will be submitting for the RECORD two articles, one from the Washington Post entitled "CBO: Ending the Wars Could Save \$1.4 Trillion," and an article that appeared in Scientific American entitled "Legacy of Mental Health Problems From Iraq and Afghanistan Wars Will Be Long-lived."

Mr. Chairman, the time has come for us to come together and find a different strategy in Afghanistan, one that will bring our troops home sooner rather than later. It is time to end this war.

[From The Washington Post, June 23, 2011]

CBO: ENDING THE WARS COULD SAVE \$1.4

TRILLION

(By Ezra Klein)

It's increasingly clear that a deal on the budget deficit will have to include a lot of spending cuts that Democrats can deny are spending cuts and at least some tax increases that Republicans can deny are tax increases. I'll get to the tax increases in a future post. But if you're looking for the spending cuts, look no further than the wars.

Last night, President Obama announced that "the tide of war is receding," and that he will soon bring the Iraq and Afghanistan wars "to a responsible end." Left unsaid is the effect that could have on our projected deficits. According to the Congressional Budget Office, we're talking big money: \$1.4 trillion, to be exact.

That has less to do with the likely cost of the wars than the way CBO officials estimate future spending. In the case of discretionary spending—which is the pot of money that

goes to the wars—they simply take current spending and assume it grows at the rate of inflation. So though it's clear our wars are winding down, they won't count the savings from them in their projections until there's explicit government policy that winds them down.

But if they can be convinced, they've made clear that they're willing to count big savings. "In 2010, the number of U.S. troops (active-duty, reserves, and National Guard personnel) deployed for war-related activities averaged about 215,000," CBO said its *January budget outlook* (pdf). "In the alternative scenario presented here, the number of military personnel deployed for war-related purposes would decline over a five-year period to an average of 180,000 in 2011, 130,000 in 2012, 100,000 in 2013, 65,000 in 2014, and 45,000 in 2015 and thereafter. Under this scenario, total discretionary outlays over the 2012-2021 period would be \$1.1 trillion less than the amount in the baseline. Debt-service costs would bring the cumulative savings relative to the baseline to about \$1.4 trillion over the coming decade."

I'm told that a big chunk of these savings were included in the debt-ceiling deal that, until today, Eric Cantor and Jon Kyl were negotiating with the Democrats. But eventually, we're going to have some kind of deal on the debt ceiling, and I'd bet quite a bit of this money will be in there. The best type of deficit reduction, after all, is the kind you were going to do anyway.

[From the Scientific American, June 27, 2011]  
LEGACY OF MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS FROM  
IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN WARS WILL BE  
LONG-LIVED

(By John Matson)

As Operation Enduring Freedom, the war on terror in Afghanistan, winds down and some 33,000 U.S. servicemen and service-women return from overseas in the next year, a plan announced by President Obama on June 22, the psychological issues that veterans face back home are likely to increase.

Some of the key psychological issues affecting the approximately two million American troops deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan since 2001 have been traumatic brain injury (TBI), depression and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)—and the diagnoses often overlap. A 2008 report by the RAND Corp. think tank estimated that more than 26 percent of troops may return from the wars on terror with mental health issues.

It is reasonable to expect a continuation of these brain and mental health trends, only multiplied by the anticipated dramatic uptick in returning troops. On top of that, such issues also tend to crop up several months or even years after service members settle in, rather than directly after homecoming, as researchers learned following America's wars in the late 20th century. A false honeymoon can deceive health care workers and family into a perception that all is well among members of the military reentering society stateside.

After the withdrawal of U.S. soldiers from Vietnam in 1973 "the only thing that happened is that rates of problems went up," says George Mason University assistant professor of clinical psychology Keith Renshaw. "The longer people are back, the more people come forward as potentially struggling." A study in the April issue of the *Journal of Affective Disorders* showed that among service members injured in Iraq or Afghanistan, health care usage—and psychiatric problems—increased over time.

The influx of veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan into the military mental health system has yet to peak, but it is already well underway. There is some concern, however,

that the health care system is unprepared to handle the care of returning troops. A 2010 report from the Institute of Medicine identified a "critical shortage of health care professionals—especially those specializing in mental health—to meet the demands of those returning from theater in Iraq and Afghanistan and their family members."

TBI is especially common: roughly 30,000 servicemembers were diagnosed annually in 2008, 2009 and 2010, according to U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) figures. Most of those diagnoses were for concussions or other relatively mild forms of brain injury. PTSD is also worryingly prevalent—in a RAND survey, 13.8 percent of veterans and returning soldiers from Iraq and Afghanistan met the criteria for PTSD, meaning that some 275,000 U.S. service members may be affected in total.

The RAND report predicted that the mental health needs of returning Iraq and Afghanistan veterans will increase over time. "There are a lot of concerns that what we see now are underestimates, if anything," Renshaw says.

Many of the afflicted veterans will not seek help, and others will not do so for some time. "There's a lag time between when people serve and when they actually come in," says Shira Maguen, an assistant professor at the University of California, San Francisco, School of Medicine and a psychologist at the San Francisco Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Center. "For many of those people there are a lot of barriers at this point, the biggest of which is probably stigma." Renshaw notes that some soldiers who remain active in the armed forces resist seeking help because they do not want to endanger their military careers by acknowledging psychological issues. Others seek help in civilian practice rather than in the military health system.

The DoD and the VA have taken steps to prepare for the forecast rise in PTSD cases, highlighting two approaches to treatment—cognitive processing therapy and prolonged exposure therapy—that studies have shown to be effective. And June 27 has been designated National PTSD Awareness Day. "They're rolling out a massive dissemination effort," Renshaw says. "But I don't think we're at the point that we're ready yet."

New veterans suffering from PTSD may well fare better than their predecessors who served in Vietnam, as the disorder was only recognized by the American Psychiatric Association in 1980. "I think we've learned a tremendous amount from Vietnam and from prior conflicts," Maguen says. "I think we're in a unique position now to deal with it."

Even with lessons learned from Vietnam and the Persian Gulf wars, however, veterans of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom present a special treatment challenge. In some ways the new crop of veterans have had similar combat experiences to Vietnam veterans. Both groups fought in wars without clearly delineated front lines, where ambush and insurgency are a constant threat. But the types of combat exposure have changed, as have the potential triggers for negative psychological reactions later in life. For instance, Renshaw says, the urban component of the wars on terror and the threat of improvised explosive devices have made driving and traffic jams problematic triggers for some veterans. "Our methodology is still evolving to catch up with the nature of these conflicts," he says. "I think this is something we're going to be working on and dealing with for a long time."

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1940

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I join in this effort.

I tell you, without any pride but with humility, that this past weekend I signed 31 letters to families and extended families who have lost loved ones in Afghanistan and in Iraq.

At this time I have signed over 10,374 letters because of my mistake in voting to send our kids to Iraq, which was an unnecessary war with misinformation led by the previous administration. So I join my colleagues today on both sides of the aisle, and I thank those who offered this amendment.

This past weekend I decided to email my adviser, who is a former commandant of the Marine Corps, and said, "What do you think about President Obama's plans?"

I will read just two short points to you: "I think the time is too long. I think he needs to increase the number of troops coming out of the country more and quicker."

And his last point: "Get real with training and army and police force. All we are doing is training eventual new members of the Taliban. Trainers are doing a wonderful job, but we don't have the time to make an army. Every day someone dies. Every day an American dies or gets his or her legs blown off."

Mr. Chairman, to the left of me is a poster that was in the Raleigh, North Carolina, paper. Too many times, as we debate and there are eloquent speakers on the floor of the House, but we don't see any faces. We don't see any broken arms or legs.

Here is a young lady holding a little baby in her arms, and the little baby is looking at the officer who is presenting her with a draped flag. How often does this happen throughout America? We never see it.

It is time to bring our troops home. They have done everything they were asked to do by President Bush, to get al Qaeda, who was responsible for 9/11, to get bin Laden. We have done all of that. We have done everything we can do.

And as my friend from Massachusetts said, \$10 billion a month and we can't fix the schools, we can't fix the roads here in North Carolina and throughout America.

I'm from North Carolina. I know what's happening to my State. I know what's happening to the other States.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to bring them home. We don't need any more babies coming to their moms and dads and saying, when is daddy coming home? When is mother coming home? And they are being told they are not coming home. They are gone.

They have given their lives for America. We have done enough for Afghanistan. It has a corrupt leader and a corrupt government, and we need to come home.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, there will be a number of amendments offered in the next little while by Mr. GARAMENDI, by Ms. LEE, myself and Mr. JONES and by others all in various ways seeking to speed our exit from Afghanistan. I support them all.

Two weeks ago, the President proposed that we continue fighting in Afghanistan for at least 3½ more years. In those 3½ years, more of our soldiers will die, more of our Treasury will be spent and, in the end, we will not be any closer to creating a stable Afghanistan or to enhancing our safety.

The whole premise of this war is wrong. Fighting in Afghanistan does not enhance the security of the United States. Ten years ago we were attacked on 9/11 by al Qaeda. Al Qaeda had bases in Afghanistan, and at that time it made sense to go in and destroy those bases, and we did.

But the CIA tells us that there are now fewer than 100 al Qaeda personnel in all of Afghanistan. So why are we still fighting there? Why will we still have 70,000 troops in Afghanistan at the end of 2012, troops who will continue to risk their lives every day in a war that has already claimed too many American lives?

And we will continue pouring billions of dollars into an intractable mess when we should be devoting taxpayer funds to our own economy, to our own jobs, our own housing, our own social programs and our own education.

Afghanistan is in the middle of what is so far a 35-year civil war. If we continue on this course, in 3 years there will be several thousand more American soldiers dead, several hundred billion more dollars wasted, and two or three more provinces labeled pacified.

But as soon as we leave, now, or in 2014, or 2016 or whenever, those provinces will become unpacified. The Taliban and the warlords will step up the fighting, and the Afghan civil war will resume its natural course.

Our troops are fighting valiantly, Mr. Chairman, but they are in the wrong mission. We should recognize that rebuilding Afghanistan is both beyond our ability and beyond our mandate to prevent terrorists from attacking the United States.

To delay withdrawal of our forces and continue this terrible policy at so high a cost is quite simply unconscionable. It is unjustifiable to sacrifice more lives and more money on this futile endeavor.

Mr. Chairman, we should withdraw our troops now, all of them, as rapidly as physically possible.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, on March 16, 2011, I joined my cochairs of the Congressional Progressive Caucus Task Force on Peace and Security and 76 other Members of Congress in sending a letter to the President asking him to move swiftly to end America's longest war, the war in Afghanistan.

Since then, the cochairs have continued to call on the administration to move towards a significant, swift and sizeable reduction in our troops in Afghanistan, meeting or exceeding the number of troops on the ground before the escalation.

Similarly, the Democratic National Committee, of which I am vice chair, called for a "sizeable and significant" drawdown beginning in July. Even the U.S. Conference of Mayors called for an end to the Afghanistan war. In poll after poll, the majority of Americans are consistently calling for an end to this war.

A significant redeployment of U.S. troops from Afghanistan, beginning of this month, would have sent a clear message that the United States does not seek a permanent presence in Afghanistan.

This move would recognize that we cannot afford the war in Afghanistan, costing nearly \$10 billion per month, while American families struggle to stay afloat amid the slow recovery of our Nation's economy.

The cochairs of the CPC Task Force on Peace and Security believe that a significant, swift, and sizeable troop reduction in Afghanistan is necessary, especially given the fact that the CBO reported recently that ending the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq will save this country \$1.7 trillion, and especially given the fact that a recent Brown University study shows that the United States has spent \$3.7 trillion in these wars since 2001.

Anything less hurts our Nation's future and is unacceptable. It is time to focus on securing a future of economic opportunity and prosperity for the American people, and the President must move swiftly and boldly to end the war in Afghanistan and bring our troops home now.

The President's announcement last month does not reflect a significant policy change in Afghanistan. This strategy does not represent a drawdown in Afghanistan, but rather aims at maintaining the status quo through the end of 2012.

Simply removing the 30,000 surge troops from Afghanistan means that by the end of the summer of 2012 we will be exactly where we were in late 2009. Tens of thousands of American soldiers will continue to fight a battle that their commanders insist will only end with a political solution.

Peace in Afghanistan will depend ultimately on an Afghan solution, not on American soldiers. Everyone seems tired of this war, from Republicans and Democrats in Washington, to Afghans in Kabul, to Americans in Kansas. Administration officials acknowledged

that due to America's mounting debt and deficits, war costs at nearly \$120 billion annually for Afghanistan alone are no longer sustainable.

□ 1950

Republicans gave similar ground with Appropriations Chair HAROLD ROGERS and Defense Subcommittee Member JACK KINGSTON expressing concern about the costs, the mission, and the lack of progress—bolstering Republican Senator DICK LUGAR's call for troop withdrawal from Afghanistan. Nearly half the House weighed in during the recent Defense authorization debate with a call for an accelerated plan to draw down troops and transition to Afghan control.

Moving beyond what Washington wants, consider the Afghans, who are at the receiving end of all of this. After a series of serious civilian casualties resulting from multiple indiscriminate NATO bombings, Afghan President Hamid Karzai had declared opposition to any and all air strikes on Afghan homes. This adds to Karzai's insistence that foreign forces must end night raids, stop unilateral operations, and stay off roads and out of Afghan villages.

The Afghan people are no more pleased than Karzai with America's continued presence, hardly a surprise given that General Petraeus has increased bombing throughout the country by 80 percent in the last year alone. According to a recent poll, nearly six out of 10 Afghans said Western troops must leave on or before the original July 2011 withdrawal date. Only 17 percent say that the deployment should be maintained longer.

After spending hundreds of billions of American tax dollars, the security and day-to-day life in many regions of Afghanistan aren't improving. Crime, economic opportunity, and freedom of movement are getting worse, not better. Availability of electricity, food, medical care, and schools has shown little or no improvement in recent years.

So, for all these reasons and more, the case is clear: We need to end this war in Afghanistan, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. I rise in opposition to the underlying bill and will seek an amendment shortly.

Memorial Day was a time when four of my colleagues and I traveled throughout Afghanistan. We learned a great deal, and what we did learn we brought home.

1,650 American men and women have died in Afghanistan, and yet the incredible dedication of American soldiers was easy to see. They risk their lives every day. And it is with the utmost respect that we honor them on Memorial Day and beyond. I have great respect for the President and recognize

the difficult situation, the decisions that he must make; but, frankly, I think he made the wrong decision.

The killing of bin Laden gave us the opportunity to pivot, to go in the direction that we must ultimately go, which is to focus like a laser on al Qaeda, wherever it is in this world, including our own country. We must do that. And yet the decision to maintain in Afghanistan a troop level that really reflects what existed in 2009 is not sustainable. It's costing us a fortune, a fortune that we can ill afford.

This entire town is caught up in a debate over the deficit and the pending default crisis, and yet we seem to want to continue to pour money into Afghanistan, into a five-way civil war for which there is no military solution. Negotiations are essential. Yet is this country pushing forward the negotiations? If so, it's in secret, and I certainly hope it is there, because therein lies the solution.

I think we don't need 100,000, 50,000, 60,000, troops in Afghanistan. We really only need a handful to focus on al Qaeda, wherever they may be in that region. And so if we were to draw down our troops in the next 18 months to 25,000 in Afghanistan and then 10,000 in 2013, we would begin to get to a level over an appropriate course of time. And it is this House's responsibility to put forth an appropriation bill that provides money for only that, and no more, to limit the funding.

It's pretty clear the President has the power to initiate a war. It's equally clear that we have the only power, the only power to fund the war. And if we say no, then this war will cease. If we say only this amount of money for only this purpose, then this war will rapidly diminish. There will be amendments on the floor shortly to achieve that goal. And we ought to proceed in that way.

We need to rebuild America. We need to bring the money and the troops home and rebuild this Nation. We can do so when this war is over. Until then, this is a sump in which we are pouring the lives of American men and women and even more Afghan men and women and our treasure to the detriment of this Nation's economic strength.

I oppose this war, along with my colleagues, and I would ask this House, Democrat and Republican alike, to use the power of the purse to bring this war to a rapid and appropriate close and fund the negotiations, fund the war on al Qaeda, not the war in Afghanistan.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentleman for raising the issue of cost, but I want my colleagues to understand what we are actually paying for military operations in Afghanistan.

We are borrowing \$10 billion per month, \$2.3 billion per week, \$328.3 million per day, \$13.7 million per hour, \$228,000 per minute. And we are having a debate right now over how we get the

debt under control. And these borrowed moneys are not even a subject of discussion. If you want to get the debt down, you've got to deal with these war costs. And I can't believe that for those who are advocating the status quo that they don't want to pay for it, it's going on our credit card, and I think that is unacceptable. This is an enormous cost to us here in our own country.

I thank the gentleman.

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

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

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

Ms. CHU. I am opposed to the underlying bill because it does not do enough to withdraw our troops from Afghanistan.

Earlier this month, the President made an important announcement. He plans to withdraw 10,000 troops from Afghanistan in the next 6 months and another 20,000 by next summer. This is a step in the right direction, and I commend the President for following through with the drawdown plan.

But the American people are crying for a significant and sizable drawdown, and we are still too far from that. Even after these troops come home, which won't be for another year and a half, we will still be exactly where we were in 2009. Seventy thousand American soldiers will still be serving in Afghanistan, and I can't help but wonder why.

The ongoing financial and human costs of this war are now indefensible. We spend \$2 billion a week on the war effort in Afghanistan. And what's worse is that our own money is working against us.

Last year, I was outraged to learn that taxpayers are spending \$2.16 billion on private contractors in Afghanistan. These contractors use part of the money to pay off local warlords, which then ends up in the Taliban's hand. So, in effect, we are funding both sides of the same war.

This corruption and waste of hard-earned American dollars is the direct result of unreliable counsel and a lack of perspective, and it's costing us a whopping \$100 billion a year. That's five times more than we spend on Pell grants every year, financial aid to put American kids through college. That's double what we spend on Medicaid that keeps all Americans healthy regardless of income. And \$100 billion would completely pay for the Homeland Security Department, Commerce Department, Department of Science and the entire judicial branch combined. When money is tight and Congress is trying to slash Medicare and Social Security to keep this Nation afloat, it is irresponsible to keep writing blank checks for this war.

But, sadly, that's not the largest toll of this war. Since 9/11, we've lost over 1,600 American lives. Over 11,000 troops have been wounded, and an untold number of Afghan civilians have lost their lives after a decade of war.

□ 2000

And it is not getting any better. In fact, last year was the most deadly year on record for U.S. troops in Afghanistan.

Al Qaeda is no longer in Afghanistan but scattered around the world. It did not take 100,000 troops to find Osama bin Laden, and it does not take a military occupation of Afghanistan to protect us from terrorist threats. By failing to significantly draw down the number of troops in Afghanistan, we continue to focus efforts away from the terrorists and needlessly put American soldiers in the line of fire.

But this story is about more than just numbers and figures; it is about real people who sacrifice everything to keep us safe. On Sunday, April 3, of this year, a 21-year-old young marine named Harry Lew died while serving the country in Afghanistan. He was the son of Sandy and Allen Lew, the brother of Carmen Lew, and he was my nephew.

Harry died while serving on watch duty in Helmand Province. His unit's goal was to provide security to locals and to promote development in the region. But 3 short months before he was set to return home, he was gone.

Ending this war will save American lives. Ending it will let us focus on fighting terrorism around the globe. Ending the war will save money at a time when we need it the most. It is time to end the war in Afghanistan, bring our troops home, and begin seriously addressing our real security needs.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I very much appreciate the time, Mr. Chairman, and I rise only because I can't help but be moved by the Progressive Caucus' interest in getting us out of Afghanistan as quickly as possible.

I know of those who are very concerned about America being involved in wars anywhere. It was not my intention to speak about this subject until I heard my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) who has an amendment later that would strike the funding for approximately 2½ months of the proposed cost of this effort in Afghanistan.

And as I thought about that, I would want to caution my friend, Mr. GARAMENDI, and others, about the role in Afghanistan. Indeed, it is important for us to note, those of us who may have read "Charlie Wilson's War," and I am sure my colleague has read it thoroughly, but Charlie Wilson was a colleague of mine on the Subcommittee on Defense who first raised the prospect of challenges in Afghanistan.

At that point in time, the Soviet Union was attempting to move into Afghanistan to take over that entire country, giving them access to the entire region, a warm water port, and



otherwise. If it had not been for, in my judgment, the effort as a result of Charlie Wilson's war and the efforts of Pope John Paul, who was then the bishop from Poland, perhaps it is very possible that the Soviet Union never would have fallen. But, indeed, Charlie Wilson's war created a circumstance where the Soviets did withdraw from Afghanistan. And so we were right on the edge of opportunity and peace and freedom in Afghanistan.

And what I would caution my colleague from California about is, following that, what did America do? America did what we often do in the world where there is strife and struggle, where we are asked to play a role in leadership, providing for opportunity and change for peace. The vacuum that was left in Afghanistan as a result of our walking away after the war, after the Soviets left, was that vacuum. And within the vacuum, there came terrorists who would have America and freedom in mind. Indeed, as a result of that vacuum, al Qaeda, Taliban, and others got strength and found a terrorist center. And now we are involved in a war that involves the future of the world, not just peace for the world but American peace as well.

Indeed, I would be very cautious as we go about suggesting that we ought to automatically walk away from the commander in chief's plan. Indeed, if we are not careful, the vacuum will catch up with us, and America will find itself in a much broader and a much more intense struggle.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GRIMM). The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Before I yield to my colleague from California to respond, I would like to mention, and I appreciate Mr. LEWIS' history, but I would suggest to you that al Qaeda could have found a base in Yemen, they could have found a base in the Sudan, they could have found a base in other places. There was nothing particularly unique about Afghanistan that allowed them to have that base there. The fact is that we went into a country to fight al Qaeda, which was all in the mountains in Pakistan, and even in the cities in Pakistan, probably with the knowledge of the Pakistani government, and we have wasted a lot of money and lives in an area where we didn't need to be because that war will continue.

There are only 100 al Qaeda, give or take, left in Afghanistan, but there are al Qaeda in other spots in the Middle East, and al Qaeda's people have plotted terrorist activities from Germany and from other places in Europe. They don't need Osama bin Laden's base to have activity. There is nothing unique with Afghanistan.

As far as the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union went down for goodly reasons, because of all of the money they spent in Afghanistan. True, we were

there fighting them; but their attempt at gaining empire, which has been the cause of the loss of many empires, stretching too far and going beyond their supply lines, killed them. They spent money there. And they'd like us to stay there. They are being real nice to us. They're helping us with bases to bring in armaments and troops and supplies.

Come on, America, spend your money. Break your government. Come like we are, broken.

It was a mistake.

I believe that we need to get out of Afghanistan because we are losing lives and money, and doing it for a reason that is not going to make our country any better.

Mr. LEWIS talked about strife in places in Afghanistan. I will tell you about strife—in the United States of America, in my city, in Detroit, in Philadelphia, in Boston, in Chicago. You go to the inner cities of America, and you will see people without hope and without opportunity. That is where infrastructure needs to be built. That is where education needs to be affirmed, not in projects in Afghanistan, but in the United States of America. And that is what the Conference of Mayors said, that we cannot afford this; while our cities go to decay and our people lose their opportunity and our middle class is destroyed, we fight a war in Afghanistan which was the war of another generation, which we should have learned from history and the Soviets' experience and what happened to them. If you don't learn from history, you are doomed to make the same mistakes. I see that happening.

Admiral Mike Mullen said national debt is our biggest security threat. Admiral Mullen: National debt is our biggest security threat.

He said at a breakfast just last month in a tribute to our troops that that is the biggest problem we have. And when you have a problem like that that is a security interest, you go to your biggest spot where you can save money, which is the defense budget, and this war that is draining and has cost us so much—Afghanistan and Iraq.

I have some amendments coming which I am going to offer that would reduce the amount of money that we spend with the forces, and also the amount of money that we spend with the infrastructure and the development there in Afghanistan.

The fact is, just like in Iraq, we put in equipment and buildings and then we leave, and they don't have the ability to maintain those buildings or maintain that equipment, and it goes to waste. We don't need to be wasting our resources, leaving them there where they will just go to waste. We need to spend those resources in America and create jobs in America, and hope and opportunity for America.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

I just want to respond to something that Mr. LEWIS said, who is a good friend of mine and whom I respect very much. He talked about the need for us to be cautious. Well, I wish we were more cautious where we committed our young men and women in the field of battle.

It is politicians that put our service men and women in harm's way, and it is politicians that keep this war going. The fact of the matter is that we have an unreliable partner in Afghanistan. President Karzai is corrupt. He fixed the last election. I mean, he is denigrating our service men and women. When I was over there, one of our soldiers from Massachusetts said to me, What bothers me most is we are risking our lives to try to help improve the quality of life of people in this country, and the President of this country, Mr. Karzai, denigrates us, diminishes what we do, calls us names, accused the United States of using nuclear weapons in Afghanistan.

The Massachusetts soldier said to me, Do you know what that feels like?

□ 2010

Look, we need to rethink our policy in Afghanistan. Nobody is talking about walking away. What we're saying is that the current policy of counterinsurgency is going broke.

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

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

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

Ms. LEE. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentlelady from California.

Previously, my good friend with whom I've worked for more than 35 years in various levels of government challenged me on the position I take with regard to winding down quickly the war in Afghanistan. His recitation of history, while accurate, is woefully incomplete.

Much of what we are now fighting was actually begun by Charlie Wilson, morphed over this period of time perhaps by Pakistan. But we're caught in the middle of a civil war, not just a civil war, but a five-way civil war, one that has gone on for at least the last 35 years. We are, as my friend Mr. MCGOVERN just stated, backing a government that is, on the face of it, corrupt by any standard.

So what are we doing here? What is this all about?

In fact, we went into Afghanistan to get al Qaeda, and we did. There is only a handful there. There are probably far more al Qaeda sympathizers—and maybe active members—in the United States than in Afghanistan.

So why do we have over 100,000 American troops and another 40,000 NATO troops in Afghanistan?

I did not suggest that we leave in a vacuum. Instead, I said we leave a

small force behind that goes after al Qaeda. Take them out wherever they happen to be. Bring our troops back home. Go back to the original mission in Afghanistan. Go after al Qaeda.

You're quite correct, my colleagues. They're in Somalia; they're in Yemen; and they're in other parts of this world. The more troops we have in Iraq and Afghanistan, the more reason we give to those who want to recruit yet more al Qaeda members. This makes no sense going forward. Yes, we will have a continuing obligation, but if you take a look at the strategy that is now in place, one that calls upon America to maintain its troops, then you can count on a larger deficit. That makes no sense to me. Let's bring our troops home rapidly. The amendments that will be on the floor will cause that to happen.

We have the power of the purse here. This Nation can no longer sustain \$120 billion a year in Afghanistan when our bridges are crumbling, when our children are not educated, when we cannot afford in the budget you're putting forth to feed our children or to care for our elderly. This war must end, and it must end soon.

I have great respect for the President, but he has got the wrong strategy. He is continuing on the strategy that by the proof on the ground does not work. Pivot. Go back to what we once said was our goal. Get al Qaeda. Take them out wherever they happen to be. We know we can do it. We have done it.

Anybody who wants to play the al Qaeda game on their side, know that this Nation has the capability to take you out.

My good friend, Mr. LEWIS, the next time you want to recite the history of Afghanistan, recite the full history of Afghanistan, including this Nation's 10-year effort and all of the mistakes that we have made. Let us not compound those mistakes by continuing on the same course for another 3, 4, 5 years and beyond. It's time to end this war. It's time to focus on the true enemy here—al Qaeda.

Ms. LEE. I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOSWELL

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 122, line 10, strike "Not" and insert "(a) Not".

Page 124, after line 7, insert the following: (b) It is the sense of Congress that suicide prevention programs should be a priority of the military departments with respect to reinvesting the efficiency savings described in subsection (a).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOSWELL. This is a very simple amendment. It clarifies that the Defense suicide prevention programs are a priority and should always remain a priority.

I am not alone in my concern for the rates of suicide among our servicemembers in the active duty, Guard, and Reserve components. I, like some of the rest of you, have had that experience with my own constituency back in the Iowa Reserve.

The Department of Defense has identified large potential savings from improved efficiencies, totaling as much as \$100 billion over the next 5 years. Section 8128 directs the Secretary to report to Congress on how it will redirect those savings into priorities of the military departments. However, there is no direction that ensures that the Secretary include existing suicide programs as "priorities" for reinvestment from these savings.

This amendment simply clarifies that suicide prevention programs—which already exist and have already been authorized—are a priority and will remain a priority. We must do everything in our power to reduce the suicide rates of our men and women in uniform, and this amendment fulfills that obligation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill; therefore it violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

This amendment proposes to state a legislative position, and I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard?

The gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, as you might expect, respectfully I rise in opposition to the point of order.

In accordance with clause 2 of rule XXI, this amendment does not make a new appropriation; it does not re-appropriate unused funds; it does not restrict the availability of funds; and it does not change existing law.

In fact, Defense suicide prevention programs have already been authorized by law, for example, the Yellow Ribbon Program, which helps support National Guard and Reserve servicemembers and families. This amendment simply clarifies that suicide prevention programs—which already exist and have already been authorized—are a priority and will always remain a priority. So I humbly suggest that no one in good conscience could suggest otherwise.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard? If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language expressing the sense of Congress.

The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

□ 2020

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8129. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability.

SEC. 8130. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months.

TITLE IX

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Army", \$6,822,635,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 125, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$3,438,789,000)".

Page 125, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$445,117,000)".

Page 125, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$337,774,000)".

Page 125, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$665,978,000)".

Page 126, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$103,610,000)".

Page 126, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$20,878,000)".

Page 126, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$12,714,000)".

Page 126, line 23, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$13,411,000)".

Page 127, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$315,703,000)".

Page 127, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$4,719,000)".

Page 127, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$11,012,116,000)".

Page 127, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$2,021,929,000)".

Page 128, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$1,160,729,000)".

Page 128, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$3,010,749,000)”.

Page 128, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$1,948,995,000)”.

Page 130, line 10, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$70,707,000)”.

Page 130, line 16, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$20,000,000)”.

Page 130, line 23, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$11,731,000)”.

Page 131, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$119,794,000)”.

Page 131, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$10,159,000)”.

Page 131, line 25, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$1,625,451,000)”.

Page 133, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$154,418,000)”.

Page 135, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$4,161,156,000)”.

Page 138, line 22, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$21,099,000)”.

Page 139, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$5,546,000)”.

Page 139, line 13, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$34,740,000)”.

Page 139, line 20, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$223,174,000)”.

Page 140, line 9, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$6,847,000)”.

Page 140, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$52,352,000)”.

Page 140, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$40,179,000)”.

Page 141, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$210,224,000)”.

Page 141, line 19, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$4,738,000)”.

Page 142, line 3, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$15,423,000)”.

Page 142, line 10, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$483,835,000)”.

Page 142, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$61,480,000)”.

Page 143, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$941,192,000)”.

Page 144, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$1,419,000)”.

Page 144, line 25, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$8,253,000)”.

Page 145, line 8, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$22,523,000)”.

Page 145, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$30,609,000)”.

Page 145, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$133,194,000)”.

Page 161, line 12, relating to the spending reduction account, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$33,000,124,000)”.

Ms. LEE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Let me just first thank Chairman ROGERS, our ranking member, Mr. DICKS, and my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their hard work in putting together this bill.

I rise today to offer the Lee-Jones amendment, joined by Representatives NADLER; WOOLSEY; OLVER; STARK; JESSE JACKSON, JR.; HONDA; CONYERS; GRIJALVA; PAUL; and AMASH. And I want to thank each of my colleagues for joining Representative JONES and me on this important amendment.

This amendment would end the war in Afghanistan by ending the funding for combat operations but would provide funds to bring our troops home in a safe and orderly manner. And while I would have preferred to offer the Lee amendment, which I have offered in the past—to fence off and to limit funding to the safe, orderly withdrawal of all U.S. Armed Forces in Afghanistan—I was unable to do so today given that we are debating on an appropriations bill. So I want to emphasize again this important point: that while this amendment cuts war funding, it cuts combat operations funding, but it does leave enough funding to provide for the safe and orderly return of all U.S. forces from Afghanistan.

I speak today as the daughter of a lieutenant colonel who fought in several wars, one who knows the trauma and devastation of wars on families. I want to be clear that our servicemen and -women have performed with incredible courage and commitment in Afghanistan. They are doing everything we asked them to do. But the truth is that they have been put in an impossible position. They are fighting in a way with no military solution and no end in sight. Only a political and diplomatic solution and a regional stabilization strategy will end this war.

In fact, this concern of “war without end” is why I opposed the resolution authorizing military force on September 14, 2001. It began a series of blank checks that we have been writing for nearly a decade now.

There are few things that we know with certainty regarding the situation in Afghanistan:

We know that corruption persists unabated, and in many cases has been fueled by the U.S. occupation and influx of foreign cash. President Karzai has proven himself time and time again unwilling—or, at the very least, un-

able—to meaningfully root out corruption within his own administration;

We know that the United States troop presence has increased from 4,000 troops in 2002 to almost 100,000 in 2011. At the same time, military and civilian casualties have increased at record rates, and violence is on the rise;

We also know that al Qaeda's presence in Afghanistan has been all but eliminated, and Osama bin Laden is dead. It's not feasible or in our national security interest to address this threat through a military-first, boots-on-the-ground strategy in Afghanistan;

And we know, as military and foreign policy experts from across the political spectrum have told us repeatedly, that the situation in Afghanistan will not be resolved by a military solution.

We need to bring our troops home safely and swiftly, and that is why I am offering this amendment.

This war is costing us too much. With over 1,600 troops killed and tens of thousands more seriously wounded in Afghanistan, the human toll continues to mount every day. And we have already spent over \$400 billion fighting in Afghanistan. It is past time to admit that we can no longer afford to send more blank checks for a war without end.

The United States has squandered more than \$1.1 trillion on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Economists estimate that the total direct and indirect costs of these two wars by their end may total as much as \$6 trillion.

With no military solution, we need to redirect these funds to job creation and supporting those efforts for the most vulnerable, including those who have been unemployed for over 2 years and have no more unemployment benefits. While we spend \$2 billion a week—mind you, \$2 billion a week—on this decade-long war, critical programs like Medicare are on the chopping block as we seek to get our Nation's finances in order.

The American people are sick and tired of this war and the massive unending spending that it requires.

Just last month, the United States Conference of Mayors passed a resolution to end the wars and to use the savings to build bridges and schools and infrastructure here at home where it is needed. The resolution specifically calls on the President and the United States Congress to end the wars as soon as strategically possible and bring these war dollars home to meet vital human needs, promote job creation, rebuild our infrastructure, aid municipal and State governments, and develop a new economy based on renewable, sustainable energy and reduce the Federal debt.

We need to bring our troops back and use the savings to address our Nation's fiscal challenges. The American people recognize this. It's time to say that enough is enough. It's time to begin with safe and orderly withdrawal of United States troops from Afghanistan. This amendment does just that by ending the funding of combat operations in

Afghanistan while maintaining funds for a safe and orderly withdrawal.

This is not a cut-and-run amendment. This is a responsible amendment to bring our troops home now. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment, helping to bring our servicemen and -women home safely and ending the war in Afghanistan.

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

Mr. PRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of the point of order, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman has an amendment to reduce the overseas contingency operation—aka the war on terror—by \$33 billion. She intends for this amendment to support, as she says, an orderly withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan. However, such a reduction would, in fact, severely disrupt and suspend a redeployment from Afghanistan. The magnitude of her funding reduction would also threaten the ability to support troop pay and safety.

The committee has provided funds to begin the redeployment of troops in Afghanistan. If the redeployment from Afghanistan were to be accelerated, there would be significant increases in personnel, equipment, and transportation costs in fiscal year 2012.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment and urge others to do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my dear friend Congresswoman LEE and the rest of the authors.

Congresswoman LEE is a courageous voice for peace in Afghanistan and around the world, and what she says—this is the bottom line of this amendment—is clear: We should not spend one more dime waging war in Afghanistan. The only money we appropriate must be used to wind down the war with the safe, orderly, complete, and long overdue military redeployment out of Afghanistan.

□ 2030

The White House announced about 2 weeks ago that we would have a troop withdrawal from Afghanistan. I believe that announcement was tragically inadequate. Actually, I was hoping to hear that at least 50,000 troops would be coming home by the end of 2011. Instead, the President announced his intention to wait another year, the summer of 2012, before removing the 33,000 troops that were added with the surge. Too slow, too cautious, too modest.

I don't know how much clearer the writing on the wall has to be, Mr.

Chairman. Afghanistan remains in terrible disarray, with a terribly corrupt central government and a security force actually incapable of enforcing security. Our military footprint isn't doing enough in Afghanistan. It is actually causing more harm than good. Meanwhile, the human cost here at home is nothing short of devastating. Casualties have spiked. Americans are dying in Afghanistan at an unacceptable rate, more than 200 troops so far this year and over 1,600 troops since the war began nearly a decade ago.

And, Mr. Chairman, making it home alive doesn't mean making it home whole. Thousands upon thousands of servicemembers will spend the rest of their lives coping with the wounds and the scars they acquired in this unnecessary war. Many have left limbs behind in Afghanistan. Others will never regain their mental health or their peace of mind, suffering the devastating effects of PTSD.

Why would we continue to throw another dollar at a war that has done so much to hurt our people and Afghan civilians and done so little to help Afghanistan in general? This week, as a matter of fact, all of Washington is abuzz about the debt ceiling negotiations. Commentators are asking us, where will we find consensus that preserves the full faith and credit of the United States of America? Well, Mr. Chairman, there is a consensus in the United States, a consensus among the American people, and that is that the \$10 billion a month that we're spending in Afghanistan is roughly \$10 billion too much. But war spending is not on the table in these talks. Instead, Medicare cuts are on the table, while my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are clinging tight to loopholes and subsidies for oil companies, corporate jets, and the horse racing industry. Their spending priorities are just totally warped.

Mr. Chairman, it's time to bring all this in line with the priorities of the American people. It's time to end this war. It's time to stop investing money that we need right here at home, and it is time to invest only in bringing our troops home safely.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support the Lee amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. NADLER. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I won't take 5 minutes.

I rise to speak in support of the Lee amendment, which I have the honor of cosponsoring. My views on Afghanistan, I expressed a little while ago, but I just want to make a couple of comments.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) said we have to be careful, that we have to be wary of a vacuum should we pull out. He analogized it to what

happened with the Soviets when the Soviets lost and there was a vacuum because we turned our backs on it. And he was right. We should not have turned our backs on helping, on helping with schooling and other things in Afghanistan at that time. But the fact of the matter is the world's history is full of empires that threw away their substance on silly military adventures. This is a silly military adventure. It's a total waste, because it is a classic, where we are fighting when we have forgotten why we are fighting.

We went into Afghanistan to get rid of the al Qaeda bases. That took a week. For good measure we spent another week and got rid of the Taliban government. And now what are we fighting for for the last 8 years? To put a government in our image? It's not going to happen. To install and see that there is a government that can rule from Kabul? There hasn't been a government in Kabul who has run the entire country since Alexander the Great. That's not going to happen.

We can't settle their civil war, which has now gone on for 35 years, nor will settling their civil war aid our security, which we can't do anyway, and we don't have to. Our security is fighting the terrorists, but the terrorists are all over the place. And maybe we have to, if they develop a base in Pakistan, maybe we have to bomb it or send in special forces. Ditto for Somalia, Yemen, or God knows where.

Every sovereign country as a condition of its sovereignty must make sure that its territory is not used to attack someone else, and if territory of some country is being used to attack us, or to plot mayhem against us, we have the right and the duty, if necessary, to deal with that. But that's not the question in Afghanistan. The CIA, as I said before, tells us there are fewer than 100 people there. Why do we need 70,000 troops? Those troops could be better occupied back home in the United States training, helping fight disasters. Our money could be better occupied dealing with our serious fiscal problems, building up our infrastructure, building up our schools, building up our social services, and even building up our military for real threats.

There are real threats in the world. Pakistan is dangerous because they have nuclear weapons. We have to pay attention to it. But I fail to see any purpose whatsoever for having tens of thousands of troops, tens of billions of dollars in Afghanistan where we vanquished the enemy 10 years ago. We ought to declare victory, we should have pulled out, and we should do so right now.

I thank the gentlelady for her amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 125, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,695,031,000)”.

Page 125, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$348,845,000)”.

Page 125, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$264,718,000)”.

Page 125, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$521,937,000)”.

Page 126, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$81,201,000)”.

Page 126, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$16,362,000)”.

Page 126, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$9,964,000)”.

Page 126, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,511,000)”.

Page 127, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$247,421,000)”.

Page 127, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,698,000)”.

Page 127, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$8,662,596,000)”.

Page 127, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,584,616,000)”.

Page 128, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$909,681,000)”.

Page 128, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,359,569,000)”.

Page 128, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,527,457,000)”.

Page 130, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$55,414,000)”.

Page 130, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$15,674,000)”.

Page 130, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$9,193,000)”.

Page 131, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$93,884,000)”.

Page 131, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$7,962,000)”.

Page 133, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,748,000)”.

Page 139, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$17,697,000)”.

Page 139, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$113,688,000)”.

Page 140, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,488,000)”.

Page 140, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$26,669,000)”.

Page 140, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$20,468,000)”.

Page 141, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$107,091,000)”.

Page 141, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,414,000)”.

Page 142, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$7,857,000)”.

Page 142, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$246,473,000)”.

Page 142, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$31,319,000)”.

Page 143, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$737,626,000)”.

Page 144, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$723,000)”.

Page 144, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,204,000)”.

Page 145, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$11,474,000)”.

Page 145, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$15,593,000)”.

Page 145, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$104,386,000)”.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$20,887,651,000)”.

Mr. GARAMENDI (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with reading the rest of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

□ 2040

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank my colleagues for bringing that recitation to an end, but I also urge my colleagues to pay careful attention to what we’re trying to accomplish here. I’ll try to explain it without reading each and every one of those lines.

The Afghan Study Group, Richard Haas and many others who are very familiar with the Afghanistan war and the way in which it is being conducted have suggested that by the end of 2012, America should have no more than 25,000 troops in Afghanistan and then further, wind down the war in 2013 to 10,000 troops focused on terrorists, focused on al Qaeda.

As I spoke a few moments ago on this issue, this amendment is to accomplish that goal, to wind down the war in a responsible way over the next 18 months so that at the end of the 18 months—that would be December 31, 2012—that there’d be no more than 25,000 troops in Afghanistan.

Now, unfortunately, I can’t add the rest of it, but I will at least give the reason for this. And that is to pivot on the success of getting bin Laden. We went to Afghanistan to get al Qaeda. We succeeded. And now we are involved in a civil war, a great civil war, a five-sided civil war, maybe a six- or seven-sided civil war; and we are supporting a government in that war that is at best corrupt and quite possibly even more inept. So what are we doing there besides spending \$120 billion a year?

Well, we are kind of fighting it out. We’re losing a lot of Americans, and even more Afghans are dying. We’re not going to be able to solve this with troops on the ground. This war needs to be negotiated. As much effort as we are spending on the troops, we should spend on negotiations. Unfortunately, little or no negotiations are going on that are at least talked about publicly; and I would hope they’re going on privately, secretly, but I don’t think that to be the case.

So we need a negotiated settlement; we need to pivot on the success of bin Laden. We need to focus like a laser on al Qaeda wherever they happen to be in the world. And we know that they are in Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, other places in the world—including the United States. So our focus must be on that, not on this civil war. We cannot solve it with our troops in Afghanistan.

This amendment would cause us, as Members of Congress, to exert the au-

thority given to us by the Constitution, that is, the power of the purse, and by denying funding for more than 25,000 troops at the end of 2012, we will accomplish the goal of rapidly, appropriately winding down the war. Not my words, but the words of the Afghan Study Group and Richard Haas—people who know these issues.

We must do this for our own good, for the good of this Nation. We’re sitting here in the midst of a great debate upon a default crisis, a back-and-forth about how do we deal with the deficit. Well, one way we can deal with the deficit is to end this war; \$120 billion a year adds up to a third of a trillion dollars in just 3 years. We’re not suggesting we can get that. We know we’re going to have to maintain some sort of a presence there.

But surely we don’t need to spend \$120 billion in Afghanistan when in our own country we are denying our children an education for lack of money. We are denying our elderly the health care that they need, for example, terminating Medicare for lack of money. We are not feeding our children; “60 Minutes” recently did a heart-wrenching story on homeless children living in cars and hotels in America because their parents have lost their jobs.

We have an unemployment rate that demands our attention, demands our investment in America, rebuilding America’s bridges, roads, rebuilding our manufacturing sector, making it in America once again, rebuilding the real strength of this Nation, its economy, and the middle class so that they can have jobs that will allow them to stay in their homes, provide for their children, live the good American life.

We must end this war. We must first wind it down. Were this more than an appropriation bill, I would have gone to step two, which is 10,000 at the end of 2013 with a mission that is the original mission, that is, going after the terrorists, not nation-building. We must, as the President said, rebuild our Nation. And unlike the President, this amendment offers us the opportunity to use our money to rebuild this Nation.

By the way, for you deficit hawks, it’s all borrowed money. You’re borrowing money for Afghanistan, or you’re borrowing money to rebuild this Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We oppose this amendment for the same reason we opposed the gentlewoman’s amendment from California on the last. It would be highly disruptive to our troops and, I think, put them at great risk for their personal safety. So we 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 California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Navy", \$919,034,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Marine Corps", \$675,360,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Air Force", \$1,436,353,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Army", \$207,162,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Navy", \$44,530,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps", \$25,421,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Air Force", \$26,815,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "National Guard Personnel, Army", \$646,879,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "National Guard Personnel, Air Force", \$9,435,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army", \$39,175,755,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

rorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 127, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$200,000,000)".

Page 149, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$200,000,000)".

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$200,000,000)".

Mr. WELCH (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 Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, one of the central questions that Congress must address is whether to continue the policy and nation-building in Afghanistan. As previous speakers have indicated, it's expensive. It's also very questionable as to whether it's anything but a failure.

□ 2050

The cornerstone of the nation building program is the Commander's Emergency Response Program. That gives the commanders flexibility, at their own discretion, to authorize significant infrastructure projects in Afghanistan, the goal being to win hearts and minds of the Afghan citizens. When you lay it out by its intentions, it's a very reasonable tool to provide to our commanders. The problem is the evidence is in, and it has been a failure.

The \$400 million Commander's Emergency Response Program, CERP, is a central component of what I believe is a failed nation building strategy. And the fundamental question here is this: Does the Defense appropriations bill double down on the nation building approach which has been drawn into such question?

Now, of the CERP development dollars, according to the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, SIGAR, about half of the CERP projects reviewed were unsustainable and fell into disrepair immediately following their transfer into Afghan hands. That failure of sustainment is real, and it is not subject to something that we can control here.

So the question that we have to ask on behalf of our military strategy is, is the money being used in a way that's effective? From the perspective of the Afghans, is it being used on projects that are sustainable? And the evidence, on the basis of our SIGAR report, is the answer is "no." And it's not surprising. You know, we've got to get a bit real

about this, whatever your position is on Afghanistan. If you have a government that has no infrastructure of civil service, that doesn't even have the capacity to do the sustainment, they don't have a civil service that can go out and maintain and repair the roads and other projects, is it realistic to expect that they will?

When you have a government that is corrupt, for whatever reason, but where the money that gets injected by the U.S. taxpayer into these projects, with the best of intentions, gets siphoned off into paying off people who have positions of authority, is that a wise use of our taxpayer dollar? Is it going to help our military ultimately be successful? So the question that we have a responsibility to answer is whether this tool of nation building makes sense.

One of the other questions that I think is fair to ask: Many of us have been to Afghanistan, and we've met with some of our USAID people, our State Department people who are out there, our military people of course, trying to implement these projects, Mr. Speaker. The amount of security that is required in order to allow people to do the simplest of projects in the middle of a shooting war is an enormous expense. And the question that comes to mind for me, and I think many Americans, is this: Does it make sense to do these infrastructure projects, these hearts and minds projects in the middle of a shooting war, or are those things that have to be done before or after? That's really the question.

So the intention of this program makes sense. The flexibility for our commanders they see as desirable. It is a tool that they can use. But we have had 10 years now of history. We have had a fully blown report by SIGAR that has said it just doesn't work. It just doesn't work.

So is it time for this Congress to call the question about the wisdom and the efficacy of this nation building tool, the CERP programs that fall into disrepair immediately upon their completion?

Our amendment calls the question, Mr. Speaker. And it would cut in half, which is about the amount that's documented to be wasted, the amount that is spent by U.S. taxpayers on these nation building activities in Afghanistan.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under section 3(j) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, because the amendment does not merely propose to transfer appropriations among objects in the bill, but also proposes language other than the amounts.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on this point of order? The Chair will rule.

To be considered en bloc pursuant to section 3(j)(1) of House Resolution 5, an amendment must propose only to transfer appropriations from an object or objects in the bill to a spending reduction account. Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont proposes other changes to the bill, namely changing the level of a limitation, it may not avail itself of section 3(j)(1) of House Resolution 5 to address the spending reduction account. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 127, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$15,000,000) (increased by \$15,000,000)”.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment tonight that will save both blood and an immense amount of money. The amendment I am introducing along with Congressman BLUMENAUER designates already authorized funds in the amount of \$15 million to be used to insulate the shelters at forward operating bases in Afghanistan. Properly insulating military shelters can significantly reduce energy consumption, which in turn can decrease the number of vulnerable fuel convoys needed to support our troops.

These fuel convoys cost us dearly. They are an absolutely vital supply link to our troops in the field, but they are exposed to constant and devastating attack. Despite the Pentagon spending \$24 billion a year to protect fuel convoys in Afghanistan, more than 3,000 troops and civilian contractors have been killed or wounded while riding on convoy. What’s more, fully two-thirds of the fuel used in Afghanistan goes to provide electricity for air-conditioning and heat at military installations. If we can reduce the energy required to heat and cool shelters in the field, then we can reduce the number of vulnerable fuel trucks needed to support the operations. Simply put, insulating the structures in the field will save lives of people who will not be on convoys to be attacked.

We will also save money. Properly insulated shelters use up to 92 percent less energy for their heating and cooling. With more than 200,000 gallons of diesel fuel used every day to power our forward operating bases in Afghanistan, insulating our field shelters has the potential to significantly reduce fuel consumption. A similar insulation effort in Iraq has led to almost \$1 billion a year in savings and has taken more than 11,000 fuel trucks off the road. This in turn has helped to prevent an estimated 458 casualties in Iraq.

A little arithmetic will show you that this \$15 million invested in insulating the shelters in the forward bases in Afghanistan should save several billion dollars in costs, as well as thousands of lives.

I want to thank Congressmen BLUMENAUER, HINCHEY, and WELCH for their support of this amendment. Together, the amendment provides a common-sense way to reduce fuel consumption across the war zone. This would save about two-thirds of the 200,000 gallons used a day. With the total cost of fuel sometimes exceeding \$400 a gallon in Afghanistan, including the transport costs, and thousands of casualties suffered by fuel convoys, a small investment of \$15 million in energy efficient insulation can go a long way in saving thousands of lives and upwards of billions of dollars in resources.

I urge passage of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

□ 2100

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very, very similar to one that the House rejected earlier today.

The project that would be funded by this amendment, by the shifting of this money, is not an authorized program to begin with. But even if it were, the Army’s O&M account in the OCO portion of the bill is funded at over \$39.1 billion.

And should this project remain in the final authorization bill and the Department concurs that it is a high enough priority, then there simply are ample funds to cover it with the \$39.1 billion.

So I see no reason for this amendment, and I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GARDNER). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Navy”, \$6,749,489,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps”, \$3,571,210,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”, \$10,739,587,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide”, \$9,312,876,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress): *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading:

(1) Not to exceed \$12,500,000 for the Combatant Commander Initiative Fund, to be used in support of Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom.

(2) Not to exceed \$1,750,000,000, to remain available until expended, for payments to reimburse key cooperating nations for logistical, military, and other support, including access provided to United States military operations in support of Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom, notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided*, That such reimbursement payments may be made in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, and in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may determine, in his discretion, based on documentation determined by the Secretary of Defense to adequately account for the support provided, and such determination is final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the United States, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further*, That the requirement to provide notification shall not apply with respect to a reimbursement for access based on an international agreement: *Provided further*, That these funds may be used for the purpose of providing specialized training and procuring supplies and specialized equipment and providing such supplies and loaning such equipment on a non-reimbursable basis to coalition forces supporting United States military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided in this paragraph.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 128, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000,000)”.

Page 129, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000,000)”.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000,000)”.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with the money that we give Pakistan. It specifically deals with the reimbursement account that the United States pays for the war on terror to reimburse Pakistan for the spending that they do and the money that they request back from the United States, specifically takes \$1 billion out of the reimbursement account and applies it to the reimbursement or, excuse me, the Spending Reduction Act.

Since May 2, when Osama bin Laden was taken out and we learned more about the role that Pakistan is playing—or, shall I say, not playing—in the war on terror, they have become more and more an unfaithful ally. President Bush said, when the war on terror began, to the countries throughout the world, either you are with us or you are with the terrorists.

Pakistan has yet to prove which side they are really on, so much so that when Osama bin Laden was taken out by the American military, we did not trust Pakistan enough to even tell them that we were going to come into their country. Our distrust against that country has been proven over and over again since that date.

On May 16, the Wall Street Journal reported that over 40 percent of the money that Pakistan requests for reimbursement for military aid is denied by the Federal Government because those claims are unfounded by the Federal Government. In one case last year, the United States paid millions of dollars to refurbish four helicopters to help Pakistan's Army transport troops into battle against the Taliban, but it turned out that Pakistan diverted three of those aircraft to peacekeeping duties in Sudan operations for which Pakistan receives compensation from the United Nations.

Other claims include a \$26 million charge for barbed wire and pickets and \$70 million for radar maintenance, although there is no enemy air threat related to the war on terror.

And on May 22, 15 to 20 militants stormed three hangars at the naval aviation base in Karachi. It took the Pakistan military over 15 hours to end that siege.

Two U.S. P-3Cs were destroyed. The P-3C is an anti-submarine and marine surveillance aircraft. Some reports now indicate it was an inside job, as the terrorists had military uniforms and knew exactly where the planes were located.

Then on June 14, reports confirmed that Pakistan now has arrested CIA informants that helped us locate Osama bin Laden, where he had been living under the eyes of the Pakistan military for years.

As reported in The New York Times on June 14, ISI arrested 30 Pakistani informants who helped the United States capture bin Laden. One was a Pakistani Army major who officials said copied the license plates of cars visiting bin Laden's compound at Abbottabad.

Then further, in June, when CIA Director Leon Panetta went to Pakistan to inform them that there was a factory that was making bombs or IEDs that could be used against Americans, by the time the Pakistani troops showed up, the militants had disappeared.

Not to be outdone, we told them again about a second place where IEDs were being made, more bomb-making facilities only days later, and once again the terrorists picked up and dis-

appeared. Sounds like they had inside information.

And lastly, on June 29, Pakistan asked the United States to shut down a drone base that it had in Islamabad and ended U.S. operations at the Shamsi Air Base. Although the United States denies that occurred, Pakistan's defense minister said that it has ended those operations. And, of course, drones carry out strikes against the Taliban and al Qaeda militants on Pakistan's border with Afghanistan.

And lastly, Transparency International has rated 178 countries on corruption, and Pakistan, our so-called ally, is rated the 143rd most corrupt, beating out, of course, Bangladesh and Nigeria, who have less corruption in their governments.

So we are dealing with a corrupt government. We don't know where our money is going. It may end up in the hands of people who hate us. It's being wasted. The Pakistan military, the Pakistan Government is trying to play at least two sides: our side, their side. They may be on a third side, who knows. But a billion dollars that we send them for so-called reimbursement of the war on terror, we can stop that. They are an unfaithful ally.

Only 17 percent of the Pakistani citizens say they even like the United States. That puts 83 percent that do not like the United States. We don't need to pay the Pakistan people to hate us. They will do it on their own.

So we no longer need to fund them. We need to take a billion dollars out of this account and put it into the deficit reduction spending account.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. The bill includes approximately \$2.4 billion to support the Pakistani military. Of this amount, 1.1 billion is for the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund and approximately 1.3 billion is provided through Coalition Support Funds.

The Pakistani Counterinsurgency Fund provides for the training and equipping of Pakistani forces specifically to aid U.S. counterterrorism objectives. Coalition Support Funds are used to reimburse the Pakistani military for operations which generally support U.S. counterterrorism objectives.

In the wake of Osama bin Laden's killing by U.S. Special Forces, serious questions have arisen about Pakistan's reliability as a strategic partner. And I must say that I agree with much of what the gentleman from Texas has just said.

The relationship with Pakistan has always been difficult, but maintaining the relationship is essential. This relationship helped the U.S. make progress against terrorism, and the Pakistanis have allocated a significant part of their forces within their own borders to this mission.

A complete withdrawal of U.S. assistance would likely polarize Pakistan and exacerbate significant pro- and anti-American rifts with their military and their government generally. Aggravating this divide would be counterproductive to U.S. objectives in the region, and we must remember that they are also a nuclear power.

In addition to the counterterrorism activity, the fact of Pakistan's nuclear weapons capabilities provides ample reason for the U.S. to continue to try and engage Pakistan.

I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2110

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The ranking member, Mr. DICKS, has eloquently pointed out why we are opposing this amendment. But like Mr. DICKS and like Mr. POE, the author of the amendment, I couldn't agree more. If this language included the word Pakistan, I would probably have to have a different attitude on this amendment because I share those concerns and I share them strongly. However, I understand the importance of our coalition and the coalition support fund that we have agreed to and the importance of maintaining that agreement.

But I would say that someone at a higher level who deals diplomatically with other countries, including Pakistan, has dropped the ball somewhere. I agree with Mr. POE, but I just don't think that we can be in a position where we can renege on our agreements and arrangements with our coalition partners, because they are very important to us and to the missions that we face.

So as reluctant as I might be because I share Mr. POE's thoughts, I also will oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve", \$217,500,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve", \$74,148,000:



*Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS  
RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve", \$36,084,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE  
RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve", \$142,050,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY  
NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard", \$387,544,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL  
GUARD

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard", \$34,050,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS  
TRANSFER FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, there is appropriated \$5,000,000,000 for the "Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund" for expenses directly relating to overseas contingency operations by United States military forces, to be available until expended: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress): *Provided further*, That of the funds made available in this section, the Secretary of Defense may transfer these funds only to military personnel accounts, operation and maintenance accounts, procurement accounts, and working capital fund accounts: *Provided further*, That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, that the Secretary shall notify the congressional defense committees 15 days prior to such transfer: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as originally appropriated.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 131, line 25, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$5,000,000,000)".

Page 161, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$5,000,000,000)".

Ms. LEE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Ms. LEE. I want to once again thank Mr. ROGERS and Ranking Member DICKS and my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their hard work on this bill. Let me also thank my colleagues who are joining Representative JONES and me on this bipartisan amendment: Representatives WOOLSEY, OLVER, HONDA, GRIJALVA and PAUL.

Mr. Chair, I rise to offer the Lee-Jones amendment to redirect the \$5 billion of the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund into a deficit reduction account. This amendment does nothing to undermine the efforts that our servicemen and -women have performed with incredible courage and with extreme commitment in Afghanistan, Iraq and around the world. They have done everything asked of them. And as the daughter of a military veteran, I take any matters that affect our troops very, very seriously.

But supporting our troops does not mean giving a blank check to the Pentagon. I have consistently said that we cannot afford to give any more blank checks to the Defense Department.

This amendment is about eliminating a giant \$5 billion check with a blank memo to fight the global war on terror anywhere, at any time, without any accountability. The Department of Defense just has to notify Congress that these funds are being transferred.

This \$5 billion giveaway, which is what it is, it's like a slush fund, it's like a war slush fund, another giveaway to the Pentagon. It's a \$5 billion check to use as it pleases with little or no congressional oversight. There's no accountability in how these funds are spent. While we understand that the Pentagon needs flexibility to address terrorist threats to this Nation and around the world, we need not create a separate slush fund, mind you, to do it. The flexibility has been given elsewhere in this bill, including \$119 billion in flexibility in this appropriations bill, a tremendous amount, at a time when we are cutting aid to American families who need assistance with buying food or receiving health care and also during a time when there are many calling for cuts in Medicare.

We already have a process in place for the Pentagon to get additional funds, as needed, outside of this appropriations bill; and the Congress has consistently responded well to the needs of the military. But Congress does not need to create a \$5 billion war slush fund. The Pentagon can incorporate its work to fight terrorism globally into its budget while taking steps

to rein in waste, fraud, and abuse in an already bloated budget.

Sixty cents of every dollar of discretionary funds is already handed over to the Pentagon. There's no doubt that this war slush fund would give rise to opportunities for waste, fraud and abuse at the Pentagon, such as the more than \$300 billion in major weapons system cost overruns identified by GAO.

It's time to address the culture of unlimited spending and no accountability at the Pentagon. Being strong on defense does not mean we have to give a free pass for irresponsible spending.

During such austere times, does the Pentagon really need another slush fund? Why can't the Pentagon budget for its wars, budget for preventing terrorist attacks? It's time to hold the Defense Department accountable for its bloated budget and rein in waste, fraud and abuse at the Pentagon by ending this war slush fund before it ever gets started.

I think the American people would be shocked to know what's taking place in this budget, especially this \$5 billion in war funding that's just put aside for the Pentagon to use as it pleases.

And so I hope my colleagues will vote "yes" to end this slush fund, and let's begin to start reining in these blank checks for the Pentagon. We're asking people who are vulnerable, we're asking our senior citizens, we're asking low-income individuals, we're asking everyone in this country to pay for this deficit and this debt. And we know how we got there.

But we need to really start beginning to look at deficit reduction in a real way, and in a way that is balanced, as the President said. And I don't think allowing a \$5 billion slush fund really moves us in the correct direction. It really is, I think, a sad day to think that we would allow for the Pentagon to have a \$5 billion slush fund when we cut funding for women and children and people who are hungry, when we won't extend unemployment for people who have exhausted their 99 weeks of unemployment compensation.

I can remember asking the Speaker to allow us to vote for unemployment compensation that would provide for 14 additional weeks of unemployment, but we were told there's no money and that was somewhere between 16, you know, to 20 billion that should have been designated as an emergency. Now we're dealing with a \$5 billion slush fund. So I ask for an "aye" vote to use this money for deficit reduction.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't call this a slush fund. This is not an additional fund that was added by the subcommittee at the request of the Pentagon or the Department of Defense.

When the subcommittee analyzed the request at our hearings and in the subsequent material provided us to justify the budget of the Defense Department for the overseas contingency operations, we had a strong disagreement. We did not think that their figures were well thought out. So rather than appropriate that \$5 billion that they requested, we moved it to what we call this transfer fund. It is not any additional money; it is just taken out of one account and put into another account. This transfer fund is to give the Defense Department some flexibility when they do get their facts and figures together on what the actual costs are.

□ 2120

Now, the \$5 billion, again, is not a slush fund. They can't spend this money without reporting back to Congress. Any money spent from this transfer fund must be reported to Congress, and Congress has 15 days in which to respond to that request.

This was done to try to make sure that we had what they needed, that the Defense Department had what they needed for the overseas contingency operations, but that they had to justify exactly how they were going to use the money. And to the contrary, rather than being the potential slush fund, this is definitely not a slush fund, and so I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, war is not predictable. We have men and women today engaged in combat. And I am a combat veteran with the United States Marine Corps. I served in the first gulf war, and I served in the Iraq war. I wish that war was predictable. I wish we knew what the enemy was going to do and when they were going to do it, but we don't know that. This is a dedicated fund to the global war on terror. It provides flexibility that is necessary for our commanders in the field at this time.

I rise in opposition to this amendment and would hope that it would be voted down.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States the "Afghanistan

Infrastructure Fund". For the "Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund", \$475,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That such sums shall be available for infrastructure projects in Afghanistan, notwithstanding any other provision of law, which shall be undertaken by the Secretary of State, unless the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense jointly decide that a specific project will be undertaken by the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That the infrastructure referred to in the preceding proviso is in support of the counterinsurgency strategy, requiring funding for facility and infrastructure projects, including, but not limited to, water, power, and transportation projects and related maintenance and sustainment costs: *Provided further*, That the authority to undertake such infrastructure projects is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: *Provided further*, That any projects funded by this appropriation shall be jointly formulated and concurred in by the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense: *Provided further*, That funds may be transferred to the Department of State for purposes of undertaking projects, which funds shall be considered to be economic assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for purposes of making available the administrative authorities contained in that Act: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority in the preceding proviso is in addition to any other authority available to the Department of Defense to transfer funds: *Provided further*, That any unexpended funds transferred to the Secretary of State under this authority shall be returned to the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund if the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, determines that the project cannot be implemented for any reason, or that the project no longer supports the counterinsurgency strategy in Afghanistan: *Provided further*, That any funds returned to the Secretary of Defense under the previous proviso shall be available for use under this appropriation and shall be treated in the same manner as funds not transferred to the Secretary of State: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein to the Secretary of State in accordance with section 635(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act from any person, foreign government, or international organization may be credited to this Fund, to remain available until expended, and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers to or from, or obligations from the Fund, notify the appropriate committees of Congress in writing of the details of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That for the purpose of the section the "appropriate committees of Congress" are the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Relations and Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs and Appropriations of the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 133, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$200,000,000)".

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$200,000,000)".

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, the Defense appropriations bill is one of our primary funding bills to help protect our country against threats. However, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, correctly said that our national debt is our biggest national security threat.

With that said, finding dollars that can be diverted from lower priorities to apply to deficit reduction will indeed make America safer. This amendment will reduce funding for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund by \$200 million and return those funds to help reduce the deficit. That is \$200 million to help reduce the deficit.

The Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund was established to provide funds for infrastructure projects, and some reports also indicate funds could be used for other purposes; but, predominantly, they are for infrastructure purposes. My amendment does not completely eliminate funding. It keeps over \$200 million in the infrastructure fund, but it reduces it so we can take a serious look at how we can achieve savings to reduce the deficit in funds spent overseas that are not being used properly and effectively.

With the death of Osama bin Laden, there is not a need for a large U.S. presence in Afghanistan. In fact, the killing of Osama bin Laden was the biggest deficit reduction action this country has known if we take advantage of that action and act on it to make it into a deficit reduction action. We need to rethink our goals and strategy in Afghanistan.

According to the World Bank, 97 percent of Afghanistan's gross domestic product is derived from military funding and foreign assistance—97 percent. If we build a vast infrastructure in Afghanistan, they will not be able to sustain it after we leave. The American people should not have to fund that infrastructure while sitting in traffic in our own Nation, in gridlock, seeing schools in disrepair, hospitals that can't provide services, and watching our own infrastructure crumble—infrastructure that can create and does create jobs carrying goods to market and providing jobs in America.

If House rules permitted, I would direct some of these funds toward building our own infrastructure. That's what we need to do. But that's not the case. The Afghan Government cannot spend all that we are giving to it, and our funding is only fueling corruption and profiteering.

Mr. POE mentioned Pakistan being third from the bottom ahead of Nigeria and another nation. Afghanistan is right there with them. They are fighting for the third to last place. Afghanistan is historically a corrupt nation, and what fosters corruption is money and the moneys that we give them; and 97 percent comes from us. It is going into the pockets of people who aren't

using it to build that infrastructure to help their own people. We are fostering corruption. Afghans could build their own infrastructure for far less than we are investing.

We need to pull back some of this funding to focus on our domestic priorities, but we need to be concerned about our deficit. Let's keep America safe and strong on all fronts.

I urge my Republican colleagues to join with me in a bipartisan effort, stretching from Florida to Tennessee, the width of the Southeastern Conference, and Conference U.S.A., I may say as well for central Florida. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the AIF, Infrastructure Fund for Afghanistan was created by this Congress in the FY 2011 House-passed authorization bill. It was again fully authorized in the FY 2012 House-passed authorization bill. We support the objectives of Operation Enduring Freedom, including the Afghan Security Forces Fund. This is a counterinsurgency tool that General Petraeus placed the highest priority on when he recommended that we create the AIF in place of the CERP, the Commanders Emergency Response Program. So we did that. We took money from the CERP, put the money into the AIF as part of General Petraeus's counterinsurgency program.

So we think this is not a good amendment, and we are opposed to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against my colleague from Tennessee's amendment.

General Petraeus testified before the House Armed Services Committee and stated that the current counterinsurgency strategy employed by U.S. forces and NATO in Afghanistan is seeing success.

I was there in mid-April; and having been there since 2005 through that time frame, the narrative there today is better than it has been since I started going over there in 2005. What we are doing there is working. The Afghan Infrastructure Fund is key to General Petraeus' counterinsurgency campaign as improvements to Afghanistan's infrastructure is necessary to obtain support from the local populace. General Petraeus' successful counterinsurgency strategy is dependent on the local populace and the intelligence they provide.

Visible development projects increases the Afghan Government's legit-

imacy in relation to the Taliban, especially since these projects are conducted in areas vulnerable to Taliban influence. Furthermore, economic development increases security in Afghanistan by providing jobs for former insurgents and building markets for alternative crops to opium, thus reducing corruption.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. The House Armed Services Committee has fully authorized this program. The House Appropriations Committee has gone through this bill with a fine-tooth comb. They believe that these funds will be properly used and properly supervised in the building of Afghan infrastructure as we continue to put in place the system we need so that when we leave, and we will leave, the Afghan people can sustain what we are doing.

One of the messages I got when I was there in April, unlike some of the previous efforts, we will build things to Afghan standards. That is not meant to be a pejorative; it is meant to face reality. When you build a road to U.S. standards, they cannot maintain that road to U.S. standards. But when you build a road to Afghan standards, they can in fact maintain that infrastructure. That is the new paradigm that they are working off of. Good enough for Afghanistan is not a pejorative; it is simply facing a reality that this country is different from the United States, and infrastructure projects there will be built to those Afghan standards.

I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2130

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

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

Mr. COHEN. 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 Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 133, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$475,000,000)".

Page 161, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$475,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Afghanistan policy that is funded in the fiscal year 2012 Defense appropriations bill. I join the efforts of my colleagues in a vari-

ety of amendments designed to accelerate the end of the war in Afghanistan.

For more than 9 years now, our troops have been executing the American mission in Afghanistan with bravery, dedication and extraordinary competence; but what started out as a "quick war" in 2001 to bring Osama bin Laden to justice and to dismantle al Qaeda in Afghanistan has turned into the longest war in United States history. The original mission has now been largely accomplished, and with bin Laden's death in Pakistan, this provides an opportunity to reexamine our ongoing mission in Afghanistan, which some estimates indicate is costing us in excess of \$8 billion per month.

We should no longer be sending billions of American taxpayer dollars to the Afghan people for their schools, their hospitals, their roads, bridges, and police at the expense of making those same investments in our own country, especially when the Afghanistan Government, under the leadership of President Karzai, has proven itself incredibly corrupt.

In fact, Transparency International ranked Afghanistan the third most corrupt country in the world; and The New York Times recently reported about a road construction project, just one example in Afghanistan, funded by American taxpayers. It's a 64-mile-long project and is expected to cost \$176 million to build, which comes to \$2.8 million a mile. Undisclosed amounts of money have gone to pay off local strongmen to buy security while the project is ongoing, and it was reported that the people collecting these bribes staged attacks on the construction crews in order to make the bribes necessary in the first place.

With this kind of corruption and many other examples, we simply cannot afford to finance the infrastructure projects associated with this war. Don't forget, Mr. Chairman, that on top of everything else we're not even paying for this war. It's actually being financed on the national credit card. These are difficult economic and budgetary times. It is time to reassess U.S. involvement in Afghanistan so that we can focus on rebuilding our own economy, putting Americans back to work, and making sure our Nation can compete in the 21st century.

That is why I'm offering this amendment today, which will strike \$475 million from the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund. Vital investments to our country's economic stability, the education of our children, the health of our seniors, and the employment of our workforce have time and again been put on the chopping block in this Congress. We're told that we can't afford to adequately repair our crumbling infrastructure here in America; we're told that Pell Grants and student loans are too expensive; and we're told that we need to change the safety nets for our Nation's seniors and most vulnerable populations—and in the same

breath, we're told we should continue to borrow billions and billions of dollars for nation-building in Afghanistan. What we really should be doing is nation-building right here at home. Instead of building roads and bridges and hospitals and schools halfway around the world in Afghanistan, we should be investing resources on the urgent needs of our own country.

Budgets are a reflection of our priorities.

Are we going to pay down our Nation's debt? Are we going to make the much needed investments in our own roads and bridges and ports? Are we going to protect our seniors? Are we going to ensure that access to college remains affordable? If we continue to spend billions and billions of dollars in Afghanistan, then we cannot have a balanced discussion of these priorities and these choices.

As we debate the merits of raising the debt ceiling and as we consider our domestic priorities, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, which strikes \$475 million from nation-building in Afghanistan in order to keep those dollars right here at home—to invest in our future and to reduce our debt.

There was a recent report, Mr. Chairman, done by the Eisenhower Research Project at Brown University's Watson Institute for International Studies just this past week. This group's cost of war project has released new figures for a range of costs associated with U.S. military responses to September 11, including our activities in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan. They project that the wars will cost Americans between \$3.2- and \$4 trillion and cost 225,000 lives.

It is time to end this spending. It is time to make these investments in infrastructure in our own country, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. This is pretty much the same debate we just had. The difference is that this particular amendment just eliminates the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund altogether, and the other amendment didn't do that.

This account, this Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund, was created by Congress in the fiscal 11 authorization bill and again in the fiscal 12 authorization bill—which we just passed a few weeks ago—at the request of General Petraeus, who made this one of the most important parts of his counterinsurgency strategy. Now, if you don't believe that General Petraeus knows what he's talking about, then maybe you should vote for this amendment; but those of us who have watched General Petraeus skillfully function as the leader in Iraq and there again at Cen-

tral Command and there again in Afghanistan, we believe that this is not a good amendment and that it should be defeated, the same as the other amendment that we just defeated, so I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. This amendment is very similar to the one we just debated except as to the amounts, and it does strike the entire infrastructure account. I would like to make a couple of points that I didn't make earlier with respect to the previous amendment.

None of the conversation that I was ever aware of prior to bin Laden's death remotely said that the war was over or that the fight was over if we killed bin Laden. Had my colleagues on the other side of the aisle been making that argument from start one, then it might have some validity to it; but quite frankly, that was just a marker in this long fight against Islamic jihadists and these terrorists.

The other issue of invoking past costs, or sunk costs, is informative as to how we got to this point in time and as to looking at where we go from here to when we have all American troops out of there; but how we make the intelligent decisions and intelligent investments in Afghanistan between now and then is the bigger question. Whatever it costs to fight in Afghanistan, whatever it has cost to fight in Iraq over the past 8 years or whatever, I understand those are big numbers; but we are looking forward as to how we push the Afghan security system to a point where they can take care of themselves and, in fact, begin to run their country as they should.

Most of my good colleagues' arguments were better suited for the conversation we had in April with reference to the overall budget. That budget passed. This amount that we are now going to spend on the Department of Defense fits under the discretionary spending cap that we put in place by the majority vote of this House back in April. The Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations had done their work, allocated their amount of moneys across a lot of priorities, said "no" to a lot of things, and said "yes" to this issue. So I rise in opposition to my colleague's amendment, and I would urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 135, line 11, insert before the period at the end the following: "": *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, the Secretary of Defense shall transfer \$236,000,000 to the Secretary of Transportation for the National Infrastructure Investments program".

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading requirement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CLARKE of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. This amendment would shift \$236 million from the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund and would return that money back to the taxpayers of the United States—the U.S. Department of Transportation's National Infrastructure Investments program.

□ 2140

Look, I understand that we're trying to fight terrorism by spending all this money in Afghanistan, but the best way to protect the American people from terrorist attacks is to repair our roads and bridges, secure our ports, help fund secure rapid transit systems so we don't have to spend as much money buying foreign oil—and you know that some of that money that goes to these foreign countries when we buy oil ends up in the hands of terrorists. Let's redirect a share of the money that is going to rebuild roads in Afghanistan to build and invest in transit in America. Not only is this good for Americans, we're going to pave over all these potholes that are damaging our cars. And with rapid transit programs, we're going to help provide people who can't afford a car—or in my area, in metro Detroit, people can't afford auto insurance even though they have good driving records because they're red-lined. At least if we transfer some of that money to transit, they will have a way to go to work and to other events for leisure.

But the bottom line is this: If we invest this money in the United States as opposed to spending it all in Afghanistan, we're going to create jobs here in the United States. That is the best way

to secure our country—to make sure we put as many people as possible here back to work.

I urge your support on this amendment.

This amendment would shift \$236 million from the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund, AIF, to the Department of Transportation's National Infrastructure Investments Program.

The Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund provides funding for infrastructure projects such as water, power and transportation and related maintenance and sustainment cost.

My amendment would cut the amount dedicated to this fund in half. While we can agree that this funding is helpful to the Afghan people, I believe that we need to invest in nation-building at home at least as much as we invest abroad.

My amendment would restore about half of the funding historically given to the National Infrastructure Investments Program, which is zeroed out in this bill.

The National Infrastructure Investments Program awards grants to state, local, and transit agencies on a competitive basis for highway, bridge, port and rail projects that stand to make a significant national or regional impact.

The Department of Transportation estimates that, for every \$1 billion invested in Federal highways, more than \$6.2 billion in economic activity is generated. Spending tax dollars in Afghanistan fails to create the same economic multiplier.

The U.S. has invested approximately \$51 billion in reconstruction and development for Afghanistan since 2002.

Our nation faces an "infrastructure deficit" as well as a fiscal deficit: federal investment in infrastructure has declined as a share of GDP over the past fifty years while the cost of building new infrastructure has risen.

A report from the American Society of Civil Engineers estimates that the nation needs \$2.2 trillion dollars of infrastructure expenditure over the next 5 years, but less than half that amount has been budgeted.

This is an important issue, and we need to make sure we are taking care of our country's infrastructure needs. I hope that we can work together to make sure that we have adequate funding for the highway, bridge, and port projects that create jobs and further commerce here at home. I think that as we reassess our mission in Afghanistan we should be able to fund these kinds of important programs and still devote significant savings to the deficit.

However, I understand that the House rules do not allow transfers such as are proposed in this amendment, so I will withdraw the amendment in the hopes we can work on this issue in the future.

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

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law." The amendment gives affirmative direction in effect.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to address the point of order?

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I understand the honorable Representative's point of order here.

You know, if there is anything that is not in order, it's the nature of these rules. There are people out here in this country who are taxpayers, they don't want to see their money spent or borrowed in Afghanistan rebuilding their roads when we have all these potholes right here. We should be able to, in this Congress—

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman's comments must be confined to the point of order.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not debating the point of order, and so I insist on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction to transfer funds. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the "Afghanistan Security Forces Fund", \$12,800,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Commander, Combined Security Transition Command—Afghanistan, or the Secretary's designee, to provide assistance, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to the security forces of Afghanistan, including the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, and construction, and funding: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this heading is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: *Provided further*, That up to \$15,000,000 of these funds may be available for coalition police trainer life support costs: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any person, foreign government, or international organization may be credited to this Fund and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees in writing upon the receipt and upon the obligation of any contribution, delineating the sources and amounts of the funds received and the specific use of such contributions: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to obligating from this appropriation account, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such obligation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees of any proposed new projects or transfer of funds between budget sub-activity groups in excess of \$20,000,000: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursu-

ant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 135, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000,000)".

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$4,000,000,000)".

Mr. COHEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading.

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I do realize the result of this amendment probably. There is another Latin phrase besides "nunc pro tunc," which is "morituri te salutant," which is basically "we who are about to die salute you."

I understand the votes today, and I see them, but I find it hard to fathom, with the American public—and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who are indeed concerned about the deficit, not going at the place where you can really get to the deficit, which is in spending in the defense budget. That's Moby-Dick. You don't throw your harpoons at a minnow; you throw your harpoon at the whale. This is the whale. And Captain Ahab had a good point; you go out there and you see the big one, you go for it.

This would reduce the funds we are giving to the Afghanistan security forces by \$4 billion. It wouldn't take all of it. It would keep two-thirds—they would still have two-thirds. It would reduce it by \$4 billion and return those funds to help the deficit. The \$12.8 billion that is currently allocated to this fund is nearly equivalent to the entire GDP of Afghanistan. Their GDP is \$14 billion to \$16 billion. Let's understand this, Mr. Chairman: We are giving the Afghanistan people their entire GDP, and we're borrowing it from China and other places. This makes no sense. We need to go after the big whale.

Six times the total annual revenue of the Afghan Government—which is approximately \$1.5 billion—is what we're giving them. I understand these funds are to be used to provide assistance to the security forces of Afghanistan, including training and providing equipment, supplies, and services. Well, I have seen soldiers killed over there, my constituents that were killed by Afghanistan soldiers that we trained. We don't know which ones are Taliban and which ones are going to turn on us, and we're training them and giving them weapons.

Roughly \$6 billion of the \$12.8 billion is for salaries and benefits. In light of the President's announcement of withdrawing troops from Afghanistan, we need to make reductions all around, and that includes reduction for these security forces. This country could not, should not fund the structure that the Afghanistan Government cannot fund and at a time when we need to take a look at our deficit.

Now I have heard General Petraeus' name over there. I'm a fan of General Petraeus too, but he's sometimes wrong. He's sometimes wrong. And I think he was for us supporting the President in Libya. And some of the folks over there that are so supportive of General Petraeus weren't so supportive of General Petraeus then. So they understand he's not always right, and he's not right on these funds either. These troops are not going to be trained in a way that they're going to be able to sustain the forces. They're not going to use the weapons, they're not going to be able to supply them. It's going to be a waste.

General Mike Mullen talked about our debt being our biggest security threat, and accordingly we need to re-adjust our priorities and find realistic ways to reduce our deficit. This is a way we can do it and save \$4 billion—still give them \$8.8 billion. It's plenty. I'd like to see it all cut, but I realize that's not realistic. But we are pulling out. We're not going to be able to train those troops to where they're going to be able to maintain the funds to pay those troops in the future. Most of it is salaries, and when we're gone they're not going to have the salaries.

I've been to Afghanistan, you've been to Afghanistan. It is beyond Third World—it's Fourth World, and we're giving them the last of our dollars. If you really, really, really, really care about reducing the deficit, you've got to go for the whale, you've got to go for the defense budget. And just giving this money to Afghanistan is I think a dereliction of duty.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, as we speak, our marines, soldiers, sailors, and airmen are fighting for freedom in some of the toughest places imaginable. A vote for this resolution is a vote to pull the support out from under our troops and to leave a legacy of failure in Afghanistan. I urge against supporting this amendment.

Although I applaud the bravery and skill of the personnel who brought Osama bin Laden to justice, it is important to remember that this is not justification to abandon our efforts to increase the security in Afghanistan. The men and women of our military are working tirelessly to increase the proficiency of Afghan security forces, but to transition lead responsibility for

security to them is irresponsible at this time. The Afghan security forces did not suddenly become more proficient because of the death of Osama bin Laden. I am strongly supportive of transitioning responsibility to the Afghan security forces, but only when they are fully prepared to assume that responsibility.

□ 2150

I agree that nation-building should not be a principal tool for achieving America's national security objectives. Such campaigns are too expensive in both blood and treasure, particularly given the circumstances our Nation currently faces. However, this is not an excuse to negate the sacrifices our troops have made or the progress they have won in Afghanistan.

I believe that establishing an arbitrary time line for withdrawal will actually hobble any efforts for a political reconciliation with the Taliban. If they are certain that our forces are leaving before the currently planned transition time line of 2014, they lose all incentive to work with us and the Afghan Government on a political solution.

What this amendment, in fact, does, though, is cuts off funding for the development of Afghan security forces. Our entire exit strategy is based on developing Afghan security forces so that they are strong enough to allow us to pull our forces out to complete a transition whereby they assume operational control by 2014.

Mr. COHEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Half of the money we give them is for salaries. When we pull out, we don't pay the salaries. Their budget is only like 15 percent of everything we give them. They can't pay the salaries. They can't borrow from China. So what's going to happen then?

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. We have three security objectives in Afghanistan. The first is to make sure the Taliban don't take over the entire country. The second is to keep al Qaeda out of the country. And the third is to have a permissive environment from which we can strike targets in Pakistan at will, as we did with Osama bin Laden.

Cutting the legs under the current strategy of giving them the capability of standing up their own security forces completely undermines where we are right now and undermines the President's goals of being able to do that transfer of operational control by 2014.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. First, I want to compliment the gentleman from Colorado for having made a very, very

eloquent statement that really is factual and gets right to the point. But the reason I rise also is earlier in the day, just in case there are Members here tonight that weren't there early today, I did suggest that I might say this again and again and again during this debate. This subcommittee that recommends this bill in a very non-political way, in a very careful way, reviewed and analyzed all of the requests that we had from the administration in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2012 appropriations for national defense.

The original recommendation, we reduced by \$9 billion, and I think that is larger than the gentleman's whale, but it is a substantial cut and it was made without any regard to politics. We were extremely careful not to affect the war fighter. We were extremely careful not to affect our Nation's readiness. This is not a good amendment, and I 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 Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

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

Mr. COHEN. 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 Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 135, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$35,000,000)".

Page 146, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It reduces the Afghan Security Forces account by about 1 part in 500, one five-hundredth, in order to increase the Defense Health Program account by \$20 million to save soldiers' lives. It will give the Pentagon a much-needed infusion of funds to address a serious gap in our military's suicide prevention.

I learned about this gap through the tragedy of a young constituent from New Jersey who fell through the cracks. He took his own life in September of 2008. But it is not just one soldier. We have a broad problem here. In each of the past 2 years, more American soldiers have died at their own hands than have been killed in war fighting.

Coleman Bean of East Brunswick, New Jersey, attended East Brunswick public schools, he enlisted in the Army

in 2001, and he attended Airborne school at Fort Benning. His first assignment with the 173rd Airborne was in Italy. In 2003, he and the rest of the 173rd conducted a combat jump into Iraq.

Like many of his buddies, he saw the horrors of war firsthand, and, like some, he sought treatment from the VA for his diagnosed post-traumatic stress disorder when he returned home in 2004. He was honorably discharged from active duty in 2005, and, like other Army members, Coleman Bean still had 4 years of reserve duty commitment through what is known as the Individual Ready Reserve (IRR) program. He was recalled to duty in Iraq in 2007 through the IRR and was assigned to serve in northern Iraq. When he returned to New Jersey the following year, he was still suffering from the symptoms of PTSD but managed to conceal his condition from even those closest to him. No one reached out to him. Tragically, he took his own life in September 2008. Ironically, tragically, a few weeks after Coleman took his life, the VA called to say that his appointment was ready.

Two Federal agencies charged with helping prevent suicides among our returning soldiers utterly failed this soldier and his family. Indeed, earlier this year, the Ninth Circuit Court, siding with two veterans groups that sued the Department of Veterans Affairs for failing to provide timely care for veterans at risk of suicide, noted that an average of 18 veterans per day take their own lives. We must stop this epidemic. This amendment will help. We can't allow another family to lose a son or a daughter, a father or a mother, a husband or a wife because of buck-passing.

When I investigated Coleman Bean's tragedy, the VA confirmed that they don't offer dedicated suicide prevention programs for members of the IRR. They consider that a DOD responsibility. The DOD officials at TRICARE said that treating IRR members is the VA's problem. Simply stated, if you are a member of the Individual Ready Reserve suffering from PTSD, you're on your own.

The same problem applies to other categories of reservists, such as the Individual Mobilization Augmentees (IMAs), and the members of the Inactive National Guard (ING). According to the Defense Department, there are at least 123,000 IRR, IMA, and ING members who have done at least one tour in Iraq or Afghanistan.

My amendment would give the Secretary of Defense the funding needed to expand the suicide prevention outreach program to ensure that members of these reserve units who have served a tour in Iraq or Afghanistan will receive a call from a properly trained counselor not less than once every 90 days so long as the servicemember remains in the IRR, the IMA or the ING. In these calls, the trained counselor would be required to determine the

emotional, psychological, mental, medical and career needs and concerns of the reservist. Covered reservists identified as being at risk would be immediately referred to the nearest military treatment facility.

I have discussed this program with the Pentagon. The Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, Dr. Stanley, assures me that the Department has more than adequate legal authority to carry this out. What he needs is funding, and my amendment would provide that funding.

When we get the word out about these counseling services, we save lives. This amendment is budget neutral, it is vitally needed, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

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

□ 2200

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. I rise in support of the amendment, and urge that we accept it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. We will accept the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 136, line 23, insert before the period at the end the following: “: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, the Secretary of Defense shall transfer \$2,000,000,000 to the Secretary of Homeland Security to increase funds available for the State Homeland Security Grant Program under section 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 605)”.

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

(Mr. CLARKE of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. This amendment redirects \$2 billion from Afghanistan Security Forces to the State Homeland Security Grants Program (SHSP).

My amendment makes sure that the Afghanistan Security Forces aren't funded at the expense of our country's Homeland Security efforts.

The State Homeland Security Grants Program ensures that states have strategies in place to protect, respond to, and recover from acts of terrorism and other catastrophic events.

State Homeland Security Grants Program was cut dramatically in the FY '12 Homeland Security Appropriations bill and was under-

funded in the FY '11 bill. This amendment would restore grant funding to the FY '10 level to make sure our first responders have the resources they need to keep our communities safe.

My amendment does not jeopardize the training and equipping of the Afghanistan Security Forces. Even with my amendment, the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund is funded above the FY '10 level of \$9.1 billion.

This is an important issue, and we need to make sure we are taking care of our country's homeland security needs. I hope that we can work together to make sure that we have adequate funding for protecting ourselves from terrorism and catastrophic events. I think that as we reassess our mission in Afghanistan we should be able to fund these kinds of important programs and still devote significant savings to the deficit.

However, I understand that the House rules do not allow transfers such as are proposed in this amendment, so I will withdraw the amendment in the hopes we can work on this issue in the future.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law. The amendment gives affirmative direction in effect.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does another Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I would like to speak on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is pending.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I would like to speak on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. This bill, this amendment which transfers money from the Afghanistan Security Forces to Homeland Security, it better supports existing law, better supports this defense budget because it better protects the American people, less money by funding police and fire as opposed to blowing all that money in Afghanistan.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman must confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Again the gentleman is discussing the amendment and not the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will hear Members on the point of order.

The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chair, just to clarify.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. In order to explain my position on the point of

order, I had to explain the merits of this amendment. This Defense budget is about protecting the American people. I'm saying redirect the money to Homeland Security.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will confine his remarks to the point of order.

The Chair is prepared to rule. For the reasons stated in the previous ruling, the amendment violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I made this announcement earlier in the day that I would allow the Member to have the 5 minutes to speak on the amendment even though it was subject to a point of order, if that courtesy was not abused. In recent points of order, that courtesy has been abused.

I will continue to show that courtesy to Members who do not abuse their 5 minutes and who do not abuse the point of order.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. As a new Member in this body, I have the utmost respect for this institution and to the chair. And to the extent that I appeared to be out of bounds, I do apologize.

It's the fact that this country is in crisis. We have a huge debt. We have so many people that need jobs. And since the budget resolution was passed, April 15, Osama bin Laden was captured and killed, and that provided us with an opportunity to reassess our mission in Afghanistan.

I want us to take a little share of our money that we're spending in Afghanistan and return it here to protect the American people, and also take the remainder of the savings to pay down our debt.

And I do understand what the rules provide. It is just, Mr. Chair, in closing, I believe these rules are old and out of date. We need to, in this House, respond more quickly and nimbly and more effectively on behalf of the American people.

And my closing point is this. We've spent over \$50 billion in economic aid to Afghanistan. Let's take a share of that money, redirect it back home, create jobs here by repairing our roads and bridges. I understand that we don't want to have safe havens for terrorists around the world like Afghanistan. The best way to protect the American people is invest in homeland security, help fund our police and firefighters. They don't have the equipment that they need. The communication and radios with which they can talk to each other, they can share information.

And also, too, I believe it's the duty of this Congress to find a way to pro-

vide more equipment in funding for police and fire because this Congress in the past had failed to effectively address the foreclosure crisis which really dropped property values so our local units of government don't have the revenue to hire more police and fire.

So saying that, I want to say to the chairman that I respect your position; I respect this institution. I'm here trying to fight for my people I represent in metro Detroit and return American tax dollars back to Americans to create jobs here and to protect Americans here at home.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAKISTAN COUNTERINSURGENCY FUND  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the "Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund", \$1,100,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary's designee, to provide assistance to Pakistan's security forces; including program management and the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, and funds; and facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, and construction to build the counterinsurgency capability of Pakistan's military and Frontier Corps: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this provision is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein to appropriations for operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; defense working capital funds; and to the Department of State, Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority in the preceding proviso is in addition to any other authority available to the Department of Defense to transfer funds: *Provided further*, That funds so transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation account, notify the Committees on Appropriations in writing of the details of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 137, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000,000)".

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000,000)".

Mr. POE of Texas (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I'll be brief.

I had my argument on the other \$1 billion that I asked to be deducted from the reimbursement account to be sent to the spending reduction account.

This is a separate fund that also gives money to Pakistan, over a billion dollars. I'm asking that a billion dollars of that fund that goes into counterinsurgency also be sent to the spending reduction account.

There are several reasons for that, but the main one is the Pakistan Government is correct: we don't know where the money is going. We found out that after we took out Osama bin Laden, in that compound we found documents that revealed discussions of promises of no al Qaeda attacks in Pakistan in exchange for sheltering Osama bin Laden.

That's the type of things that we wonder about whether Pakistan is on our side or on the side of our enemies. We don't know whose side they're on. So I'd ask the adoption of our amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I move to strike the final word.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from California for any comments he may have.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the goals of this amendment which are to demand accountability from a nation that until recently has been one of our good friends.

Pakistan has faced serious problems throughout its history, and the United States has played a leading role in helping stabilize that troubled nation. We have spent billions and billion of dollars in military support and billions and billions more in economic assistance. We have worked as close as we can with Pakistan's military and intelligence agencies in order to stabilize the border region near Afghanistan where al Qaeda and the Taliban are trying to overthrow both Afghanistan and the Pakistan governments.

It is therefore hard to express the anger and frustration of all Americans when we discovered that Osama bin Laden, the man who had engineered the death of thousands on American soil, was living in comfort just a short drive from Islamabad. And we have asked in vain how this could occur. Rather than help us get to the bottom of how this international criminal could live for years within blocks of their military school, we received protests from Pakistani officials that our brave Special Forces captured and killed bin Laden under their noses.

□ 2210

But, Mr. Chairman, what has really outraged me and many of my colleagues is that the Pakistanis have had



the audacity to arrest and detain the informants who helped us bring this ultimate terrorist to justice. It is almost too much to take, and it is time that we made it clear to the Pakistanis that our friendship is at the breaking point. For this reason, I am convinced that we must carefully scrutinize every dollar that we are spending in Pakistan in this bill, and especially in the Foreign Operations bill.

And, Mr. Chairman, while I want to support Chairman YOUNG and the work of Mr. DICKS, as well as the rest of my colleagues on this committee, I do want to serve notice that as we go forward and I am able to gather more information, I could very well be presenting a very similar amendment in the Foreign Operations bill. It is high time that we get the answers that we seek here and know really which friends are truly our friends.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I continue to be opposed, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, there is no question that the Pakistanis are a troubled ally. They are an unstable Islamic country with extremist tendencies and a country that has nuclear weapons. The funding that we are talking about right now is that which is for training them in counterinsurgency operations.

We have troops in combat at this time in Afghanistan. The Taliban, the Afghan Taliban who are fighting our forces in the field oftentimes have sanctuary in Pakistan. We are trying to stand up a Pakistani military that is not simply exclusively engaged or exclusively focused on a conventional war with India but is able to launch counterinsurgency operations, particularly in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas. I think this funding is critical so long as we have troops in the field in Afghanistan that we seek to maintain, or certainly increase the capability of the Pakistani military counterinsurgency operations.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment and would urge my colleagues to vote against it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### PROCUREMENT

##### AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Aircraft Procurement, Army", \$387,900,000, to remain

available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

##### MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Missile Procurement, Army", \$118,412,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

##### PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army", \$37,117,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

##### PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Procurement of Ammunition, Army", \$208,381,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

##### OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Other Procurement, Army", \$1,398,195,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

##### AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Aircraft Procurement, Navy", \$492,060,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

##### WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Weapons Procurement, Navy", \$41,070,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

##### PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps", \$317,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

##### OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Other Procurement, Navy", \$249,514,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

##### PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Procurement, Marine Corps", \$1,183,996,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

##### AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force", \$440,265,000, to re-

main available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

##### MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Missile Procurement, Air Force", \$46,920,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

##### PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force", \$139,510,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

##### OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Other Procurement, Air Force", \$3,213,010,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

##### PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for "Procurement, Defense-Wide", \$406,668,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

##### NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

For procurement of aircraft, missiles, tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, other weapons and other procurement for the reserve components of the Armed Forces, \$1,500,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014, of which \$490,000,000 shall be available only for the Army National Guard: *Provided*, That the Chiefs of National Guard and Reserve components shall, not later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act, individually submit to the congressional defense committees the modernization priority assessment for their respective National Guard or Reserve component: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

##### MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROTECTED VEHICLE FUND

###### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund, \$3,195,170,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to procure, sustain, transport, and field Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicles: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall transfer such funds only to appropriations made available in this or any other Act for operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; and defense working capital funds to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That such funds transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, not fewer than 10 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees

in writing of the details of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army”, \$8,513,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy”, \$53,884,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force”, \$182,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide”, \$192,361,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS  
DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For an additional amount for “Defense Working Capital Funds”, \$435,013,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for “Defense Health Program”, \$1,228,288,000, which shall be for operation and maintenance: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for “Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities”, \$469,458,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund”, \$2,577,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Director of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device

Defeat Organization to investigate, develop and provide equipment, supplies, services, training, facilities, personnel and funds to assist United States forces in the defeat of improvised explosive devices: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; and defense working capital funds to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For an additional amount for the “Office of the Inspector General”, \$11,055,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 9001. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this title are in addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for 2012.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 9002. Upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer up to \$3,000,000,000 between the appropriations or funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall notify the Congress promptly of each transfer made pursuant to the authority in this section: *Provided further*, That the authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense and is subject to the same terms and conditions as the authority provided in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2012.

SEC. 9003. Supervision and administration costs associated with a construction project funded with appropriations available for operation and maintenance, “Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund” or the “Afghanistan Security Forces Fund” provided in this Act and executed in direct support of overseas contingency operations in Afghanistan, may be obligated at the time a construction contract is awarded: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, supervision and administration costs include all in-house Government costs.

SEC. 9004. From funds made available in this title, the Secretary of Defense may purchase for use by military and civilian employees of the Department of Defense in the U. S. Central Command area of responsibility: (a) passenger motor vehicles up to a limit of \$75,000 per vehicle and (b) heavy and light armored vehicles for the physical security of personnel or for force protection purposes up to a limit of \$250,000 per vehicle, notwithstanding price or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.

SEC. 9005. Not to exceed \$400,000,000 of the amount appropriated in this title under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Army” may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to fund the Com-

mander’s Emergency Response Program (CERP), for the purpose of enabling military commanders in Afghanistan to respond to urgent, small scale, humanitarian relief and reconstruction requirements within their areas of responsibility: *Provided*, That each project (including any ancillary or related elements in connection with such project) executed under this authority shall not exceed \$20,000,000: *Provided further*, That not later than 45 days after the end of each fiscal year quarter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the source of funds and the allocation and use of funds during that quarter that were made available pursuant to the authority provided in this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes described herein: *Provided further*, That, not later than 30 days after the end of each month, the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees monthly commitment, obligation, and expenditure data for the Commander’s Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan: *Provided further*, That not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes described herein for a project with a total anticipated cost for completion of \$5,000,000 or more, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing each of the following:

(1) The location, nature and purpose of the proposed project, including how the project is intended to advance the military campaign plan for the country in which it is to be carried out.

(2) The budget, implementation timeline with milestones, and completion date for the proposed project, including any other CERP funding that has been or is anticipated to be contributed to the completion of the project.

(3) A plan for the sustainment of the proposed project, including the agreement with either the host nation, a non-Department of Defense agency of the United States Government or a third party contributor to finance the sustainment of the activities and maintenance of any equipment or facilities to be provided through the proposed project.

SEC. 9006. Funds available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide supplies, services, transportation, including airlift and sealift, and other logistical support to coalition forces supporting military and stability operations in Iraq and Afghanistan: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees regarding support provided under this section.

SEC. 9007. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act shall be obligated or expended by the United States Government for a purpose as follows:

(1) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq.

(2) To exercise United States control over any oil resource of Iraq.

(3) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

SEC. 9008. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the following laws enacted or regulations promulgated to implement the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (done at New York on December 10, 1984):

(1) Section 2340A of title 18, United States Code.

(2) Section 2242 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (division G of Public Law 105-277; 112 Stat. 2681-822; 8 U.S.C. 1231 note) and regulations prescribed thereto, including regulations under part 208 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations, and part 95 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) Sections 1002 and 1003 of the Department of Defense, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations to Address Hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico, and Pandemic Influenza Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-148).

SEC. 9009. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees not later than 45 days after the end of each fiscal quarter a report on the proposed use of all funds appropriated by this or any prior Act under each of the headings Afghanistan Security Forces Fund, Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund, and Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund on a project-by-project basis, for which the obligation of funds is anticipated during the 3-month period from such date, including estimates for the accounts referred to in this section of the costs required to complete each such project.

(b) The report required by this subsection shall include the following:

(1) The use of all funds on a project-by-project basis for which funds appropriated under the headings referred to in subsection (a) were obligated prior to the submission of the report, including estimates for the accounts referred to in subsection (a) of the costs to complete each project.

(2) The use of all funds on a project-by-project basis for which funds were appropriated under the headings referred to in subsection (a) in prior appropriations Acts, or for which funds were made available by transfer, reprogramming, or allocation from other headings in prior appropriations Acts, including estimates for the accounts referred to in subsection (a) of the costs to complete each project.

(3) An estimated total cost to train and equip the Afghanistan and Pakistan security forces, disaggregated by major program and sub-elements by force, arrayed by fiscal year.

SEC. 9010. (a) FUNDING FOR OUTREACH AND REINTEGRATION SERVICES UNDER YELLOW RIBBON REINTEGRATION PROGRAM.—Of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by title IX, up to \$20,000,000 may be available for outreach and reintegration services under the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program under section 582(h) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 125; 10 U.S.C. 10101 note).

(b) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—The amount made available by subsection (a) for the services described in that subsection is in addition to any other amounts available in this Act for such services.

SEC. 9011. Funds made available in this title to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment unit cost of not more than \$250,000: *Provided*, That, upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary to meet the operational requirements of a Commander of a Combatant Command engaged in contingency operations overseas, such funds may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than \$500,000.

SEC. 9012. (a) The Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan may, subject to the direction and control of the Secretary of Defense and with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, carry out projects in fiscal year 2012 to assist the commander of the United States Central Com-

mand in developing a link between United States military operations in Afghanistan under Operation Enduring Freedom and the economic elements of United States national power in order to reduce violence, enhance stability, and restore economic normalcy in Afghanistan through strategic business and economic opportunities.

(b) The projects carried out under paragraph (a) may include projects that facilitate private investment, industrial development, banking and financial system development, agricultural diversification and revitalization, and energy development in and with respect to Afghanistan.

(c) The Secretary may use up to \$150,000,000 of the funds available for overseas contingency operations in “Operation and Maintenance, Army” for additional activities to carry out projects under paragraph (a).

SEC. 9013. From funds made available in this title to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance, up to \$524,000,000 may be used by the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to support the United States Government transition activities in Iraq by undertaking facilities renovation and construction associated with establishing Office of Security Cooperation locations, at no more than ten sites, in Iraq: *Provided*, That not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing a detailed justification and timeline for each proposed site and the source of funds.

SEC. 9014. (a) Not more than 85 percent of the funds provided in this title for operation and maintenance may be available for obligation or expenditure until the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits the report under subsection (b).

(b) Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on contractor employees in the United States Central Command, including—

(1) the number of employees of a contractor awarded a contract by the Department of Defense (including subcontractor employees) who are employed at the time of the report in the area of operations of the United States Central Command, including a list of the number of such employees in each of Iraq, Afghanistan, and all other areas of operations of the United States Central Command; and

(2) for each fiscal year quarter beginning on the date of the report and ending on September 30, 2012—

(A) the number of such employees planned by the Secretary to be employed during each such period in each of Iraq, Afghanistan, and all other areas of operations of the United States Central Command; and

(B) an explanation of how the number of such employees listed under subparagraph (A) relates to the planned number of military personnel in such locations.

SEC. 9015. Of the amounts appropriated or transferred to the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the ‘Fund’) for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2011—

(1) not more than 25 percent of such amounts may be obligated or expended until such time as the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State—

(A) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the strategy to utilize the Fund and the metrics used to determine progress with respect to the Fund; and

(B) notifies the appropriate congressional committees of the intent of the Secretary to

obligate or expend amounts that are in excess of such 25 percent and a period of 30 days has elapsed following such notification.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the amounts described in the matter preceding paragraph (1) shall be available for reprogramming.

(3) Such report shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(A) A discussion of United States strategic objectives in Pakistan.

(B) A listing of the terrorist or extremist organizations in Pakistan opposing United States goals in the region and against which the United States encourages Pakistan to take action.

(C) A discussion of the gaps in capabilities of Pakistani security units that hamper the ability of the Government of Pakistan to take action against the organizations listed in subparagraph (B).

(D) A discussion of how assistance provided utilizing the Fund will address the gaps in capabilities listed in subparagraph (C).

(E) A discussion of other efforts undertaken by other United States Government departments and agencies to address the gaps in capabilities listed in subparagraph (C) or complementary activities of the Department of Defense and how those efforts are coordinated with the activities undertaken to utilize the Fund.

(F) Metrics that will be used to track progress in achieving the United States strategic objectives in Pakistan, to track progress of the Government of Pakistan in combating the organizations listed in subparagraph (B), and to address the gaps in capabilities listed in subparagraph (C).

SEC. 9016. (a) Not to exceed \$176,575,000 from amounts made available to the Department of Defense in this Act or any other Act for fiscal year 2012 may be obligated for information operations or military information support operations: *Provided*, That such amount is to be derived from the amounts provided in title IX of this Act for the following accounts in this title as follows:

“Operations and Maintenance, Army”, \$104,675,000;

“Operations and Maintenance, Navy”, \$1,200,000;

“Operations and Maintenance, Air Force”, \$20,400,000; and

“Operations and Maintenance, Defense Wide”, \$50,300,000.

(b) Such amounts are to be allocated only in accordance with the direction and for the purposes specified in the classified annex accompanying this Act.

#### (RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 9017. Of the funds appropriated in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following account in the specified amount:

“Mine Resistant Ambush Protection Vehicle Fund”, 2011/2013, \$595,000,000.

□ 2220

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 161, line 4, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

## TITLE X—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

## SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 10001. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is \$0.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by \$124,800,000.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple. It cuts \$124.8 million from the overall bill. For my colleagues who say they are committed to deficit reduction, this is your chance to prove it.

This amendment reduces government spending while protecting the Pentagon's national security mission by reducing the funding for military bands to the authorized level. Currently this bill and the Pentagon's budget includes a total of \$324.8 million for 154 military bands and more than 5,000 full-time professional military musicians.

This amendment would reduce the total funding for military bands to \$200 million. The limit set for spending on military bands included a voice vote in the 2012 defense authorization bill, H.R. 1540.

Let me be clear: This amendment brings the defense appropriations bill in line with the spending on military bands established in the defense authorization bill. Again, the House is already on record voting to limit spending on military bands to \$200 million.

Earlier, in debate on this bill, Representative CARTER of Texas had an amendment that struck the language that I had inserted in the defense appropriations bill that would limit the military bands to \$200 million. This amendment was agreed to on voice vote.

I do not believe that the majority of Republicans and Democrats in this House want to be on record adding, adding over \$124 million in spending for military bands.

This amendment gives all of my colleagues the opportunity to reduce the cost to government by cutting \$124 million from this bill, while allowing the Pentagon to continue to spend \$200 million for choirs, jazz bands, ensembles, and other musical missions.

There is no doubt that bands are important. We all enjoy listening to military bands and cherish the traditions of military music. But at a time of fiscal crisis, \$200 million must be enough for ceremonial music, concerts, choir performance, and country music jam sessions.

Maybe you believe that spending \$325 million in 2012 is in our national security interests, a national priority that cannot even be cut or reduced.

Well, I couldn't disagree more. There are really Members in this House who in good conscience vote to cut nutrition for programs for poor, hungry women and infants, but vote to protect a military bands budgets? Is this House really capable of gutting investments on women's health care, but allow \$5 million increases in funding for military bands?

Republicans are forcing cuts in law enforcement, firefighters, homeless veterans, but they take a stand opposing limiting funding for military bands to \$200 million as a national security priority. Is this Congress really going to raise the debt ceiling so it can pay \$325 million for military bands next year with money borrowed from China? These are truly misplaced priorities.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress faces record deficits, and it's time for both smart investments and tough choices. In this \$650 billion defense appropriations bill, this amendment proposes an extremely modest test of this House's willingness to cut spending for non-essential military functions.

Last year the Army Materiel commander had a \$4.4 million state of the art building especially constructed for the Army Materiel Command Band. While schools, health care centers and food banks are getting cut, \$4.4 million is an example that seems to indicate to me that no one told the Pentagon that this is a fiscal crisis.

The Pentagon does not need any more band aid.

Mr. CARTER argued against reducing spending on military bands, saying the language didn't save 1 cent, and he was correct. This amendment saves U.S. taxpayers \$124.8 million, and that makes a lot of sense to the Minnesotans I represent. And it should make a lot of sense to my tea party Republican colleagues who march to their own drummers.

This amendment gives all my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, a chance to show our constituents a deficit reduction. I urge my colleagues to support this reduction to unnecessary defense spending.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman's amendment would essentially cap funding for military bands at \$200 million and reverse a decision of the body earlier this evening.

The band's main mission is music, with a secondary wartime mission for security. Band members train for security, and given the shortage of guards, security is often the band members' go-to-war mission. Every soldier is taught their basic combat skills and can secure the perimeter.

The Department of Defense strongly believes that military bands are vital to recruiting, retaining, and community relations, and that they provide patriotic, inspirational music to instill in soldiers, sailors, and airmen the will to fight and win, and foster the support of our citizens and promote national interests.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment and urge others to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. 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 Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments left, and this one will deal with the subject of NASCAR.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, add the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Not more than \$20,000,000 of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay motorsports drivers, racing teams, or racing cars in the National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing (NASCAR), the National Hot Rod Association (NHRA), the Indy Racing League Indy Car Series, or the American Motorcyclist Association (AMA) Super Bike Racing or otherwise conduct recruiting outreach through motor sports under the authority of section 561(b) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106-398; 114 Stat. 1654A-129).

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

□ 2230

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, my amendment requires the Department of Defense to limit what they spend on motorsports sponsorships for NASCAR, the National Hot Rod Association, the Indy Car Series, or AMA Super Bike Racing to no more than \$20 million in fiscal year 2012. With our Nation in a fiscal crisis, I can't imagine anyone wanting to spend more than \$20 million for taxpayer-funded racing teams.

As Members of Congress, we must make choices with what to do with America's taxpayer money. Congress needs to set priorities that will reduce the deficit and grow our economy.

This year, the Department of Defense will spend at least \$63 million in taxpayer funds to sponsor motorsports for so-called recruitment purposes. In the last decade, hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars have been spent to sponsor motorsports racing.

And what do the American people get for their investment? Those millions of tax dollars buy decals—big stickers—on race cars. They pay for multimillion dollar race contracts for millionaire race car drivers and racing team owners. For example, the National Guard is currently spending \$20 million in taxpayers' funds to sponsor one race car driver, \$20 million, one race car driver.

At a time when our Nation is fighting two wars and facing a fiscal crisis, why are we borrowing money from China, Russia, and Saudi Arabia to pay for sponsorships and millionaire car drivers? How does that advance national security?

Now, many of my colleagues insist that these sponsorships are critical to the survival of an all-volunteer military. I disagree. But I respect their passion despite the fact there is no evidence to demonstrate that this motorsports program is effective in recruiting. And that is why my amendment maintains a significant and sufficient investment in motorsports sponsorships, \$20 million, to allow the Pentagon to demonstrate to us and to the taxpayers it does work.

Now as Members of Congress, we must do a better job of exercising our oversight over the Pentagon's recruiting budget. Right now, 75 percent of Americans ages 17 to 24 years old are not qualified—let me repeat—75 percent of young Americans ages 17–24 years old are not qualified to serve in the Armed Forces.

Motorsports sponsorships are not the answer to making America's youth more physically fit or more academically prepared to serve. And according to a 2010 report by a retired military leader entitled "Too Fat to Fight," the U.S. military faces serious long-term recruiting challenges.

Let me quote the report directly. When weight problems are combined with educational deficits, criminal records, and other disqualifiers such as asthma or drug abuse, 75 percent of Americans 17–24 years old are unable to join the military for one or more of those reasons. The military will have to have more fit young men and women if they are going to find enough recruits with the excellent qualifications needed for a modern military.

But we're not talking about \$63 million to sponsor academic decathlons, soccer leagues, or baseball teams.

With these alarming trends facing America's young people, the Pentagon needs to be leading a national effort to ensure young people around this country from coast to coast are educationally prepared, physically fit, morally sound, and dedicated to serving our country. Those young men and women aren't just found at racetracks. Yet that is where our branches of military are spending disproportionate amounts of recruiting budgets on an increasingly small number of recruiting targets.

Here is an example of a motorsport's recruiting power. In 2010, the National

Guard spent \$645,000 to sponsor one single NASCAR race, the Air Guard 400. According to the Air National Guard, that \$650,000 sponsorship generated 439 recruits. Only six of those leads were qualified leads or recruited eligible.

How many enlistments for \$650,000? Zero. Zero enlistments, zero contracts signed. Other branches of the Armed Forces have found these sponsorships to be a waste. The Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Navy have all canceled their motorsports sponsorships years ago, shifting their valuable recruitment dollars to more effective programs.

I respect the patriotism and passion of motorsports fans. I do. And I encourage the U.S. military to continue its longstanding relationship with motorsports like NASCAR. This amendment does nothing to the additional \$3 million the Army spends on outreach to NASCAR racing events or the millions spent on military recruitment at races. But we are wasting taxpayers' dollars on race cars and millionaire drivers with little or nothing to show from it.

I've heard from supporters of racing sponsorships talk about the passion points and media impressions these sponsorship dollars produce among television viewers. Really? Americans don't know that there is an Army or an Air Force, or the American people don't know that we are at war in Iraq and Afghanistan? They don't need a racing car to tell them that we have a volunteer military and our country is at war.

Already this year, the Republican Congress has voted to cut nutrition programs for poor, hungry women and infants. And this majority is cutting investments in energy efficiency at a time of high gas prices.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to limit the sponsorship of motor racing to \$20 million.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I compliment the gentlelady for her determination. She has really worked this amendment hard on more than one occasion. The House has already spoken on this issue. When we considered earlier H.R. 1, this amendment was defeated by more than 100 votes, 448–281.

But this is a recruiting tool. I don't think any of us want to go back to a draft. I think we like the fact that we have an all-volunteer service. But if you feel an all-volunteer service means you have got to recruit, then you use more than just NASCAR or sporting events or advertising in newspapers to gain recruits so that we can have an all-volunteer military, as opposed to a conscripted, drafted military.

The Army National Guard estimated that it engaged more than 83,000 prospects in the year 2010. The Air Force reports that their NASCAR sponsorship is the second-highest source of acces-

sions of all event sports sponsorships. The Army expects that they will, this year, engage 28,700 prospects and gain access to 182 schools through its sponsorship of NASCAR.

Now, the gentlelady, as I said, is persistent. She uses the occasion to mention the fact that the Marine Corps does not use sporting, does not use NASCAR for recruiting. Which is true. But that is not a reason why we should discontinue the program. The Navy and the Marine Corps do not sponsor motorsports, NASCAR. But they both use the sponsorship of sporting events as part of their recruiting programs. The Navy is a sponsor of the X Games, while the Marine Corps sponsors a variety of events, including the Ultimate Fighting Championship.

The fact of the matter is we spend a lot of money for recruiting, and the recruiting for our programs that are successful ought to be continued and should not be denied for whatever the reason that someone objects to using the money for sponsoring race car vehicles.

The National car took seventh place, by the way, in Daytona this past weekend. And not only do we get the sponsorship, the excitement of the crowds and many of whom go to the recruiting stations, but we get newspaper coverage for free, we get television coverage for free, coverage that we don't have to pay for because of these events that we do sponsor.

So, as we did in the Appropriations Committee, and as we did on H.R. 1 earlier in this year, I just hope that we will, once again, defeat this amendment, and I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2240

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. 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 Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be provided to the Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan or used to carry out section 9012.

Ms. MCCOLLUM (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, Section 9012 of this Defense appropriations bill contains language authorizing the Pentagon, under the direction and control of the Secretary of Defense, to operate a task force for business and stability operations in Afghanistan.

The bill provides \$150 million to the Secretary of Defense to operate this business task force. Our brave military men and women have been in Afghanistan for 10 long years confronting the Taliban, killing terrorists, and helping secure a better future for the Afghan people.

When in the course of this long war did it become the Department of Defense's role to facilitate business opportunities for Afghan and foreign companies?

Is it really within the Pentagon's expertise or mission to excel at business development, farming, or mineral exploration?

This bill gives the Department of Defense authorization to carry out "projects that include private investment, industrial development, banking and financial system development, agricultural diversification and revitalization, energy development in and with respect to Afghanistan."

Afghanistan is an active war zone.

American servicemembers are under attack and our Department of Defense should be solely focused on their security. The Pentagon's focus should not be on starting up businesses or facilitating business development tours for corporate CEOs. Economic development is an important part of America's overall strategy in Afghanistan, but that is the role of civilian agencies like USAID, the Department of State, or the Department of Commerce.

Congress needs to invest in America's civilian capacity to carry out this function. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership in this House does not believe international development activities are a component of national security. If they did, they would not cut vital foreign assistance capacity and programs.

Every House Member needs to ask why the Pentagon is supporting the development of the Afghan carpet industry while U.S. soldiers are under attack. Afghan carpets should not be a strategic priority for the Department of Defense.

Every House Member needs to ask why the Department of Defense is helping Kate Spade, an exclusive New York handbag designer, to source raw materials in Afghanistan? Since when did the Pentagon invest taxpayer dollars in promoting women's fashion?

The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense described his role in heading up the task force in *The Washington Post*: "We do capitalism. We're about helping companies make money."

Colleagues, helping companies make money is not the role of the Depart-

ment of Defense. This is the worst example of mission creep. It is up to Congress to perform its oversight duty and rein in the Pentagon.

Getting people to work in Afghanistan is important. Afghans who are working on farms, in factories, in functioning government ministries, and in the police and military are likely not shooting at our troops. But this report that accompanied the Defense authorization bill that passed in May said it best, and I quote from the Defense authorization bill: "The function of private sector business development falls outside of the core competency of the Department of Defense."

The House Armed Services Committee's report went on to further state: "The mission of TFBSO should eventually fall under the jurisdiction of a different agency, likely USAID or possibly the Department of Commerce."

The Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan and its \$150 million budget should not be funded and not authorized in the Defense authorization bill. This function and this money belongs in the State and Foreign Operations appropriations bill.

This task force is another example of the militarization of foreign assistance that diverts the Pentagon from its core mission of security and war fighting. It also dangerously blurs the line between military-affiliated personnel in a war zone and civilian personnel carrying out development activities.

America needs the Department of Defense to take care of its top priority: ensuring the national security of our country. We all know there will be fewer and fewer military personnel in Afghanistan in the coming months. Troops stationed in Afghanistan will be in increasing danger. We must allow those troops to focus on their security mission.

If the Secretary of Defense truly believes business development and the work of the task force is vital to national security, then the Pentagon can contract with professionals at USAID to carry out this function.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and get the business development and cooperative investment support out of the Pentagon.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, some years ago, the Americans and our allies pretty much stabilized Afghanistan and neutralized the Taliban. But then before the job was completed, we all walked away. The Taliban resurged, came back, and created the situation that we face today and yesteryear and the year before. Let's not let that happen again.

Now this Task Force for Business and Stability is part of that operation to

try to maintain stability once we clear out and neutralize the Taliban once again. The mission of the task force is to assist the commander of U.S. Central Command in developing a link between U.S. military operations in Afghanistan and economic elements of U.S. national power in order to reduce violence, enhance stability, and to restore economic normalcy in Afghanistan through business and economic opportunities such as agricultural diversification and energy development.

The Secretary may use up to \$150 million of available operations for overseas contingency operations. This amendment would prohibit that. This amendment would not permit us to do the things that we need to do after winning on the battlefield. After eliminating the combat areas, we have got to maintain an Afghanistan that is not any longer under the jurisdiction and the influence of the Taliban.

As I said, we did that once before at great cost. We neutralized the Taliban. We basically stabilized Afghanistan, and then we walked away. We didn't do the things that this Business and Stability Operations Task Force would do.

So let's do them this time so we don't have to go back and refight the war against the Taliban in Afghanistan. It is not a good amendment. It is not a good amendment, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I agree with the gentleman on this particular amendment. I think we should vote it down.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to close the defense commissary store at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey.

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, over 19,000 people in New Jersey depend on the goods and services provided by the commissary at Fort Monmouth. The looming closure of Fort Monmouth has cast a cloud over the future of this facility, causing considerable consternation among the active duty, Guard and Reserve, and military retirees who count on the commissary to help them save money and live their quality lives that we have promised them.

In February 2011, the Secretary of the Army recognized the importance of this facility and recommended to the Pentagon leadership that the facility remain open. Department regulations give the Pentagon the ability to decide whether to keep the commissary open after a base closes.

□ 2250

I should point out that the active personnel at Naval Weapons Station Earle, which does not have a commissary, depend on this commissary as well. We in New Jersey, in the New Jersey delegation, strongly agree with Secretary McHugh's recommendation, which is currently under consideration in the Pentagon.

The amendment I am offering, but will withdraw pursuant to a discussion, a colloquy with my colleagues, would bar the use of fiscal 12 funds to close the commissary.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking member.

Mr. DICKS. I can completely understand the gentleman's concern here. I want the gentleman to know that I am prepared to work with him on this to see if we can talk to the powers that be over in the Pentagon. Hopefully, they can accept Secretary McHugh's recommendation.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLT. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me say that I agree with Mr. DICKS. We are more than happy to work with you in order to work out this problem.

Mr. HOLT. I thank both gentlemen. This means a great deal to the people of New Jersey, to whom we owe a great deal for their military work.

SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,

Washington, DC, February 25, 2011.

Hon. RUSH HOLT,

U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HOLT: Thank you for your August 17, 2010 letter concerning the closure of the commissary and post exchange on Fort Monmouth, New Jersey.

As we have discussed, the post exchange stores at Fort Monmouth must close in preparation for the closure of Fort Monmouth. However, I have directed the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations, Energy and Environment to send an official request to the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness [USD(P&R)] to keep the Fort Monmouth commissary open for a transitional 2-year period following installation closure.

If USD(P&R) approves this request, the continued operation of the commissary for this 2-year period will be conditional on a volume of sales that supports operational costs. Defense Commissary Agency's (DeCA) projections indicate annual sales of \$9.2M in the year following closure. DeCA will continue to review sales and cost data and will advise the Army if sales decline significantly.

Thank you for your inquiry into this matter and for your continued support of our Soldiers and their Families.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. MCHUGH.

With that understanding, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. 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. FRELINGHUYSEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. GARDNER, 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. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 7, 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:

2260. A letter from the Director, Policy Issuances Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cooperative Inspection Programs: Interstate Shipment of Meat and Poultry Products [Docket No.: FSIS-2008-0039] (RIN: 0538-AD37) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2261. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Diethylene Glycol Monoethyl Ether (DEGEE); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0474; FRL-8877-1] received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2262. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — C9 Rich Aromatic Hydrocarbons, C10-11 Rich Aromatic Hydrocarbons, and C11-12 Rich Aromatic Hydrocarbons; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0517; FRL-8876-2] received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2263. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Turkey pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2264. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Bangladesh, pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2265. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report for calendar year 2010 on the country of origin and the sellers or uranium

and uranium enrichment services purchased by owners and operators of U.S. civilian nuclear power reactors, pursuant to Public Law 102-486, section 1015; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2266. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Information Required in Prior Notice of Imported Food [Docket No.: FDA-2011-N-0179] (RIN: 0910-AG65) received June 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2267. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Administrative Simplification: Adoption of Operating Rules for Eligibility for a Health Care Claim Status Transactions [CMS-0032-1FC] (RIN: 0938-AQ12) received June 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2268. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards No. 108; Lamp, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment [Docket No. NHTSA-2004-18794] (RIN: 2127-AK85) received June 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2269. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Amendments to National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Area Sources: Plating and Polishing [EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0084; FRL-9320-6] (RIN: 2060-AM37) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2270. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Standards of Performance for Stationary Compression Ignition and Spark Ignition Internal Combustion Engines [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0295, FRL-9319-5] (RIN: 2060-AP67) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2271. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Review of New Sources and Modifications in Indian Country [EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0076; FRL-9320-2] (RIN: 2060-AH37) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2272. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Revision of Fee Schedules; Fee Recovery for Fiscal Year 2011 [NRC-2011-0016] (RIN: 3150-AI93) received June 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2273. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Decommissioning Planning [NRC-2008-0030] (RIN: 3150-AI55) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2274. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 11-16, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2275. A letter from the Secretary, Army, Department of Defense, transmitting annual audit of the American Red Cross consolidated financial statements for the year ending June 30, 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2276. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-049, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2277. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-040, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2278. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-061, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2279. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-037, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2280. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-026, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2281. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-053, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2282. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-048, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2283. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-052, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2284. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-055, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2285. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-050, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2286. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-039, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2287. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2288. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department of Defense Inspector General Semiannual Report, October 1, 2010 — March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2289. A letter from the Executive Director, Election Assistance Commission, transmitting Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2290. A letter from the Director, Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2291. A letter from the Board, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting the semi-annual report of the Inspector General of the Federal Labor Relations Board for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2292. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation; Implementation of Information Technology Security Provision [GSAR Amendment 2011-02; GSAR Case 2011-G503; (Change 50) Docket 2011-0012, Sequence 1] (RIN: 30900-AJ15) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2293. A letter from the Delegated Authority of the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Connecticut Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2294. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Performance of Functions; Claims for Compensation Under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act; Compensation for Disability and Death of Noncitizen Federal Employees Outside the United States (RIN: 1240-AA03) received June 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2295. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Aircraft Equipped with Rotax aircraft Engines 912 A Series Engine [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0504; Directorate Identifier 2011-CE-014-AD; Amendment 39-16702; AD 2011-11-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2296. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model DC-10-10, DC-10-10F, DC-10-15, DC-10-30, DC-10-30F (KC-10A and KDC-10), DC-10-40, DC-10-40F; Model MD-10-10F, MD-10-30F, MD-11, and MD-11F Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1044; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-033-AD; Amendment 39-16704; AD 2011-11-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2297. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE SYSTEMS (OPERATIONS) LIMITED Model BAe 146 and Avro 146-RJ Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0673; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-208-

AD; Amendment 39-16705; AD 2011-11-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2298. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulation of Fractional Aircraft Ownership Programs and On-Demand Operations; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FAA-2001-10047; Amdt. No. 91-322] (RIN: 2120-AH06) received June 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2299. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond aircraft Industries GmbH Model DA 42 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0231; Directorate Identifier 2011-CE-003-AD; Amendment 39-16706; AD 2011-11-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2300. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Transitional Relief under Internal Revenue Code Section 6033(j) for Small Organizations [Notice 2011-43] received June 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2301. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Application for Reinstatement and Retroactive Reinstatement for Reasonable Cause under Internal Revenue Code Section 6033(j) [Notice 2011-44] received June 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WEBSTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 337. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-135). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 2406. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property in Tracy, California, to the City of Tracy; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 2407. A bill to protect the safety of America's roads by limiting the operation of motor carriers domiciled in Mexico beyond municipalities and commercial zones on the United States-Mexico border to a pilot program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.



By Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2408. 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 Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 2409. A bill to decrease the statutory limit on the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 2410. A bill to establish a temporary private education loan debt consolidation program to assist eligible borrowers in refinancing all or a portion of their private education debt as Federal Direct Consolidation Loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DOLD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. GUINTA):

H.R. 2411. A bill to provide for an employee election on Form W-4 to have amounts deducted and withheld from wages to be used to reduce the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MORAN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FARR, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 2412. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to equalize the exclusion from gross income of parking and transportation fringe benefits and to provide for a common cost-of-living adjustment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 2413. A bill to establish a sustainable Federal Secondary Market Facility for Residential Mortgages that is financed by private capital, to terminate the conservatorships of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and repeal the charter Acts of such enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. BOREN):

H.R. 2414. A bill to exempt certain farm vehicles from certain operating requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CRITZ, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DENT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KELLY, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 2415. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11 Dock Street in Pittston, Pennsylvania, as the "Trooper Joshua D. Miller Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2416. A bill to extend temporarily the treatment of Monroe County, Pennsylvania,

as a HUBZone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. POE of Texas, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 2417. A bill to repeal certain amendments to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act with respect to lighting energy efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa (for himself and Mr. BOSWELL):

H.R. 2418. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Future Farmers of America Organization and the 85th anniversary of the founding of the National Future Farmers of America Organization; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 2419. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the meaning of "combat with the enemy" for purposes of service-connection of disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2420. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 2421. A bill to provide for the treatment and temporary financing of short-time compensation programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HANNA, Ms. BUERKLE, Ms. HOCHUL, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 2422. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 45 Bay Street, Suite 2, in Staten Island, New York, as the "Sergeant Angel Mendez Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HINCHEY:

H.R. 2423. A bill to amend title 41, United States Code, to increase the American-made content requirement for the Buy American Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2424. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to ensure that certain Federal contracts are set aside for small businesses, to enhance services to small businesses that are disadvantaged, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2425. A bill to prohibit Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and Ginnie Mae from owning or guaranteeing any mortgage that is assigned

to the Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems or for which MERS is the mortgagee of record; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 2426. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to limit claims in connection with decisions to issue permits, licenses, and approvals for highway and public transportation capital projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. BACA, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 2427. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify a maintenance exemption regarding the removal of sediment, debris, and vegetation from certain structures; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. JONES, Mr. CANSECO, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 2428. A bill to protect the taxpayers of the United States by limiting the Federal payment of legal fees for current and former officers and affiliated parties of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 2429. A bill to exempt certain class A CDL drivers from the requirement to obtain a hazardous material endorsement while operating a service vehicle with a fuel tank containing 3,785 liters (1,000 gallons) or less of diesel fuel; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. FALBOMAVAEGA):

H.R. 2430. A bill to amend the percentage of funds appropriated under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 required to be reserved for outlying areas and the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. HOCHUL, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2431. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the possession, transfer, or use of fraudulent travel documents, to amend title 49, United States Code, to require recurring training for transportation security officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY (for himself, Mr. PENCE, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. HULTGREN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 2432. A bill to provide for a feasibility study before carrying out any Federal action relating to the Chicago Area Water System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 338. A resolution welcoming His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama to Washington, DC, and recognizing his commitment to world peace, nonviolence, human rights, religious freedom, and democracy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY  
STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 2406.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 2408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).”

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 2409.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 2 of the Constitution grants Congress the power “to borrow Money on the Credit of the United States.”

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 2410.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This Bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, known as the “Commerce Clause.” This provision grants Congress the broad power to “regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Please note, pursuant to Article I, section 8, Congress has the power “to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 2411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8, which include the power to “lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises, to pay the debts. . .”

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 2412.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 2413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 2414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 which states The Congress shall have the power “to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2415.

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 1, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2416.

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 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas:

H.R. 2417.

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 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 2418.

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. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 2419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, which states that Congress, among other things:

“Shall have Power To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years; To provide and maintain a Navy”

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 and Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 2422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Legislation to name a Post Office after an individual is constitutional under Article I, Section 8, Clause 7, which gives Congress the power to establish Post Offices and post roads.

By Mr. HINCHEY:

H.R. 2423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

“The Congress shall have Power “to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and

among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 2426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section I

Article I Section 8 Clause 9

Article III Section 2

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 2427.

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 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 2428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 2429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 2430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clause 1), which grants Congress the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 2431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY:

H.R. 2432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 8, Section 3, of Article I of the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 21: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 56: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 58: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 85: Ms. BASS of California.

H.R. 157: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 178: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 181: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. HONDA.

- H.R. 186: Mr. MORAN.  
H.R. 198: Mr. CARNAHAN.  
H.R. 218: Ms. BASS of California.  
H.R. 303: Mr. TIBERI.  
H.R. 308: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.  
H.R. 358: Mr. GOSAR.  
H.R. 365: Mr. MEEHAN.  
H.R. 376: Mr. FILNER.  
H.R. 402: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
H.R. 421: Mr. BROOKS.  
H.R. 432: Mr. BERMAN.  
H.R. 436: Mr. REHBERG.  
H.R. 452: Mr. YODER, Mr. KELLY, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. BUCHANAN.  
H.R. 456: Mr. RUSH, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. ENGEL.  
H.R. 459: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 494: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Ms. HIRONO.  
H.R. 515: Mr. SHIMKUS.  
H.R. 589: Mr. REYES and Mr. MARKEY.  
H.R. 605: Mr. RUNYAN.  
H.R. 607: Mr. TONKO.  
H.R. 613: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 634: Mr. ROSS of Florida.  
H.R. 645: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. HENSARLING.  
H.R. 687: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. HONDA.  
H.R. 692: Mr. CHAFFETZ and Mr. MULVANEY.  
H.R. 704: Mr. CHAFFETZ and Mr. MULVANEY.  
H.R. 711: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.  
H.R. 721: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. BOREN, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. HALL.  
H.R. 733: Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 735: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. BROOKS.  
H.R. 743: Mr. HIGGINS.  
H.R. 750: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. MCCOTTER.  
H.R. 765: Mr. BASS of New Hampshire.  
H.R. 773: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
H.R. 774: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.  
H.R. 795: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.  
H.R. 798: Mr. NADLER.  
H.R. 808: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.  
H.R. 816: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. SHIMKUS.  
H.R. 820: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.  
H.R. 822: Mr. LOBIONDO.  
H.R. 825: Mr. SIRES.  
H.R. 835: Mr. BARLETTA.  
H.R. 853: Ms. BASS of California.  
H.R. 876: Ms. WOOLSEY.  
H.R. 883: Mr. MICHAUD.  
H.R. 912: Mrs. MALONEY.  
H.R. 923: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. LOBIONDO.  
H.R. 931: Mr. HUELSKAMP and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 942: Mr. HOLDEN.  
H.R. 959: Mr. CHABOT.  
H.R. 972: Mr. BROOKS and Mr. STEARNS.  
H.R. 1002: Ms. HAYWORTH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HECK, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. KELLY, and Mr. HONDA.  
H.R. 1005: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. RAHALL.  
H.R. 1041: Mr. DOLD.  
H.R. 1057: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. HANABUSA.  
H.R. 1058: Mr. GUINTA.  
H.R. 1070: Mr. PRICE of Georgia and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.  
H.R. 1103: Mr. FILNER, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. HONDA.  
H.R. 1106: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. NADLER.  
H.R. 1113: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. FARR.  
H.R. 1127: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 1164: Mr. GOODLATTE.  
H.R. 1166: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. POSEY, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.  
H.R. 1173: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
H.R. 1193: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.  
H.R. 1206: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. RENACCI.  
H.R. 1219: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
H.R. 1259: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. KLINE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, and Mr. MANZULLO.  
H.R. 1269: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 1278: Mr. GONZALEZ.  
H.R. 1283: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. MORAN.  
H.R. 1287: Mr. BERG.  
H.R. 1297: Mr. HARRIS.  
H.R. 1312: Mr. MANZULLO.  
H.R. 1322: Mr. BOSWELL.  
H.R. 1331: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. ACKERMAN.  
H.R. 1350: Mr. RUSH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. CAPUANO.  
H.R. 1351: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. SEWELL.  
H.R. 1358: Mr. CHAFFETZ.  
H.R. 1370: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. REHBERG.  
H.R. 1380: Mr. COBLE.  
H.R. 1385: Mr. DENT.  
H.R. 1386: Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.  
H.R. 1390: Mr. GUINTA and Mr. LANDRY.  
H.R. 1394: Mr. OLVER.  
H.R. 1416: Mr. BACA, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. COSTA.  
H.R. 1418: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. MCCOTTER.  
H.R. 1439: Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.  
H.R. 1449: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. STARK.  
H.R. 1462: Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. CUMMINGS.  
H.R. 1463: Mr. MEEKS.  
H.R. 1465: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.  
H.R. 1479: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.  
H.R. 1489: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. STARK, and Mr. CAPUANO.  
H.R. 1505: Mr. NUNES.  
H.R. 1506: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SPEIER, and Mrs. MALONEY.  
H.R. 1524: Mr. POLIS.  
H.R. 1527: Mr. POLIS.  
H.R. 1547: Mr. LUJÁN.  
H.R. 1558: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.  
H.R. 1574: Mr. BILBRAY.  
H.R. 1580: Mr. OWENS, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. OLSON, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SCHRAEDER, and Mr. MCKINLEY.  
H.R. 1588: Mr. AUSTRIA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. CLEAVER.  
H.R. 1591: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. TURNER, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. LOBIONDO.  
H.R. 1636: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. LUJÁN.  
H.R. 1639: Ms. JENKINS.  
H.R. 1672: Mr. RANGEL.  
H.R. 1699: Mr. GOODLATTE.  
H.R. 1706: Mr. HOLDEN.  
H.R. 1720: Mr. HIGGINS.  
H.R. 1744: Mr. FLORES, Mr. HANNA, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
H.R. 1755: Mr. BARROW and Mr. CULBERSON.  
H.R. 1756: Mr. CRITZ and Mrs. MYRICK.  
H.R. 1774: Ms. WATERS.  
H.R. 1781: Mr. SIRES.  
H.R. 1796: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.  
H.R. 1798: Mr. POSEY and Mr. BACA.  
H.R. 1802: Mr. TURNER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. FILNER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. WEST.  
H.R. 1803: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 1815: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Ms. CHU, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mrs. MYRICK.  
H.R. 1819: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.  
H.R. 1831: Mr. REHBERG.  
H.R. 1834: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. HAYWORTH, and Mr. PAUL.  
H.R. 1842: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.  
H.R. 1846: Mr. PITTS.  
H.R. 1852: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BONNER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. MEEHAN.  
H.R. 1856: Mr. FLEMING.  
H.R. 1860: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.  
H.R. 1897: Mr. SIRES, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. KING of New York.  
H.R. 1905: Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. FLEMING, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MARINO, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. LUJÁN.  
H.R. 1932: Mr. MULVANEY.  
H.R. 1933: Mr. HINOJOSA.  
H.R. 1946: Mr. ROSS of Florida and Mr. GERLACH.  
H.R. 1955: Mr. PAYNE.  
H.R. 1969: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
H.R. 1970: Mr. KUCINICH.  
H.R. 1976: Mr. JONES, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. WOMACK.  
H.R. 1978: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MORAN, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.  
H.R. 1981: Mr. FLORES and Mr. FORBES.  
H.R. 1995: Mr. PAYNE.  
H.R. 2005: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MARINO.  
H.R. 2008: Mr. ROKITA.  
H.R. 2009: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.  
H.R. 2018: Mr. REHBERG.  
H.R. 2026: Mr. TONKO.  
H.R. 2033: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mrs. DAVIS of California.  
H.R. 2041: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. LONG.  
H.R. 2046: Mr. STARK and Mr. KISSELL.  
H.R. 2054: Mr. POMPEO.  
H.R. 2068: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. BARROW.  
H.R. 2069: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
H.R. 2074: Mr. BACHUS.  
H.R. 2077: Mr. ROKITA.  
H.R. 2085: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.  
H.R. 2091: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LOESACK, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WU, and Mr. HOLDEN.  
H.R. 2093: Mr. JONES.  
H.R. 2098: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 2099: Mr. PAUL.  
H.R. 2100: Mr. PAUL.  
H.R. 2101: Mr. PAUL.  
H.R. 2108: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.  
H.R. 2123: Mr. FARR.  
H.R. 2145: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. PITTS.  
H.R. 2146: Mr. CUMMINGS.  
H.R. 2159: Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 2161: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2164: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2169: Mr. POLIS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2182: Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 2185: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2187: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 2198: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 2216: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 2228: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2233: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 2236: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. STARK, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 2247: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. STARK, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 2250: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 2258: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 2268: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2277: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 2299: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FORBES, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 2321: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 2337: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WELCH, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2355: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 2359: Ms. DEGETTE and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 2360: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 2365: Mr. FILNER and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 2375: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 2393: Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 2401: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 2405: Mr. BURGESS.

H.J. Res. 8: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 47: Mr. FARR.

H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H. Res. 13: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H. Res. 25: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.

H. Res. 60: Mr. HANNA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H. Res. 111: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. CARNEY.

H. Res. 130: Mr. SERRANO.

H. Res. 137: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Res. 177: Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. MARKEY.

H. Res. 220: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H. Res. 231: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 247: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. RIVERA.

H. Res. 262: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H. Res. 268: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. GRIFITH of Virginia, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PITTS, Ms. HOCHUL, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BERG, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LABRADOR, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. POLIS.

H. Res. 282: Mr. WU, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 295: Mr. KIND, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H. Res. 309: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. FARR.

H. Res. 315: Mr. CARDOZA and Mr. FORBES.

H. Res. 333: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MS. BASS OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 71: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 1590 or 1591 of title 18, United States Code, or in contravention of the requirements of section 106(g) or (h) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7104(g) or (h)).

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 72: Page 137, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000,000)".

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000,000)".

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 73: Page 128, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000,000)".

Page 129, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000,000)".

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000,000)".

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 74: Page 137, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$500,000,000)".

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$500,000,000)".

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 75: Page 128, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$500,000,000)".

Page 129, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$500,000,000)".

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$500,000,000)".

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. SHULER

AMENDMENT NO. 76: 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 restrict cooperation between employees of the Department of Defense and employees of the Department of Homeland Security.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. HUELSKAMP

AMENDMENT NO. 77: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the curriculum of the Chaplain Corps Tier 1 DADT repeal training dated April 11, 2011.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. NUGENT

AMENDMENT NO. 78: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for Operation Odyssey Dawn, Operation Unified Protector, or other military operations in Libya in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. NUGENT

AMENDMENT NO. 79: 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 Operation Odyssey Dawn, Operation Unified Protector, or other military operations in Libya.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. SESSIONS

AMENDMENT NO. 80: Strike section 8101.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. SESSIONS

AMENDMENT NO. 81: Page 22, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 33, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 34, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MS. MCCOLLUM

AMENDMENT NO. 82: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by \$119,800,000.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MS. MCCOLLUM

AMENDMENT NO. 83: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . Not more than \$20,000,000 of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay motorsports drivers, racing teams, or racing cars in the National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing (NASCAR), the National Hot Rod Association (NHRA), the Indy Racing League Indy Car Series, or the American Motorcyclist Association (AMA) Super Bike Racing or otherwise conduct recruiting outreach through motor sports under the authority of section 561(b) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106-398; 114 Stat. 1654A-129).

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MS. MCCOLLUM

AMENDMENT NO. 84: 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 provided to the Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan or used to carry out section 9012.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. WELCH

AMENDMENT NO. 85: Page 31, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$297,023,000)".

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$297,023,000)".

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. SESSIONS

AMENDMENT NO. 86: Page 31, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 33, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 34, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. MURPHY OF CONNECTICUT

AMENDMENT NO. 87: Page 160, after line 3, add the following:

(G) A discussion of whether and how Pakistan discriminates against religious minorities by requiring denunciations of particular religious minorities or sects on passport applications and other instruments of state.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. CICILLINE

AMENDMENT NO. 88: Page 133, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$475,000,000)".

Page 161, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$475,000,000)".

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. NEUGEBAUER

AMENDMENT No. 89: 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 reduce the number of B-1 aircraft of the Armed Forces.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. WELCH

AMENDMENT No. 90: Page 127, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$200,000,000)".

Page 149, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$200,000,000)".

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$200,000,000)".

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. LIPINSKI

AMENDMENT No. 91: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: Sec. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense to replace an information technology system that stores classified information in the United States with an information technology system that stores such classified information outside the United States.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT No. 92: Page 125, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,695,031,000)".

Page 125, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$348,845,000)".

Page 125, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$264,718,000)".

Page 125, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$521,937,000)".

Page 126, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$81,201,000)".

Page 126, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$16,362,000)".

Page 126, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$9,964,000)".

Page 126, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,511,000)".

Page 127, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$247,421,000)".

Page 127, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,698,000)".

Page 127, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$8,662,596,000)".

Page 127, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,584,616,000)".

Page 128, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$909,681,000)".

Page 128, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,359,569,000)".

Page 128, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,527,457,000)".

Page 130, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$55,414,000)".

Page 130, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$15,674,000)".

Page 130, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$9,193,000)".

Page 131, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$93,884,000)".

Page 131, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$7,962,000)".

Page 138, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,748,000)".

Page 139, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$17,697,000)".

Page 139, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$113,688,000)".

Page 140, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,488,000)".

Page 140, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$26,669,000)".

Page 140, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$20,468,000)".

Page 141, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$107,091,000)".

Page 141, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,414,000)".

Page 142, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$7,857,000)".

Page 142, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$246,473,000)".

Page 142, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$31,319,000)".

Page 143, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$737,626,000)".

Page 144, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$723,000)".

Page 144, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,204,000)".

Page 145, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$11,474,000)".

Page 145, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$15,593,000)".

Page 145, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$104,386,000)".

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$20,887,651,000)".

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

AMENDMENT No. 93: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 31, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MS. LEE

AMENDMENT No. 94: Page 125, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$3,438,789,000)".

Page 125, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$445,117,000)".

Page 125, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$337,774,000)".

Page 125, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$665,978,000)".

Page 126, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$103,610,000)".

Page 126, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$20,878,000)".

Page 126, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$12,714,000)".

Page 126, line 23, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$13,411,000)".

Page 127, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$315,703,000)".

Page 127, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$4,719,000)".

Page 127, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$11,012,116,000)".

Page 127, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$2,021,929,000)".

Page 128, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$1,160,729,000)".

Page 128, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$3,010,749,000)".

Page 128, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$1,948,995,000)".

Page 130, line 10, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$70,707,000)".

Page 130, line 16, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$20,000,000)".

Page 130, line 23, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$11,731,000)".

Page 131, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$119,794,000)".

Page 131, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$10,159,000)".

Page 131, line 25, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$1,625,451,000)".

Page 133, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$154,418,000)".

Page 135, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$4,161,156,000)".

Page 138, line 22, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$21,099,000)".

Page 139, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$5,546,000)".

Page 139, line 13, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$34,740,000)".

Page 139, line 20, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$223,174,000)".

Page 140, line 9, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$6,847,000)".

Page 140, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$52,352,000)".

Page 140, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$40,179,000)".

Page 141, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$210,224,000)".

Page 141, line 19, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$4,738,000)".

Page 142, line 3, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$15,423,000)".

Page 142, line 10, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$483,835,000)".

Page 142, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$61,480,000)".

Page 143, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$941,192,000)".

Page 144, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$1,419,000)".

Page 144, line 25, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$8,253,000)".

Page 145, line 8, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$22,523,000)".

Page 145, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$30,609,000)".

Page 145, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$133,194,000)".

Page 161, line 12, relating to the spending reduction account, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$33,000,124,000)".

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MS. LEE

AMENDMENT No. 95: Page 131, line 25, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$5,000,000,000)".

Page 161, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$5,000,000,000)".

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. DEFazio

AMENDMENT No. 96: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enforce section

376 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163).

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

AMENDMENT No. 97: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by \$8,500,000,000, not to be derived from amounts of appropriations made available—

- (1) by title I (“Military Personnel”);
- (2) under the heading “Defense Health Program” in title VI (“Other Department of Defense Programs”); or
- (3) by title IX (“Overseas Contingency Operations”).

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. COHEN

AMENDMENT No. 98: Page 133, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$200,000,000)”.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$200,000,000)”.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. COHEN

AMENDMENT No. 99: Page 135, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,000,000,000)”.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$4,000,000,000)”.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. POSEY

AMENDMENT No. 100: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . After the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has completed the final space shuttle mission, the Secretary of Defense shall—

- (1) to the maximum extent practicable, use the unique capabilities of the NASA Shuttle Logistics Depot of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and
- (2) preserve the unique capabilities and the highly skilled, highly certified workforce of such facility.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. POMPEO

AMENDMENT No. 1: Page 62, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 609. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the Ve-

hicle Technologies Program of the Department of Energy.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. POMPEO

AMENDMENT No. 2: Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$254,000,000)”.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$254,000,000)”.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. HARRIS

AMENDMENT No. 3: Page 62, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 609.  
“None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to fund any portion of the International program at the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy of the Department of Energy other than the U.S.-Israel energy cooperative.”

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. HARRIS

AMENDMENT No. 4: Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$6,000,000)”.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$6,000,000)”.



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 6, 2011

No. 99

## Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Sovereign God, Lord of the nations, You have magnified Your word above Your Name. As our lawmakers grapple with unyielding problems, give them the wisdom to turn to You for help. Lord, You have promised to supply all of our needs, so give our Senators what they need to meet the complex challenges of these days. May they take risks for the sake of truth and justice as they acknowledge with humility their need of Your abundant blessings. Bless them with a fresh regenerating touch of Your power.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUE).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, July 6, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable KIRSTEN E.

GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUE,  
President pro tempore.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following any leader remarks, the Senate will resume the motion to proceed to S. 1323, which is a bill to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit. The time until 12:30 today will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. The Senate will recess from 12:30 until 2:15 for our weekly party caucuses. The time from 2:15 until 6 p.m. is also equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

Yesterday, I filed a cloture motion on a motion to proceed to S. 1323. This vote will occur tomorrow.

### MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1326

Mr. REID. S. 1326 is at the desk. It is due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for a second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A bill (S. 1326) to implement the President's request to increase the statutory limit on the public debt.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I object to any further proceedings with respect to this matter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar under rule XIV.

### BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. REID. Madam President, yesterday my distinguished Republican counterpart said the debate over how to avert the looming default crisis is really a debate over what kind of a country we are going to be. I agree. That is certainly true. So will we be the kind of country that protects tax breaks and giveaways for the richest people and corporations while sacrificing seniors and the middle class? That is the America my Republican colleagues have proposed, and those priorities are simply backwards.

Democrats, on the other hand, believe that in a nation where half the country's wealth is controlled by probably less than 1 percent of its people, perhaps that 1 percent should not be exempt from the sacrifices asked of everyone else. If these negotiations will determine what kind of nation we are going to be, they will also determine the character of the Republican Party as well.

Will they be the party who came to Washington to help govern, to craft solutions to the difficult issues facing this Nation in cooperation with patriots on both sides of the aisle or will they be the kind of single-issue, ideological party that walks away from reasonable compromise for the sake of politics? That is the question.

David Brooks, a conservative columnist for the New York Times, was

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4333

hired for that reason, that usually liberal editorial page. They wanted someone who wrote well and was a certified conservative. David Brooks is who they chose. David Brooks believes it has obviously turned into an ideological party that walks away from reasonable compromise for the sake of politics. This is what he said yesterday—not me. Conservative columnist David Brooks said it yesterday, about the illogical and ideological Republican Party that has emerged.

Here is what he said:

If the debt ceiling talks fail, independent voters will see that Democrats were willing to compromise but Republicans were not.

He said: If we default, it will be the fault of the “Republican fanaticism.” That fanaticism is making compromise impossible no matter how much Democrats are willing to give. Independent voters, Brooks says, “will conclude that Republicans are not fit to govern. And they will be right.” David Brooks, conservative columnist, said this. The Republican Party has been taken over by ideologues devoted to or terrified by Grover Norquist and his no-tax pledge. These Republicans refuse to believe countless respected voices that have said over and over how serious a crisis we face if we fail to avoid default.

They have refused a deal that Brooks called the “mother of all no-brainers” because it violates an arbitrary pledge. Never mind that the deal is in the best interest of the country and gives the Republicans much of what they say they want. They walked away from the table.

The statesman, Dean Acheson—and he was one of our great diplomats and, certainly, a statesman—said negotiating “assumes parties more anxious to agree than to disagree.” It is no wonder, then, that Republicans have refused to negotiate. They will not even admit to supporting their own long-held positions if Democrats also support those positions.

We should all be able to agree we need to reduce the deficit and get the fiscal house in order. Democrats and Republicans alike have said that. We should all be able to agree we need to avert the global economic disaster the American default would cause. Business leaders and economists alike have said that exact same thing.

We should all be able to agree millionaires and billionaires, oil companies and the owners of yachts and jets don’t need special tax breaks the rest of Americans don’t get. Yet Republicans have defended those tax breaks again and again. They claim Democrats want to raise taxes on shipbuilders and airplane manufacturers. That couldn’t be further from the truth.

In fact, Democrats want to end special tax breaks for the millionaires and billionaires who are lucky enough to be able to afford private jets and yachts. We are happy that we stand in that way politically. These tax breaks aren’t available to middle-class Ameri-

cans. They can’t write off the family station wagon or the rowboat they take fishing with the grandkids or the motor boat they go out with every week to see if they can catch a bass or trout. These breaks are available for multimillion-dollar toys that only a handful of Americans can afford.

I repeat: I am proud that Democrats are standing up for America’s middle-class families instead of the richest of the rich. As my Republican colleagues defend tax breaks for special interests and the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans, I ask them again what kind of political party they want to be. They must ask themselves whether they want to be the kind of party that David Brooks, a conservative, described—a party of unreasonable fanatics who don’t want to compromise, no matter how sweet the deal for their side might be and no matter how grave the consequences for our Nation if they don’t agree.

---

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

---

#### TREATMENT OF SOMALI TERRORIST

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday afternoon we learned that over the weekend a Somali terrorist who had been held and interrogated on a U.S. Navy ship for the past 2½ months has been flown to New York to face criminal charges in a civilian court—a Somali terrorist flown to New York to be tried in a civilian court.

I strongly disagree with this decision. Mr. Warsame is a foreign enemy combatant, and he should be treated as one. He should be sitting in a cell in Guantanamo Bay and eventually tried before a military commission.

Warsame is an admitted terrorist. In 2009, Warsame trained and fought with the militant Islamic group al-Shabaab in Somalia. Over the last 2 years, Warsame has provided support and training to al-Qaida in Yemen.

Since the day President Obama signed the Executive order to direct the closure of the military detention facility at Guantanamo Bay and end the Central Intelligence Agency’s enhanced interrogation program, Senate Republicans have been asking the administration what would be done with an unlawful enemy combatant captured overseas in a place other than Iraq or Afghanistan. At one point, CIA Director Leon Panetta speculated that if Osama bin Laden had been captured alive, he would have been sent to Guantanamo. Over time, it became clear that the administration did not have a policy in place that could address this circumstance. So without a straight answer, we were left in the dark on how this administration would handle an enemy combatant captured overseas.

Finally, after waiting 18 months, I think we have our answer. As was disclosed yesterday, Warsame has been in military custody for months, during which time he has been interrogated by various law enforcement agencies. However, now he has been read his Miranda rights. This is a Somalian terrorist captured overseas who has now been read his Miranda rights. Why? Why? Why is a man who is a known terrorist and enemy of the United States being afforded the protections of an American citizen? Now he is in the hands of civilian authorities and will be given all the rights accorded to a U.S. citizen in a civilian court. It is truly astonishing that this administration is determined—determined—to give foreign fighters all the rights and privileges of U.S. citizens regardless of where they are captured.

In the case of Alwan and Hammadi, two enemy combatants who fought and killed U.S. soldiers in Iraq, they were captured in Bowling Green, KY, my State, and are now awaiting trial in a Bowling Green courtroom—a decision being summarily condemned by Kentuckians and most of their elected leaders from both parties at the State and Federal levels. And now Warsame, an enemy combatant with ties to al-Qaida who was captured overseas and detained by the military for months, is now inside the United States awaiting trial as a civilian criminal suspect. It is not necessary to bring or continue to harbor these terrorists within the United States. The infrastructure is already in place to handle these dangerous individuals at Guantanamo. However, it has become abundantly clear that the administration has no intention of utilizing Guantanamo unless an enemy combatant is already being held there. Instead, the administration has purposely imported a terrorist into the United States and is providing him all the rights of a U.S. citizen in court. This ideological rigidity being displayed by the administration is harming the national security of the United States of America.

Alwan, Hammadi, Warsame, and all future enemy combatants belong in Guantanamo. They do not deserve the same rights and privileges as American citizens. The administration’s actions are inexplicable, create unnecessary risks here at home, and do nothing at all to increase the security of the United States.

---

#### BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday I accepted the President’s invitation to the White House to discuss what the two parties can do together to reduce our Nation’s out-of-control deficit and debt, to create jobs, and to put the American economy back on solid footing.

As I have said for many months, the upcoming vote on the debt limit should be viewed as an opportunity to do something big that would send a clear



message to the American people and the world that we could come together and put our fiscal house in order.

It is notable that the President, who not that long ago preferred we raise the debt ceiling without any corresponding plan to do any of these things, now wants to discuss the need to do something about our crushing debt burden. Thursday's meeting will give us a chance to see if the President means what he says. It is an opportunity to see if the President is finally willing to agree on a serious plan to pay our bills without killing jobs in the process.

Until now, the President's proposals have been inadequate and, frankly, indefensible. It is ludicrous for the administration to propose raising hundreds of billions in taxes at a time when 14 million Americans are looking for work and job creators are struggling. Just last December, the President acknowledged that preventing a tax hike meant more resources were available for job creators to add employees. That was the President just last December in describing why he decided to extend the current tax rates for 2 more years—because, he said, it would be bad for job creators. That was just 6 months ago, and I do not think anybody thinks the economy is in better shape now than it was 6 months ago. Does the President now think the economy is doing so well, that unemployment is so low, and economic growth so rapid that we can take billions of dollars away from these very same job creators? That seems to be what he is saying now. It is equally ludicrous to propose more stimulus spending as part of a deficit reduction package. Republicans and, yes, some Democrats oppose these ideas because they will not solve the debt crisis and they certainly will not create any jobs.

Americans expect that in a negotiation about a debt crisis we would actually do something to significantly reduce the debt. And with so many still out of work, we expect the President to not insist on proposals his own administration says will put even more people in the unemployment line.

We are eager to meet with the President to see if he is really willing to do something big for the country. We do not think it is absolutist to oppose more stimulus spending. We do not think it is maximalist to oppose hundreds of billions of dollars in tax hikes in the middle of a job crisis. We have a better term for it: common sense.

We are ready to meet with the President on Thursday. Maybe he will have changed his mind and returned to his commonsense approach just back in December when he said that preventing tax hikes means "freeing up other money to hire new workers." Hopefully, we can finally do something big to reduce the deficit, put people back to work, and prevent Medicare's bankruptcy. That should be our goal.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### SHARED SACRIFICE IN RESOLVING THE BUDGET DEFICIT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1323, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: Motion to proceed to the bill (S. 1323) to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I rise this morning to talk about the meeting tomorrow the President has called at the White House—a summit, I think it has been referred to, one for which I have great hope. I hope it will be a summit where both sides leave their weapons at the door, sit across the table from one another, and begin talking about a comprehensive solution to a comprehensive problem. The solution to that problem, though, does not lie in creating villains and enemies. In the last 2 weeks, we have heard a lot of rhetoric coming from the White House demonizing people who have corporate jets or demonizing people who make over \$1 million.

I was reminded in this debate about millionaires in the debate in 1969 in America. It was one of the first debates I ever watched. I had returned home from the service, I had begun my business, and a report came out in the newspaper that 155 Americans who made over \$1 million paid zero taxes. I personally was astounded. Everybody else was astounded. Congress went to work to close the loophole, and they did it by creating something known as the alternative minimum tax—something to make sure someone who paid no tax at least paid "their fair share," and I put that in quotes.

Today, it is not 155 millionaires who are paying the alternative minimum tax; 34,200,000 Americans are, because oftentimes when Congress goes to target one person, they catch everybody in a bigger loop.

I do not think we need to demonize those who employ Americans, those who create the jobs, those who make our economy run, any more than we should villainize people who want to try to save Social Security or Medicare.

The President in his two speeches last week targeted millionaires, he targeted job creators, he created villains, and he created enemies. None of that will help us to solve a problem.

Now, the President is not the only one playing that game. A little bit of criticism can go to both sides.

As we look at this chart that has been on the floor in the last 2 weeks about what has happened in the last 30 months since the President was elected as to critical things, unemployment is up by 1.9 million people—17 percent in terms of the rate—gas prices are almost double, and the Federal debt is up 35 percent. But, remember, it was \$10 trillion when the President was elected, so it is not just the President's fault, but he is making it worse. Debt per person is now up by \$11,258, and health insurance premiums are up by almost 20 percent. In fact, the only thing that is down in the last 30 months is the expectations of the American people—expectations of what our future is going to be like.

So for a moment I would like to offer some historical suggestions as to what both sides can do tomorrow at the White House, when they leave the weapons at the door, sit at the table, and really begin to negotiate.

One is to look back in history when we have had big problems and we came up with big solutions. The 1980s is a particular time. I was in the State legislature then. I followed what was happening in Washington. In fact, when I was 39 years old in 1983, Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill had a meeting at the White House. I was not there, but allegedly it went something like this:

The President said: Well, Social Security is going broke in about 20 years. We just got that report. We need to fix it.

O'Neill said: I agree.

The President said: I am willing to work on it, but I am not willing to raise the tax.

O'Neill said: Well, I am willing to work on it, but I don't want to cut the benefit.

They looked at the Actuary and said: What do we do?

The Actuary said: Well, you push the eligibility out, and you get the system back in actuarial soundness.

I was 39 in 1983. I would have been collecting Social Security at the age of 65 in 2010. But because Reagan and O'Neill got together, they pushed my eligibility out by 1 year to age 66, not age 65, and now incrementally it goes up 2 months a year to age 67 in a few years. That put the system in actuarial soundness for 67 years. The reason it is now all of a sudden in trouble again is the protracted economy, and these difficulties have caused people—baby boomers—to now go to the bank of Social Security and collect early Social Security at age 62. So we have had a rush to Social Security because of the unemployment and the uncertainty in our economy. But Reagan and O'Neill fixed Social Security by pushing the eligibility out. They did not raise the tax, but they did raise the ceiling upon which it was levied.

I think it is interesting politically—I note the President should understand

and all of us should recognize—the next year was 1984, and President Reagan won 49 of 50 States, a year after he fixed Social Security.

So I do not think we ought to demonize people for trying to solve the bigger problems of our debt and deficit. Everybody in this room knows you could cut every discretionary dollar out and you would still owe \$300 billion in the deficit. The only way we are going to fix Social Security and Medicare is if we are going to fix the debt and deficit.

On Medicare, I was disappointed that when PAUL RYAN in the House came up with a forthright plan, he was immediately demonized. In fact, he was invited to the White House and criticized face to face at a conference the President had. That was just for trying.

It is about time all of us start trying, we start trying to find common ground, we start to look at our solutions in a comprehensive way. It is a time where we stop calling names and instead we start calling numbers, we start looking at what it is we can do within our control to put our spending back in line, amortize our debt over time to a reasonable amount, and reduce our deficit over time. It is not going to be fixed with one stroke of a pen or one single piece of legislation, but it is going to begin to be fixed when both sides sit down at the table and understand that this is the fourth quarter of the “major super bowl” of the future of the United States of America. Continuing to shoot each other and throw bricks and bats and create victims and create enemies and not talk about the real problems is just making it worse for all of us. It is time we made it better for the American people.

I spent the weekend with the American people who live in the State of Georgia celebrating our independence on the Fourth of July and spending some time with five of my nine grandchildren. I remember Saturday night watching my grandchildren play in the den, looking down at them. They were not looking at me. I was just watching them play, and I thought about their future. I thought about what their future was going to be like in a country that ran unlimited debt and deficits, that inflated its dollar, lowered its expectations, and was not the America I had been fortunate enough to live, work, and be born in.

Recognizing my age and my time, I know my future—the years I have left—is all about those children and those grandchildren. I want to be a part of the solution for the problem today but a part of their expectations for the future. I do not want them to look back and say: Granddad made it worse. I want them to look back and say: Granddad made it better.

Tomorrow is an opportunity for the President of the United States to lead. He has templates with which he can lead. He can either choose to take isolated enemies and isolated arrows and shoot them at people or he can, in-

stead, look back at his deficit commission. His deficit commission, which I voted for, by the way—I was one of the Republicans who voted for the creation of the deficit commission—came back in December with a comprehensive recommendation that should have come to the floor for debate. It dealt with Social Security. It did not deal with Medicare. It dealt with the Tax Code. It dealt with spending. It dealt with expenditures. It lowered tax rates and raised opportunity. The President did not even let it come to the floor of the Congress of the United States. He looked the other way.

It is time we look straight in each other's eyes and say there are solutions out there that good people of good will can find a way to do, just as Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill did. But I do not want to be a part of making it worse. I want to be a part of making it better.

I hope those at the conference tomorrow sit down with that type of attitude—we do not create enemies and villains, we do not make it worse, but we begin a platform and a template where in the next 3 to 4 weeks we can begin to amortize our debt over time, reduce our deficit over time, raise the expectations of the American people, and cause a brighter future for our children and for our grandchildren.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I am going to speak to another issue first. But I want to thank my colleague from Georgia for his comments. We are in different political parties, but I listened to him and I know he is sincere. I think it is that spirit that can lead us to a solution. I hope we can find it. I will address the specifics of it later in my remarks.

#### TRYING WARSAME

But first I wish to address the comments made by the Republican Senate Minority Leader MCCONNELL. It relates to a front-page story across the United States this morning, where we have apprehended the man Ahmed Abduikadir Warsame, a Somali individual who is now being charged with terrorist crimes and going to be tried in the State of New York.

This man apparently was apprehended and held for several months on a naval vessel of the United States where he was interrogated about his involvement in terrorism and then they brought in prosecutors, criminal prosecutors from the United States, who interrogated him about what they thought would be actionable crimes that could be prosecuted in the United States.

He is now being brought to New York for a trial. The statement made by Senator MCCONNELL this morning on the floor of the Senate suggests that this was a bad decision on the part of our President and the Department of Justice to try this man in the criminal courts of the United States.

Senator MCCONNELL has made this speech many times before. He believes that trying terrorists in the courts of the United States makes America less safe, and it less likely that we could convict them. He argues they should be held at Guantanamo and tried in military tribunals. His argument has some surface appeal unless you know the facts.

The facts are that under President Bush after 9/11 and under President Obama, more than 400 suspected terrorists have been tried in the criminal courts of America, article III constitutional courts, and convicted. They have been tried in our courts and convicted. They are serving time in the prisons of the United States of America. That is right: convicted terrorists, convicted in criminal courts, now serving time in prisons across America, including in my home State of Illinois at the Marion Federal Penitentiary.

So to argue that we cannot successfully convict a terrorist in the United States, as Senator MCCONNELL did this morning, is to ignore reality. The reality is that President Bush used his Department of Justice and our courts to successfully prosecute terrorists. During the period of time since 9/11, only around 5 accused terrorists were tried in military tribunals—400 in article III criminal courts, 5 in military tribunals.

Senator MCCONNELL makes the argument—and others have joined him—that the only place to try them is in military tribunals. The fact of the matter is, we do not have a very good record in military tribunals trying would-be terrorists. There is a variety of reasons for it. The Supreme Court did not agree with our procedures. Some of the cases were not very good. The bottom line, though, is to say to any President, whether it is Republican George Bush or Democrat Barack Obama, Congress is going to tell you the best place to try a terrorist—do we have that expertise? I do not. I am not sure Senator MCCONNELL does. I think it is up to the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Attorney General to make that call.

Take the would-be terrorist to the court where we are most likely to convict. Take him to a tribunal where they are going to get a fair hearing in the eyes of the world, and conviction is most likely. That is what I think the American people want.

To come here and second guess the President because he has held a man for 2 months in military interrogation and now is being prosecuted in our criminal courts is totally unfair, unfair because the same standard was not applied to the Republican President who tried hundreds of would-be terrorists—accused terrorists—in our criminal courts successfully. That is a fact. That should be on the record.

I meant what I said about Senator ISAKSON of Georgia. He is a Republican, I am a Democrat. He is my friend. I

like him. We do not agree on everything. Our voting records are much different. But what he had to say this morning was the right thing. And what he had to say this morning, I think, should open the eyes of America about where we need to go.

Yesterday, the President sat down and said, we need to be serious about deficit reduction. We do not need a mini deal, we need something that speaks authoritatively to the world that the United States understands its deficit challenge and is prepared to make the hard choices to address it. I think the President is right.

I was interviewed this morning by a Quincy, IL, radio station. They said: Well, why would not you take a mini deal and get it over with? Well, if you think you will take a mini deal, you will probably be offered a mini, mini deal. At the end of the day, little or nothing will happen. Here is the problem we face. It is a real problem. For every dollar we spend in Washington, we borrow 40 cents. We borrow it from countries all around the world. The No. 1 creditor of the United States is China. China loans us money so that we can spend for government purposes.

How do we spend the money? Well, if you look at Federal employees, more than half of the Federal employees in the United States of America work for one department, the Department of Defense. If you look at expenditures, some of the fastest growing sections of our budget have been on the military side as we wage wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and participate in the NATO exercise in Libya.

That is a pretty expensive undertaking. We know that that has gone up 84 percent—military spending in the last 10 years, gone up 84 percent. We know at the same period of time that spending on mandatory programs, such as Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, agriculture payments, veterans payments, spending for those payments over the last 10 years has gone up 32 percent.

We know that the rest of the budget, the so-called domestic discretionary spending, which would include things such as building highways, keeping Federal prisons open, providing Pell grants to college students, giving children from poor families early childhood education, putting money at the National Institutes of Health for medical research, that is one section of the budget—it comprises 12 percent of our budget—and in the last 10 years, that part of our budget has gone up zero percent; no increase in spending in that section.

Most of our spending goes into the military—84 percent increase over 10 years—and mandatory programs—32 percent over 10 years. The biggest driver, in terms of Federal spending, the thing we cannot seem to get hold of, is health care costs. And you know that as an individual, whether you are trying to buy health insurance for your family, run a small business and trying

to cover the owners and workers, or look at it from a State and local viewpoint when it comes to public employees.

I could analyze the health care system, I do know about it. But I will tell you that it is a model that is unsustainable. You cannot watch the cost of health care go up beyond inflation every single year and expect to control deficits, whether it is your family deficit, your city deficit, or your national deficit. But that is the reality of where we are today as we face the current situation.

I listened as the Senator from Georgia, whom I respect very much, talk about what President Obama inherited. I wish to add a little perspective to it. The last time the Federal Government balanced the budget, ran a surplus, was in the final 2 years of the Clinton administration, William Jefferson Clinton, Democratic President of the United States.

We generated a surplus in those years; that is, we collected more money in taxes and revenue than we paid out. That had not happened for decades. At that point, as William Jefferson Clinton left office as President, the national debt of America, the accumulated net national debt of America from George Washington through William Jefferson Clinton was \$5 trillion—\$5 trillion, and we had a surplus in our annual budget. When President George W. Bush took over and President Clinton handed him the keys to the White House, he said: Next year, if you follow my budget, you will have a \$120 billion surplus.

That is what President George W. Bush inherited: \$5 trillion national debt, a government running a surplus of \$120 billion in the next year.

Fast forward 8 years later. At the end of President George W. Bush's 8 years in office, let's take a snapshot. What did it look like then? The national debt was no longer \$5 trillion 8 years later, it was almost \$11 trillion. It more than doubled in an 8-year period of time. And, when President Obama took office, instead of being handed a budget for the next year with a \$120 billion surplus, as President Bush was handed by President Clinton, President Obama was given a budget and he said: Next year, if you follow our budget you will have a \$1.2 trillion deficit, 10 times the amount that President Bush had in surplus. President Obama was told: You will have that in deficit. You will owe that much. The books do not balance.

What happened in 8 years? Well, several things happened. First, we waged two wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and we did not pay for them. I think back in my history, and I can remember as a kid that every birthday I would receive a savings bond, U.S. savings bond. I used to think it was interesting. They would hand me these \$25 U.S. savings bonds, and I knew they cost \$18.75. But if I did not do anything with them and held onto them for al-

most 10 years, they would be worth \$25. So Grandma and Grandpa would give me the \$25 savings bond—I would think it is only \$18.75, and I stuck it away. You know. The reason I bring it up is those savings bonds were the way we financed wars. Americans sacrificed and loaned money to their government, and they bought savings bonds.

It was my family tradition. It was a tradition of America. But when it came to the two most recent wars, in Iraq and Afghanistan, that did not happen. We borrowed the money from other countries. So during that 8-year period of time, under President Bush, we waged two wars and borrowed the money and added it to the national debt.

We did something else. No President in the history of the United States of America ever has cut taxes in the midst of a war. You know why? Because you have your ordinary budget of government. You have got to pay for it. Now you have got a new expenditure, with hundreds of thousands of troops in the field, and families saying, keep them safe and bring them home, and you are spending billions of dollars there. How could you cut taxes?

That is what happened. During the Bush administration, they cut taxes. Two wars unpaid for, cut taxes, and then President Bush signed into law programs—dramatically expensive programs that were not paid for. Medicare prescription Part D was one of them. So you had these programs signed into law, wars not paid for, taxes cut, and, at the end of an 8-year period of time, the national debt rose from \$5 trillion to over \$10 trillion, almost \$11 trillion.

The Republican Party has a philosophy, the Democratic Party has a philosophy. There are those of us who think that sometimes we should listen to one another and try to learn from one another. I think this is one of those occasions. But I will say to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle in the Senate and the Republican leaders in the House, those who are arguing that the best way to get the American economy moving forward at this point is to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in America, they have forgotten their history. That is exactly what we did under President George W. Bush, and look what happened—the biggest deficits in the history of the United States. When Barack Obama raised his hand off of that Lincoln Bible, taking the oath of office, that month we lost 700,000 jobs in America. Unemployment was running rampant and kept going.

Using the Republican economic theory of tax cuts for the wealthiest people in America—it did not work then. It will not work now. It is a tired old idea. It may give them points in opinion polls. It does not give America points and credibility around the world. It is a position they are taking.

Having said that, I guess I could stop here and they would say: DURBIN, that was a heck of a Democratic speech.

Let me go a little further. I was on the deficit commission. I sat there for 10 months and listened to everything. It was split, Democrats and Republicans, and the President appointed the commission. There were Democratic and Republican Senators, and the same thing with House Members. I came to the conclusion that there were some positions the Republicans had taken that were wrong, and there were positions that Democrats had taken that were also wrong. It was time for us to try to do something smart and do it bipartisanship. I voted for the deficit commission; 11 out of 18 of us did. I think I surprised more people than I ever imagined. But I think it was the right thing to do.

The morning I voted for it, my son, who happens to live in Brooklyn, in the Presiding Officer's State, sent me an e-mail saying: Thanks, Dad, you are doing the right thing. Well, every dad wants to hear that once in a while. I said that at this commission meeting. It meant a lot to me that my son, whom I greatly love, would have that kind of respect for that kind of decision.

Here is what we did and what we need to do now. Here is what we need to say to the American people: We can get out of this mess. America is a good, strong nation. We are good people, smart, hard working, and we have a great tradition when it comes to dealing with challenges, whether it is waging wars, or fighting recessions, or putting a man on the Moon. We can do it. We have done it, and we will do it again. Start with that premise. Don't badmouth this country, because we are blessed to be living here. This country and its history have proven over and over again that it can tackle the biggest challenges and meet them head on. Do you know who wins this battle? It is average Americans—those who have waged our wars, who were the soldiers and went off to war, my brothers in the Korean war, and others, regular old families who said it is our patriotic duty and we will serve. They continue to do it time and again.

When it comes to sacrifice, Americans know that spirit as well—not only the can-do spirit, but the spirit of, sure, my brothers each gave 4 years of their lives to the U.S. Navy, and so many others did. It says that Americans are willing to step up and participate in a national effort. When they think we are all together as a nation moving in the right direction, they want to be part of it, I want to be part of it, America wants to be part of it. When we talk about solutions to problems, we talk about everybody rolling up their sleeves and getting involved.

I know the poorest of the poor can't. They don't have the resources, or they may not have the physical or mental ability, whatever their circumstance, and I am ready to help the most vulnerable people. Asking them to sacrifice and pitch in is maybe too much in some circumstances. The rest of us should pitch in.

Here is what we ought to do. First, we should not say that anybody in America who is wealthy and comfortable in life is going to be spared in sacrifice. Everybody has to give. Those who are better off than some should give more. I don't think that is unfair. Life has been good to them; America has been good to them. When we need them, they should be asked to help. So the notion of raising taxes on the wealthiest people should not be something we automatically reject. It should be part of the conversation.

Second, we have a Tax Code that you could not carry with two arms because it is so big, loaded with laws and regulations and, frankly, most people don't know what is in it. I will tell you the people who do know: the special-interest lobbyists in Washington, the tax lawyers, and some people in congressional committees. In there, you will find that we spend almost \$1.2 trillion in tax expenditures. Most people don't understand that. I learned a little about it in the deficit commission; \$1.2 trillion in tax expenditures in the Tax Code equals all the credits, all the deductions, all the exclusions, and everything that you can take to reduce your tax burden. And \$1.2 trillion also represents the entire amount of discretionary spending each year in the United States. It is a big sum of money. So we spend it in our expenditure levels, from the Defense Department all the way through the Agriculture Department, and everything in between; and we forgive, or don't collect, the same amount in the Tax Code.

Who benefits from that? Let's look at the basics. Seventy percent of the American taxpayers do not itemize on their tax returns. They file a standard return. So the Tax Code doesn't mean anything to them. If there is a special deduction, unless it is a refundable tax credit—a rare category—it doesn't help them. Seventy percent of Americans don't touch it. What are the biggest deductions under the U.S. Tax Code today? In all my wisdom and education and experience on Capitol Hill, I said it is the mortgage interest deduction, right? Wrong. The biggest single deduction is the employers' exclusion for health care premiums. Employers are able to exclude from income the amount of money they spend for health insurance for their employees. No. 2 is the mortgage interest deduction. I use it. My wife and I bought our home and thought about it ahead of time. OK, we have mortgage interest deduction, maybe we can buy a little more home. A lot of families do. When you look at the mortgage interest deduction and realize that 70 percent of Americans don't itemize, look at the 30 percent who do, it turns out that mortgage interest deduction—the lion's share of that money goes to the very highest income categories in America. So that comes as a surprise. Do you think it is a middle class tax cut? It is not. It is, by and large, a tax cut for wealthy people.

I want to preserve that part that protects middle-income families. But, again, shouldn't those in the highest income categories be willing to see a change in that deduction if it means America's deficit is going to be finally brought under control?

When we look at the Tax Code, we need to be honest about it. There are things in there we cannot afford to do any longer—things that maybe we never should have done. We can clean up that Tax Code. What we found in the deficit commission is that by cleaning it up, we could actually produce enough revenue to lower marginal tax rates. I hope my Republican friends tune in at this point. They applaud this, and I do too. If we can lower marginal tax rates for families—even businesses in America—that is a good thing; I am for it. But it means being honest and tackling the Tax Code.

The other thing we have to look at is entitlements. This is where it gets dicey on my side. I like PAUL RYAN. Congressman PAUL RYAN is from the Midwest, and maybe I am partial as a result. He is from Janesville, WI. He studied this issue and knows it well. We come to different conclusions, but he did tackle the entitlements. I think he went too far with Medicare. Doubling the out-of-pocket expenses for people under Medicare is a nonstarter. Eliminating Medicare as we know it and putting these folks in the "loving arms" of health insurance companies in their sixties and seventies is not any kind of favor for the elderly in America. So I disagreed with his conclusions. I would not vote for that. In fact, I voted against him.

I don't disagree with PAUL RYAN saying that we have to look honestly at Medicare. If we don't do that, in 10 or 12 years it will go broke. We cannot let that happen. So we have to look at Medicare in a sensible way to reduce the costs of Medicare.

Let me give one example. In the Medicare prescription Part D Program, prescription drugs for seniors, I think Medicare ought to offer an option. The government ought to have an option that people can choose voluntarily, one way or the other, to try to buy pharmaceutical drugs in bulk, reducing their costs, so that seniors pay less. Is that a radical concept? No. It is exactly what we do in the Veterans' Administration. We can do it under Medicare prescription Part D, reducing that program and the costs to seniors, and create as part of the spectrum of competition a Medicare prescription program—one person can opt into if they want to. So there are ways to save money in Medicare without endangering basic benefits.

Here is the last thing I will say. I see my colleague from Louisiana here. I don't want to keep him waiting. Tomorrow, I will be honored to be invited to the White House with Senator REID to meet with the President and the leadership in the House and Senate—Democrats and Republicans. The President said: Leave your ultimatums at

the door. That is good advice. He understands that if we don't extend the debt ceiling by August 2, it will have a dramatic negative impact on the American economy. It is as if you would default on your mortgage—same result. Our creditors around the world will say: Oh, America is not going to pay its bills on time, so maybe we won't loan them money. Maybe if we loan them money, we will raise the interest rate. If they raise the interest rate on our government, they will raise the interest rates across our economy, whether you are borrowing for a home, a car, or whatever it is. It would be the height of irresponsibility for us to default on America's debt. That debt ceiling needs to be extended so that interest rates don't go up, because if they do, it will hurt our economic recovery and put more Americans out of work.

The template for our meeting tomorrow should be the President's deficit commission. I will only take exception to one thing Senator ISAKSON said earlier. He said that the President did not let it come to the floor for a vote—his deficit commission. In fairness to Senator ISAKSON, that wasn't the President's responsibility. It is our responsibility to bring it to the floor for a vote. I have been trying for 6 months now, with a handful of other colleagues—Democrats and Republicans—to bring this to the floor so that we would have a vote on it. I will keep on trying, as we should. I think it remains the best way to approach the deficit challenge. Let's put everything on the table. Look to the deficit commission, the Simpson-Bowles commission, which gave us guidance as to how to get out of this. If we do get it done—and we can do this—I think it is going to inspire people around the world to believe again in America's future as an economy, to invest in America, and we will create jobs. It is going to be like the turnaround that occurred when Bill Clinton came to office and said, "I am taking the deficit seriously," and he passed the deficit reduction plan by one vote in the House—I was there—and by one vote in the Senate when Vice President Al Gore cast the deciding vote. Look what happened to the economy. There was a dramatic increase in business ownership, business creation, and home ownership.

That, to me, can happen again if we come up with a bipartisan, sensible, inclusive budget deficit plan of the magnitude the President called for yesterday.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, will the Chair inform me when I have consumed 12 minutes?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, first, I rise to celebrate that we are finally, after months and months of doing everything under the Sun but facing our gravest challenge, which is spending

and debt, focused on that on the floor of the Senate. That is progress. We have a long way to go, but at least that is progress.

For months, I have been urging us as a body, urging the majority leader, who controls the floor, please, let's focus on our gravest challenge, Federal spending and debt, and not wait until the eleventh hour, not wait for a crisis atmosphere. Let's put on the floor meaningful legislation about spending and debt.

For months and months, unfortunately, we did everything but that on the floor of the Senate. The majority leader looked for every bill and every topic but that, and it was all sorts of cats and dogs—many of them, quite frankly, trivial, unnecessary legislation, particularly compared to this grave challenge of spending and debt.

Finally, last week, a group of conservatives here said enough is enough. We should not go out on our planned July 4 recess, which was scheduled to be all of this week. We said we are going to block that. It takes unanimous consent for that to happen. We said we would block it and, sure enough, we did. We said, wait a minute, we are not blocking that just to be here. We are not blocking that to be here and continue to move on to every other issue under the Sun but spending and debt. We did that to finally focus on the floor of the Senate on the gravest of all of our current challenges—Federal spending and debt.

We said we are going to vote against the motion to proceed to the Libya debate. Libya is an important matter. In fact, that debate is long overdue in Congress. Those votes are long overdue. But that challenge does not rise to the level of our greatest fundamental challenge right now as a nation, which is spending and debt. We said we are going to block that motion to proceed to yet another unrelated matter, and we did. We rounded up the votes in the last half week and got those necessary votes to block that motion to proceed. As a result, the distinguished majority leader pulled that vote, he vitiated that cloture vote yesterday.

Finally, we have an instrument on the Senate floor—a motion—about this central challenge we face, spending and debt. So that is progress. I urge all of my colleagues to come down and join this most important debate. I continue to urge the majority leader to put meaningful, substantive legislation on the floor about this topic. We have motions on sense-of-the-Senate resolutions. It focuses us on the proper topic, spending and debt. That is progress.

But, of course, a sense-of-the-Senate resolution does not do anything or change anything. We still have further to go in terms of bringing meaningful legislation to the floor, our gravest challenge, Federal spending and debt.

Why do I insist this is our top challenge at hand? The facts speak for themselves. Of every \$1 the Federal Government spends—of every \$1—over

40 cents is borrowed money—over 40 cents of every \$1. Imagine if we ran our household that way. It wouldn't take long for one to hit a financial dead end and virtual bankruptcy—if out of every \$1 our family was spending, 40 cents of it was borrowed money.

What does that mean? It means we are collecting, as a nation—as a Federal Government—about \$2.2 trillion a year. That is a lot of money, \$2.2 trillion. The problem is we are spending \$3.7 trillion—way, way, way more than we are collecting.

The distinguished majority whip mentioned entitlement spending, and I agree with him that is a big part of the issue which we must face in a careful, substantive way because Medicare is one of those big entitlement programs. It, too, is on an unsustainable path. The average American pays about \$110,000 into Medicare over his or her lifetime—a lot of money—but, on average, that average American receives in benefits over \$430,000 under Medicare. There again, it is not tough to do the math. That is unsustainable, when the average American pays in \$110,000 and receives in benefits over \$300,000.

Social Security is another huge entitlement program. This year, it is taking in less than it is spending on current retirees. That day of reckoning was going to be several years down the road, but it has been accelerated. It is here now—right now. Social Security is taking in, in tax revenue, less than it is paying out in benefits to retirees.

What does this mean? This adds up and up and up. So we have more new debt under this administration—more new debt under President Obama—than the debt compiled under all the previous Presidents combined, from the first George Bush to the latest George, George W. Bush. We have more new debt under this President than the debt accumulated from all those previous Presidents combined. We must do something, and we must do something about the real problem, spending and debt.

Washington, in a bipartisan way, has a spending problem. The fundamental problem isn't that we are undertaxed. We all know that, no matter what station in life we come from. The fundamental problem is, Washington doesn't live within its means, such as we as families do as we sit around our kitchen tables and look at our budgets. Washington has a fundamental spending and debt problem, and we need real solutions—rigorous, disciplined solutions—to get that under control.

How do we go about that? To me, it comes down to three important things: cut, cap, and balance—cut, cap, and balance. Cut: We need to cut the budget now. We need to cut the budget this year and next year. We need immediate meaningful cuts. That is why I support those immediate meaningful cuts in the Federal budget. We can't put off meaningful cuts for 1 year or 5 years or 10 years. We need them right now.

A few weeks ago, we had some budget proposals on the floor. We had several

Republican proposals and we had President Obama's proposed budget. The Obama budget didn't cut in a meaningful way. In fact, it doubled the debt in 5 years and tripled the debt in 10. On the Republican side, we had three different alternatives, all of which cut the budget in a meaningful way, and I voted for all three. We need to start now, today, with cuts.

But that is not enough. That is short term. We need immediate cuts, we need medium-term caps, and we need balance. So let's discuss caps. What do I mean by a cap? I mean we need established spending caps in each major category of the budget that takes some sort of extraordinary supermajority in the Congress to supercede. We need a glidepath to actually get through those caps to a balanced budget in a reasonable period of time.

There are several proposals in this body. There are several proposals in the House, mostly from the Republican, conservative side—virtually all of them—to establish those caps, to get us on that disciplined mandatory path so we reach that balanced budget.

Third, and finally, balance: The goal needs to be a balanced budget, and it can't be a goal generations off. It can't be a goal decades off. It needs to be a goal within our sight. The only way, ultimately, I believe, we can absolutely ensure that is through a constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

I am very proud to be a coauthor, along with all my Republican colleagues—every single one of us—of a strong, meaningful, substantive balanced budget constitutional amendment. This has been debated in this body and the House for some time. The last time it was voted on, on the floor of the Senate, it came within one vote of passing. We need to have this ultimate protection and straitjacket and enforced discipline to say we are getting to a balanced budget, we are going to stay there, and we are not going to get in this state again.

Virtually every State in the country has such a balanced budget constitutional amendment under their State constitution, and that enforced discipline works. That straitjacket at the State level works. It works in my State of Louisiana. We have such a provision in our State constitution which says we can't have a State budget which is out of balance. That mandate, that requirement for a balanced budget works. Every year, the legislature, working with the Governor, produces a balanced budget. If they go out of session and 1 month later revenues fall and the budget goes out of balance, they have to come back in within a set period of time and they have to rebalance that budget. It is not fun. It is not easy. It has been particularly difficult in this horrible economy for the last several years, but because of that mandate, because of that constitutional provision, it gets done. That is what we need at the Federal level. We need a balanced budget constitutional amendment.

So I repeat: cut, cap, and balance. It is an important formula. It is simple but substantive and it will get us where we need to be.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has consumed 12 minutes.

Mr. VITTER. I thank the Chair.

I urge all my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to come together and continue this debate and move it to the next level.

As I said when I began, the first thing I wish to do is recognize and celebrate progress because, after months of resistance from the distinguished majority leader, we are finally on the Senate floor actually talking about our most pressing challenge, spending and debt. But it is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. It is a procedural motion.

Let's get to the real substance by having meaningful legislation—cut, cap, and balance legislation—on the floor of the Senate, open to amendments and open to wide-ranging debate. That is the history and tradition of the Senate. Unfortunately, it hasn't been the practice of the Senate all that much in recent years, but we are trying to get back to that. So let's put that meaningful, substantive legislation about spending and debt on the floor of the Senate, have that debate, have amendments, and have a free flow of ideas.

Cut, cap, and balance—we can get there. We can do the work of the American people. We can rein in this runaway Federal spending and debt, and we must. We must do it now. Because if we fail to meet this challenge this year—if we fail to meet this challenge this year—I believe there are going to be dire consequences for our economy and for all American families as a result.

Having this topic on the floor of the Senate is a start, but it is only a start. Let's build on this, put substantive legislation on the floor about spending and debt, and act on that meaningful, substantive legislation.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, before I begin on my time, I would like to ask my colleague from Louisiana if he would answer a question.

Mr. VITTER. I would be happy to.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my colleague.

My colleague is right. We should move on this, this year. We certainly agree with that. Of course, the balanced budget amendment wouldn't take effect for years to come. But my colleague just voted for the Ryan budget, which actually increased the deficit. Not only did it not move deficit numbers down, but it increased the deficit. So how can he reconcile all this nice, grandiose talk about a balanced budget amendment with voting for a budget that actually increased the deficit?

Mr. VITTER. Well, first of all, I voted for that budget as well as the

Toomey budget. The Toomey budget, which was my first choice and preference, balances the budget in 10 years. That would be my first choice.

The Ryan budget gets us way down the path compared to anything else proposed on the Democratic side, such as the President's budget, which on the Senate floor actually got 0 votes out of 100. So while the Ryan budget is not my first choice, it is a dramatic improvement on the path we are currently on.

Mr. SCHUMER. I would note, for my colleague—reclaiming my time—the Ryan budget is not a dramatic step in that direction. The Ryan budget, as I understand it, does not do a thing in the first decade to reduce the deficit. It cuts a lot of spending, but it also cuts taxes and it raises defense spending.

Mr. VITTER. If I may respond, through the Chair.

Mr. SCHUMER. Please.

Mr. VITTER. That is not true. It reduces the deficit. It doesn't balance the budget within the 10-year window, which is my strong preference—the Toomey budget does do that—but it gets us going in the right direction. It reduces the deficit, and it is a particularly dramatic improvement over anything proposed by this administration.

I thank my colleague.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my colleague.

I would say it is time to walk the walk, not talk the talk. Whenever folks refuse to step to the plate to actually balance the budget—the last President to do so being Bill Clinton—they start talking about a way distant, future balanced budget amendment. This balanced budget amendment they talk about is not going to solve our problem in the next 5 years. We have to get to work right now, and that is what we are trying to do on this side, with a fair and balanced approach.

The balanced budget amendment my colleague speaks about would, if we look at the amounts—18 percent GDP—cut deeper than the Ryan budget. It would end Medicare as we know it. It would mean things we take for granted, such as food safety inspectors and flight inspectors, would have to be cut, and then it makes it impossible to close tax loopholes for millionaires and billionaires. It is not a balanced budget amendment; it is an unbalanced budget amendment because it simply reflects an ideological view that my good colleague and friend from Louisiana has but does not reflect the views of either a majority of this Chamber or certainly the American people.

So let's walk the walk. Let's not just talk the talk. I think that is very important to note. Cutting spending, which is done in the Ryan budget, is not going to work in terms of balancing the budget. It just can't, unless we decimate programs, such as Medicare, without revenues.

That is what I am here to talk about today. I rise today in support of the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice.

The clock is ticking. Time is running short to reach a deal on reducing the deficit and raising the debt ceiling. We are walking the walk and not simply talking the talk about some ephemeral balanced budget amendment that is unbalanced and will not pass.

Yesterday, the President said we needed to reach a deal within 2 weeks in order to avoid roiling the financial markets. Democrats are working in good faith, identifying spending cuts and tax loopholes to close. And what are our Republican colleagues doing?

Well, since stalking out of the negotiations 2 weeks ago, they are now sticking to their blind ideology and playing political games, such as inviting the President to come to the Capitol, when they know he can't, to deliver a message he has already heard. The Republican leader has continued to insist that we can't raise a single dollar in revenue, no matter how wasteful the tax break or how generous the substance.

Madam President, here is what it is coming down to. In the home stretch of negotiations, our Republican colleagues seem to be willing to tank the economy rather than end a single tax subsidy. Democrats are committed to reducing the deficit and getting our Nation back on a sensible fiscal track, but we know everyone must pay their fair share. We know there has to be compromise to get things done. We can't just draw a line in the sand and say: My way or no way; it will lead to fiscal Armageddon.

So over the past several weeks, we have offered a number of wasteful tax breaks that should be ended as part of the debt ceiling deal: ending subsidies for the oil and gas industry making record profits; the ethanol industry, which 36 Members on the floor, including the majority leader, supported, to their credit, and corporate jet owners, will save us tens of billions of dollars.

Now, paradoxically, our Republican colleagues are now arguing that tax breaks for oil companies and corporate jet owners are too small to consider ending. They have argued that because they will only save taxpayers tens of billions of dollars. They say that is not enough and so we shouldn't be discussing them now.

Well, I disagree. Tens of billions of dollars that we can save on wasteful subsidies are certainly worth pursuing.

But let's turn our attention to the matter at hand, one of the biggest of all taxpayer giveaways that Democrats are trying to end: tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires.

I rise today in strong support of the Senate resolution that says, simply, instead of ending Medicare as we know it, instead of cutting college scholarships and cancer research, instead of balancing the budget solely on the backs of the middle class, let's end some breaks. Let's end tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires.

Let me repeat that because that is the essence of our dispute, of our dis-

agreement. You can't varnish it any other way. I know the other side tries to say we are raising taxes, trying to imply that we want to do it on middle-class people. We don't. We are not going to touch a person whose income is below \$250,000. Some of us would even go higher, \$500,000, \$1 million. But every one of us on this side says: If you are a millionaire, you should share some of the sacrifice. The other side resists, and then they try to hide by saying it is raising taxes. It is not raising taxes on average folks. It is not raising taxes at all. It is simply going back to the level under Bill Clinton where we had record prosperity, record jobs, and record income growth for the highest end people as well as for middle-class people who got income growth as well.

So let me repeat the nub of this and why we have this resolution on the Senate floor. Here is what it says: Instead of ending Medicare as we know it, instead of cutting college scholarships and cancer research, instead of balancing the budget on the backs of the middle class, let's end tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires. This would save over \$100 billion a year and hundreds and hundreds of billions in the long run. It is not just a small amount.

I ask my Republican colleagues, is that savings significant enough to at least merit discussion and not just take it off the table?

The GOP budget would end Medicare as we know it to give hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans. The resolution says, simply: Don't let that happen.

Let me say this: I respect people who have made a lot of money. There are many of them in my State. They work hard. God bless them. But many of them, when you talk to them, are the first to say they should share in the sacrifice. There are some who would say no, but I don't think they represent mainstream America or mainstream American opinion.

In normal times this would be a consensus opinion, the fact that we shouldn't end Medicare as we know it to give hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks to the richest Americans. In normal times that would be a consensus position.

Republican Presidents and political leaders have long supported raising revenue combined with cutting spending to reduce deficits. Ronald Reagan, for instance, because he wanted to shrink government, but he was fiscally responsible. But the Republican Party has been dragged so far to the right by an ideological fringe that they now see this balanced approach as an extreme position.

What it comes down to is this: Would Republicans rather end Medicare than end tax breaks for billionaires? It is a simple choice, and this resolution will make the answer to that question clear.

Again, will Republicans do anything, even risk default, to protect tax breaks

on the highest income people, millionaires and billionaires? And would they rather end Medicare and solely rely on cuts that hurt the middle class than admit that some tax subsidies, such as those for big oil companies and corporate jet owners, are a waste of taxpayer dollars? Well, Madam President, we will soon find out.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak to the Chamber for not to exceed 20 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. I don't anticipate taking 20 minutes of time. I hope to be back on the Senate floor this afternoon talking about a related subject, but I do want to take the opportunity essentially to bring us back to the central problem we are facing in this Chamber and in this country; that is, dealing with an out-of-control spending program in Washington, DC, that has occurred over many years.

In fact, the accumulation of debt not only is at the federal level, but it has been at the State level. It has been at the local level. It has been at the personal and the private level. We have been in a cycle of debt accumulation that simply is coming to an end, and it is coming to an end because we can no longer afford to pay the interest and can no longer afford to fulfill the promises that have been made on a political basis to people over a whole series of years, both by Democrats and Republicans, and only accelerated in a dramatic fashion in the last 3 years where we have seen an explosion of spending at the Federal level. This simply cannot continue and be paid for under any system of taxation at all.

So what we have seen is a nice deflection away from the central issue, a deflection into—well, the whole thing comes down to whether we tax millionaires and billionaires. The President's speech last week, which set the stage for all this discussion, is a nice deflection away from what we all know we need to do. And what we need to do is address this out-of-control deficit, out-of-control accumulation of debt that is simply unsustainable.

Now, it is pure arithmetic and it is easy arithmetic. When we spend \$3.7 trillion a year, and revenues coming in are only \$2.2 trillion a year, we are racking up, on a year-by-year basis, a deficit of \$1.5 trillion or greater a year. And that deficit has to be paid. How is it paid? Well, 40 cents of every dollar that is spent has to be borrowed in order to pay for the promises that have been made.

So until we as a body put aside this "gotcha" stuff that may allow political positioning for the 2012 election but doesn't address the real problem, we are not going to solve this problem. There has been a lot of posturing going on, and I am not here to address that in

specific detail at this particular point in time except to say that we need to refocus on the real task before us. The real task before us is understood by the American people. They understand that we cannot continue spending money at the rates that we are spending it.

Our debt has skyrocketed 35 percent to a limit of \$14.3 trillion in just the last 2 years. Our annual deficit, our yearly deficit, is now three times greater than the highest deficit of the previous administration. Today, as a result of a stagnant economy and as a result of uncertainty imposed on our economic system, we have 14 million Americans out of work, and that number is conservative because those are the ones who are looking for work. Those who have given up looking for work amount to a significant number, and those who may never have an opportunity to get back into the workforce ought to be of great concern to us.

These facts, combined with the warnings that have been given to us by the financial markets, should make it clear to all of us, from the President to Members of Congress and both parties and to the American people, that this current plan we are operating under, the President's economic plan, is not working; that the plan of spending more and borrowing more is not getting our economy back to where it ought to be and not getting people back to work.

Over the weekend, I was privileged to be able to give the Republican address following the President's weekly address to the Nation. In that address I suggested that instead of the current plan that we are following under, we ought to look at models that are functioning much better and working to see what we can learn.

Representing the State of Indiana, I am proud to be able to say that the model that our State has used has taken us from a deficit position to a surplus position without raising taxes. By reducing spending and actually cutting taxes and balancing our budget, we have now seen a significant change in the financial fortune of the State of Indiana and Hoosiers who occupy that State.

This administration has increased spending, increased borrowing, raised taxes, and expanded the growth of government. Now the credit agencies are looking at our Federal Government and warning of dire consequences and downgrading of our debt, at the same time the model used in Indiana, which cut taxes, cut spending, and balanced our budget, resulted in a AAA credit rating, the best rating you can get.

Now, the President's plan during this time, the only one that we can work off of, is his \$4 trillion budget, which would have increased deficit spending not decreased it. Interestingly enough, the only plan that we have in front of us—a comprehensive plan at this point in time from the President or his

party—is the plan the President introduced. We have had some nice speeches, and we have had some nice rhetoric. We have heard about the dire consequences of not coming up with a sensible plan before we hit the debt limit ceiling now scheduled for August 2. But the only concrete plan proposed to us in this Chamber and in the House of Representatives from Democrats is a \$4 trillion budget which was voted on in the Senate and was defeated by unanimous vote. Not one Democrat voted for the President's budget plan. Yet no alternate plan has been proposed. There may be one in the works. We would like to see it. We would like to work off of it.

I don't understand how you can negotiate any kind of a final proposal if you don't have something to work with and the only thing we now have before us is simply a resolution on the matter of whether we ought to tax millionaires and billionaires.

Even if we went forward and did that, even if we took 100 percent of all of the income earned by all of those who are in the millionaire and billionaire category, it would be a drop in the bucket compared to what we need to do. It would do nothing to adjust and reform spending programs and duplication of spending and bureaucratic overlap in Washington that has been accumulating year after year after year. So it is a nice diversion. It is a nice way of playing class warfare. It is a nice way to set yourself up for some good talking points back home, positioning yourself for some good rhetoric if you are running for reelection. But it doesn't address the problem we have.

Here we are, having canceled our July 4 recess in order to discuss the budget and the plight we are in and try to come together and fashion a plan. We need a plan that we can assure the American people will put us on a much sounder fiscal path; calm the financial markets and the credit rating agencies; and reassure those from all over the world who invest their money in America that we finally have our hands around the problem, we are coming up with sensible solutions, America will continue to be a safe place to invest your money and the dollar will continue to be a sound currency in which the world can put their confidence.

I was encouraged by the President's statement recently that we ought to move forward. I hope the President's remarks on the budget last week were perhaps to satisfy his base or to politically position himself for more serious negotiations. I hope that is the case. The President has indicated, I believe, that we must take bold steps and take them now in anticipation of what needs to be done by August 2; and therefore he has called for a summit tomorrow. It is time we put aside the political rhetoric and the gamesmanship. It is time we get down to some serious bargaining and negotiating and come up with what I think most of us believe is necessary in order to accomplish what

we need to in addressing this very critical problem that has steep consequences.

There is agreement, I trust, that we need serious spending reductions—some have estimated that in the \$2 trillion range over a 10-year period of time. Others say to really get at the problem, it needs to be double that or more, in the \$4 trillion to \$5 trillion range.

There also needs to be a commitment to restructure entitlement programs. We all understand and know the three major entitlement programs—Medicaid, Social Security, and especially Medicare—are running out of money, are not sustainable under the current program, and need to be restructured.

Once again, this is something that is ripe for political positioning and posturing. The fact is that unless we address structural changes in the entitlement programs, those programs will have to be drastically reduced, if not eliminated, in the future because they simply are not sustainable, given the current number of recipients drawing benefits as opposed to the money that is going into most programs. Anyone who says we are doing this on the backs of senior citizens, on low-income people, is not realistically acknowledging the facts. These programs are going broke. There are those, on both sides of the aisle, who are standing and saying this has to be part of our solution to our spending and deficit problem. Those who are saying this is not part of the solution simply are telling seniors we are going to allow your program to go broke or there are going to be severe consequences.

Those who are advocating this, to the contrary, are saying we are trying to save those programs. We are trying to ensure that the needed health care benefits under Medicare and needed benefits under Medicaid and needed income under Social Security that people are depending on will be preserved in the future. We are trying to save those programs and keep those programs solvent so that a few years from now, as the trustees have indicated in their latest report on Medicare—a few years from now we will not run into a much more serious problem, which will require much more drastic action.

Also, what we need to do is ensure that we have enforcement programs in place so whatever program cuts and changes and reforms that are made are not overturned by a future Congress. We need enforcement programs to do what we are obligated to do on this floor but often do not seem to have the political will to address effectively, programs that will automatically kick in to ensure the goals we established are reached, whether or not we have the political will to go forward and do it ourselves.

I support a balanced budget. If we had had that balanced budget passed in the mid-1990s, when we came close, but failed by one vote each time, we would not find ourselves in this position now.



We would have done what States across America had to do; that is, be straight out with their constituents and simply say: Yes, you can have this new program; yes, we can expand spending, but constitutionally we are mandated to balance our budget so we have two options of getting there. We can either reduce spending in other areas, if this is more important and has a higher priority, and use that money to pay for it or we can raise your taxes. Let's decide which you want to do. Is this program of such necessity and does it have the majority support in the State or the locality and is the public willing to support it with increased taxes? That is not unlike the school referendums, where the school puts forward a plan to improve the facilities or hire new teachers and puts a referendum before the people of the school district and says: If you are willing to raise your property taxes, we add this program or do this with the education system. Sometimes they pass. Sometimes they fail. But it gives the public the opportunity to determine whether to pay for it. It leaves the ultimate financial position at a level of balance.

We should address that. If there is a dispute or difference of opinion as to what the components of a balanced budget should be, we should have that debate. We should go forward on that and work toward some sensible solution. But the only way we are going to guarantee to the American people we are not going to return to our profligate ways is to establish and enact and give to the States the opportunity to enact a constitutional amendment to balance the budget for future spending.

Finally, I wish to include the need for comprehensive tax reform. As many in this Chamber know, Senator WYDEN and I, on a bipartisan basis, have introduced comprehensive tax reform. We are going to talk about that a little bit later this afternoon. We have essentially said that the Tax Code is dysfunctional. It does not promote growth and efficiency. It needs to be reformed. There is a general consensus on that.

We have proposed a way to do it. We are open to suggestions of better ways if someone else has some better ideas. We do believe a lot of the subsidies and tax exclusions and expenditures in the Tax Code are unfair. They are put in for the benefit of a few and not the many. That part needs to be reformed.

There is a very interesting editorial this morning in the Wall Street Journal, talking about the ability to broaden the tax base by eliminating many of these exclusions but, in return, lowering the rates—whether they be individual or corporate rates. That would give us the opportunity to promote growth, which is an essential part of our reaching fiscal balance and fiscal sanity.

The time is now. The time is not after the 2012 election. The dire situation in which we find ourselves is being watched worldwide by financial mar-

kets, by all those who lend us money. They want to know what the financial future of the United States is going to be. They want to know whether we have the will and the commitment to address our very serious financial situation and the political situation that goes along with it. Are we willing to rise above the politics and do what is appropriate and necessary for this country?

The President said: "Right now, we've got a unique opportunity to do something big." I could not agree more with that statement. I am glad the President finally has come on board and said let's get engaged together and negotiate something big, something that will solve the problem. Now is the time for us and the unique opportunity for the President to lead.

But, frankly, we need more than rhetoric. We need specifics. We need to put it on the table. We need more than some kind of a rant against those who fly on corporate jets, as if that subsidy—which is the depreciation issue in the Tax Code, is going to solve the problem or whether we are going to impose a higher tax on billionaires and millionaires, which didn't even pass a Democratic Congress in December. Even if those taxes on the wealthy went up to 100 percent, it is a drop in the bucket. This is not a responsible way to go forward and negotiate what we need to negotiate.

The American people understand it. They voted at the polls in November of 2010 in a way that should send a signal that we understand what is going on and we want to send people to Washington who will address this very problem. As this thing has cascaded into 2011 and we have dithered and pushed off and rethought through what the schedule is, the American people are getting increasingly frustrated over our inability to come to terms with this current situation we face.

Now is the time. Now is the time to put politics secondary to what is right for America and what is right for Americans. We have that opportunity, a unique opportunity. In one sense, it is good we are running up against this debt limit crisis because it is forcing us to stop pushing this problem down the road, to stop delaying and waiting until after the next election. It is forcing us to take action now.

We have about 4 weeks to do what is right for the American people but, more important, what is right for the future of America, our children and grandchildren and generations to come. If we are going to be that generation which saddles them with debt they cannot climb out of and they are unable to live the simple American dream of raising a family, owning a home or a place to live, providing for the education of their children and participating in the wonderful experience this country has had through sacrifice and commitment and dedication over all these years—if we are turning that over to our children with that broken

dream and broken promise, we have not done our job.

We are here to do it now. The time is now. Let's have the political will to do it. Let's subordinate our political considerations for 2012, do what is right, and then we will have left a legacy—win, lose or draw politically—a legacy that is important for this country.

I yield any time left, the remainder of that time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has consumed his 20 minutes.

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, first, I stand in total agreement with everything my good friend from Indiana has said, particularly the emphasis on the time is right; it is now. We have been talking about a balanced budget amendment. We have been talking about this problem for many years. To me, I feel great frustration that I am even in the Chamber right now.

Quite often what I do—I have a very regular schedule. If I am not on a weekend in Iraq, Afghanistan or Africa, someplace having to do with the duties I have as the second ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, I am back in Oklahoma. I have been a pilot for 50 years and I get in a little plane and I go out and talk to real people. People shake their heads and say: Why are we still talking about this? Why aren't we doing it? Why is it we are so wrapped up in this thing?

There is not an easy answer. We are supposed to be back here, I guess, talking about a Libya resolution. We all realize that is something that kind of diverts the attention of the American people from the real problem. The real problem of course is the deficit. As I see where we are and look at some of the alternatives they have—the Senator from Indiana said the Democrats want to, I guess tomorrow morning, vote on some kind of a bill that is going to be a tax increase on the millionaires. We are right back again with our class warfare. If we are to rephrase that statement from an economic perspective we would say something like this: It is the sense of the Senate that we should raise taxes on America's job creators and entrepreneurs to prevent the economy from recovering from this recession.

That is exactly what we would be doing. Yesterday, I searched through a database of the IRS, their historical tax data. If we were to tax all the income of those individuals making \$1 million or more at a 100-percent tax rate—in other words, take every cent they have, tax them all—the total amount of revenue that would be generated would be \$700 billion.

Stop and think about that, \$700 billion is way less than half the deficit President Obama gave us just this year, a \$1.65 trillion deficit. It is clearly a deceptive thing. The American people, I think they assume they are so dumb they can tax millionaires and get

us out of this mess. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, the 750,000 Americans in the highest tax bracket report less than half of the total net business income earned in this country. This is income that comes from flow-through entities such as the LLCs and partnerships. In other words, it comes from small businesses. If we were to tax the small businesses as they are going to attempt to do by saying they are taxing the millionaires, who is going to be able to grow their small businesses? I don't know. No one, I guess, has the answer. There is no answer.

There is no question we have a serious problem in Washington. Our debt is at the legal limit of \$14.3 trillion, and what caused this problem is spending. In the short 2½ years since coming to office, President Obama has managed to increase spending by 30 percent. Thirty percent. He incurred a trillion dollar deficit each year and pushed our national debt up by 35 percent. The statistic that no one seems to care about, and we say it over and over, is this President has increased the debt of America more in his 2½ years than all Presidents throughout the history of America from George Washington to George W. Bush. Let me say this is not the first time this is coming up. Every time you turn around in this administration: Well, we are going to have to increase the debt limit. If not, some great crisis will take place. We did this on February 17, 2009. I voted against it. They increased the debt limit at that time. If you remember, that was the \$800 billion stimulus bill. In December of 2009, a stand-alone bill to increase the debt limit of \$290 billion passed. We remember so well Tim Geithner saying if we don't do this, it will ruin our credit nationwide. Then again in February of 2010, \$1.9 trillion. They increased it again. The same thing. You have to draw the line someplace. There is going to be some point at which you are going to say, no, we are not going to do it unless we get some reductions and some fiscal sanity that is built into it. Right now, since reaching the legal limit, the Treasury has been shuffling money around to pay bills and they will run out of ways to do this on August 2. If an agreement to raise the debt limit has not been reached by then, Treasury will have to decide which bills to pay and which bills not to pay, and nobody wants that.

In order to raise the debt ceiling, we have to lock in the reforms necessary to permanently prevent this income debt crisis. We all know the scary statistics, but, to me, solving the problem is easy. We spent our way into this problem so we need to stop spending to get out of it. Tax revenue has not been our problem. Tax hikes should not be a part of the solution. Regardless, President Obama has made very clear he wants tax increases to be included in any kind of a debt limit deal. Sure, he may say he wants to raise taxes on millionaires and billionaires. You are

going to hear it over and over. All these people out here are supposed to believe this. It is not true.

I said earlier the folks he is targeting are those who own small businesses and ones that are creating jobs. When you target tax hikes on folks such as these, you hurt everybody. This is not what we need to do. Our economy is stalling and our unemployment rate is still above 9 percent. We need to cut spending in the short term. This is a program that many people adhere to now. I don't know how many we have. I think the pledge includes about 30 Members who say we need to cut spending in the short term, cap spending in the medium term, and balance the budget in the long term to put the Nation on a sustainable, limited government path. This is the only way out of this mess.

I have been a leader here. I can remember back when I introduced the HELP Act. That was when this President first came in and he wanted to take the discretionary nondefense spending and freeze it at the new level after he increased it by 20 percent. I said, no, let's go back to 2008 levels. If we had done that, we would not be facing the problems we have.

Decades ago when I was in the State legislature, there was a great Senator from Nebraska named Carl Curtis. He came to me one day and he said, I have been trying to pass a balanced budget amendment here in the Senate for decades. The argument they use against it is the States will never ratify it. So he came up with the idea, let's preratify a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. Well, that sounded great to me so I introduced a resolution in the Oklahoma State Senate preratifying, which we did, a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. That was kind of fun. We came within two or three States of doing this. Had it passed, we wouldn't be here today with the problems we are facing. When you look and you say it is going to be difficult, it is not difficult. But I believe the only way to be able to pull this off and to resolve the problem is to do something about a balanced budget amendment. We have proposed one. It is out there. Senator HATCH is active in this. We are all looking at it. During peacetime the amendment would require a two-thirds majority in both Chambers of Congress to authorize the specific deficit funding level for a fiscal year. We all understand emergencies can come up. We have wars in which case we need to do something about it. This allows an escape, but it means two-thirds of the majority of the House and the Senate would have to agree to it.

Importantly, the balanced budget amendment would require a two-thirds majority in both Chambers to pass any kind of a tax increase. Our problem is our tax increases. That is what the President wants more of. The balanced budget amendment is the only reform that will put our Nation on a true path

to permanent fiscal stability. This is what we need to do. This balanced budget amendment is the reform we need, and I pledge to oppose any deal to increase the debt limit that does not immediately cut the spending in the short term, cap the spending in the medium term, and include a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

I urge the Members to seize upon this opportunity. We have not had a serious opportunity at a balanced budget amendment now for decades. The time is here because we have never faced this before. We have never had a President who has proposed and passed \$5 trillion of deficit in 2½ years. The people of America are not dumb. They know we cannot sustain that. They are going to say, all right, we all have to bite the bullet and do this thing. We need to do it. The time is right. I agree with the Senator from Indiana who said, there hasn't been a time before that is right, but this time is right. Now that this legislative agenda is dead that we have been talking about, the President has pursued aggressive regulations, especially through the EPA, that seriously harm the economy. I think a lot of people are confined in their thinking about the fact that we are spending too much money. They don't realize there is also a cost to overregulation. Right now almost everything the liberals have tried to pass through here, such as cap and trade, the President and his colleagues in the House and the Senate are trying to do through regulation through the EPA, and that is as expensive as spending money.

I don't think this is rocket science. It is something we can pass, the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, and put Americans back to work and these are the only things that will resolve our debt problems.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COBURN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I have been listening to the debate this morning. It is concerning to me because as a physician, I am trained to diagnose disease. Disease, if you break that word up, is "dis" and "ease." We are not at ease, and I hear us talking all around. I listened to the senior Senator from New York very carefully and what he had to say, and I wanted to spend a few minutes actually disputing what he had to say. Because the premise he said was if we don't raise taxes, the vital things that are legitimate roles for the Federal Government would have to be eliminated, and I find that very curious because what is lacking in the Senate body today is an actual knowledge of all that we are doing.

I go back to March when the GAO report came out on the levels of duplication within the Federal Government, and that report was eye opening to many Senators. The fact is that report only covered the first third of the Federal Government. I have long said during the past 7 years in the Senate one of our problems is the government is so big, we don't know everything it does. What came out of the report was a tremendous list of duplication, programs that do exactly the same thing in multiple different agencies. For example, we have 124 different programs to encourage students in math, science, engineering, and technology. Why would we do that? Why would we pay for 124 sets of administration? Why would we have the first program for science, technology, engineering, and math that doesn't have a metric on it to see if it works? Well, you know what the report said. None of them have a metric on it to measure whether they are effective.

We have 47 different job training programs. The report said all but three of them overlapped one another and none of those have any metric to see if they are effective or work. They cost \$18 billion a year.

We have 42 different programs to teach Americans how to be credit-worthy and financially sound. Mr. President, 42 across 6 different agencies? The fact is the Senate doesn't know what it is talking about. When we make statements that say if, in fact, we make major cuts in the discretionary portion of our budget, the things we count on will have to be sacrificed, it is not true, for there is at a minimum \$350 billion a year spent on duplication within the Federal Government, and waste. It doesn't count fraud, which is at least \$100 billion a year in Medicare. It doesn't count the Pentagon, where we have the Pentagon having duplicate weapons systems, noncompetitive contracts, cost-plus contracts where we have requirement creep so they end up costing much more than they ever should because we don't have the responsible person over there saying, no, you can't have everything you want. What you want is to have the things you need.

This whole idea that the sacrifices that need to be made are going to be highly paid for is not true because that is how much waste there is in the Federal Government—at least \$350 billion a year, and that doesn't count the \$100 billion in Medicare that is defrauded and wasted and wrongly paid. Their improper payment rate, which is 97 percent overpayments, is in excess of \$10 billion a year. So if you have \$100 billion worth of fraud, and then an improper payment rate that is around 10 percent, we could easily solve our budget problems by eliminating duplication and eliminating fraud, but it requires a lot of hard work to do the oversight. It requires a lot of legislative work to eliminate duplication. It requires us to stand and do what is nec-

essary for our country. We don't have a problem, in general, with revenues. What we have a problem with is the Federal Government is taking 26 percent of our GDP to operate itself and 40 percent of that is borrowed.

As a physician, what my training would tell me to do is go directly to the disease. Don't treat the symptoms of the disease, go directly to where the disease is, and the disease is we have a magnitude, orders of magnitude, of duplication, all well meaning, all well intentioned, that we won't sit down and work on eliminating.

I thought I would spend a few minutes going through by department. The Department of Agriculture has 130 duplicative programs—130. I will submit for the record a few of these because I don't want the record to have too many. For example, biomass programs at the Department of Agriculture. We have the Biomass Crop Assistance Program, the Biorefinery Program for Advanced Fuels Program, the Biobased Products and Bioenergy Program, the Biorefinery Repowering Assistance Program, the New Era Rural Technology Competitive Grants Program for biomass.

Those could all be combined into one at one-third the cost with exactly the same results. But we do not have the energy, the time or the motivation to go solve these problems. So the problem is not the debt and deficit, the problem is the Congress, the lack of a work ethic to roll up our sleeves and dig into it.

We have 16 export assistance programs just for the Department of Agriculture; the Department of Commerce, 18 different duplicative programs; the Department of Education, 230 identical, duplicative programs in different branches. The only reason we know that is because the Department of Education is the only Department in the Federal Government that actually knows all their programs. There is not one other agency that actually knows all their programs. That is why it was important to get the GAO report, and we have just seen the first third of it. When we get the other two-thirds—the next third will come in February of next year, and we will have two-thirds of the Federal Government.

Do you know what it is going to show? Over \$400 billion worth of duplication. The problem is not that we do not have enough revenue, the problem is we are wasteful in almost everything we do because Congress will not do the appropriate oversight for the things that are legitimate roles for the Federal Government—the first person who does not have to have any risk of no food safety, the first person who does not have to have any risk of not having Medicare or not having their Social Security, the first person who does not have to have any risk if the Congress will actually do its job. Yet we refuse to do our job because each one of these little programs has a little political body in itself that is taking and suck-

ing off the Federal Government, many times not a legitimate role under the enumerated powers of the Constitution that is a role for the Federal Government.

I get letters all the time in my office: Please fund this. Please fund this. My answer back is: Show me in the enumerated powers where it is the role of the Federal Government to do that. If it is truly our role, I am for us doing it. But if, in fact, the enumerated powers—as originally written and as evidenced by the Federalist Papers—say it is not a role for the Federal Government, then the States ought to be doing it. Better yet, we as citizens ought to be helping other citizens who have a need.

But the fact is, we have created this monster, an out-of-control Federal Government. I am talking out of control because nobody is in control of it. Nobody has the information, which is the power to do it, which is why knowing all this stuff is so frustrating. We will not eliminate the easy things that will have no impact on 99 percent of Americans. The only people impacted are the people who are benefiting directly from administering or gaming the programs.

The Department of Energy. When the Department of Energy was created, it was to eliminate our dependence on foreign energy. Our dependence at that time was 30 percent. It reached a peak of 67 percent. Thankfully, due to horizontal drilling and environmentally sound fracking, we now are at 47 percent. We have gone down 16 points since the technology was developed to go after resources that are here.

The Congressional Research Service says—and this is a report published this year—that America has energy resources greater than the combined energy resources of China, Canada, and Saudi Arabia. We are the only country in the world where the citizens own the resources and their own government will not let them have it. We deny our own resources to our own people. Consequently, we see \$4 gasoline, not because it has to be there—and we blame speculators and we blame the large oil companies. The reason gas is \$4 is because the Federal Government will not let us utilize the very resources we have.

Mr. President, 92 percent of the 650 million acres the Federal Government owns is unavailable for resource production that can be done in a clean, environmentally friendly way, with no impact whatsoever. Yet supply us with valuable energy that does not make us dependent on countries that are not supportive of our liberties and our freedom.

So you are going to hear a lot of speeches today talking about those who have actually lived the American dream, people who have made it. I am not saying there is not excesses. I am one of the very few people on my side who thinks we ought to change the Tax Code, we ought to eliminate all the

brackets, we ought to flatten the Tax Code, that it will be clearer, it will create confidence, it will create certainty, and we will see the money—the \$2 trillion that is sitting on the sidelines that could be creating jobs in this country—actually come in and create jobs.

But our problem is not the people who have been successful. Our problem is we, the Members of Congress, are not successful in accomplishing the task we were sent to do.

The Department of Homeland Security. More unregulated grants, 32 duplicative programs, no followup on the grants, no checking to see if a grant that was given actually performed the purpose. There is a significant amount of fraud, a significant amount of improper payments, significant layers of duplication. Not even the Department of Homeland Security knows what is going on, let alone Congress, because we will not do oversight.

There are 40 duplicative programs inside the Department of the Interior. Then we have all the duplicative programs across agencies. I did not list all of them here. There are 35 duplicative programs in the Department of Labor, 53 in the Department of Justice, 6 in the Department of State, 19 at the Department of Transportation. Who knows how many there are at the Defense Department because the Defense Department does not even know.

The problem we need to address is our lack of aggressiveness in reviewing and oversighting the Federal Government and eliminating the duplication.

It is frustrating to me as a physician to see us continue to treat the symptoms and never go after the disease. This disease will eventually kill us. It is bleeding us now, like it is bleeding us as we borrow \$5 billion a day—\$5 billion. That is the entire budget of the State of Oklahoma every day we are borrowing. Now we have political games being played, finger-pointing, putting our finger in the eyes of those across political lines rather than getting down to work and solving the real problems America faces.

We do not have one problem in front of us that we cannot solve as a nation. We can balance our budget. We can accomplish what we are called upon to accomplish if, in fact, we will. But the one little thing that creeps in, that is nauseating, is the vast majority of the Members of Congress are not thinking about the problems that are in front of us right now. They are thinking about the next election: How do I advantage?

When you see that happen, what you see and what you should question is, what is the motivation of the Members of Congress? Is it just to get reelected or is it to fix the very real and urgent problems in front of us? I think too often it is about us and not our country, it is about us secure in the next election rather than our children and grandchildren secure in the next generation.

I would put forward, as you hear the debate over the class warfare and the

unfairness that is propagated—that somebody has become successful and that 20 percent of Americans now pay 74 percent of all the taxes paid, that we want to tax those people more—I believe everybody in this country ought to pay taxes. I do not care who you are. I do not care what program you are on, if you get a benefit from the Federal Government that is rightly under the enumerated powers, something the Federal Government should be doing, you ought to pay a tax on it. Then you are participating. Then we would not have 55 percent of the eligible population voting; we would have 75 or 85 percent because they would have an involvement.

We have an earned-income tax credit program which we pay people who are working. We actually pay them every year. But fully 25 percent of that is fraud. That is \$17 billion a year paid out to people who are not working who are defrauding the IRS. We have not done anything about it. Mr. President, \$17 billion over 10 years is \$170 billion. That goes a long way toward reducing our structural deficit and debt. But we will not do that. The same thing on the child tax credit. That is a fraudulent program. Fully 20 percent of it is fraud. Yet we have not done anything about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used more than his 10 minutes.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to continue, since nobody is on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. I am sorry. I will finish in just a short period of time.

The question then comes over why we would not allow the States to decide whether they think we ought to have a balanced budget. It is true, it will take 5 to 7 years for it to be fully effectuated. But the sooner we start down that road and give the States the option of saying: We think you ought to live under the same rules we live under—we have all sorts of reasons why we should not have a balanced budget amendment but not one of them makes sense, not one of them fits with common sense, not one of them does anything except continue down the road we are on today.

Again I would say, as you hear the debate, think about the real disease we have rather than listening to the symptoms. The disease is we are outside the enumerated powers of the Congress. We have \$350 billion worth of waste and duplication every year that Congress will not address. We have a Tax Code that costs one-quarter of a trillion dollars a year just to comply with and then still is not fair. Yet we will not address the real disease.

The way you address the real disease is identify the real disease and then give it the treatment it needs. The treatment it needs is discipline forced on Congress by a balanced budget amendment. I guarantee you, if we were to pass it out of here, the States

would pass it and send it back to us and our children and grandchildren would be much better off with it.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, on August 2, the United States will face the debt ceiling. I am one who thinks we should be debating it every day, every week until we find a solution. But in order to find a solution, we have to first admit we have a problem. We have a significant problem. Raising the debt ceiling is sort of like not paying your credit card bill and then saying to the credit card company: I want to increase my limit. We have been doing that year after year, decade after decade. Both parties have done it. This is not just one party's problem. It is both parties' problem, and it is the country's problem.

How big is the problem? We are spending \$10 billion a day. Of that \$10 billion, we are borrowing \$4 billion a day. We are spending \$100,000 a second, and we are borrowing \$45,000 a second.

Senator DEMINT, the other day, said it was akin to a drug addiction. You know that to get better from a drug addiction, the first thing you have to admit is: I am addicted. You have to admit you have a problem. That is what is going on. We have to admit as a country we have a problem. But then we get into this debate, and each side seems to have a different position. Is the problem that we are spending too much or is the problem that we are taxing too little?

You can look at the numbers and you can actually come up with an objective answer. The answer is we are spending too much. You can look at it in terms of what is spending as a percentage of our gross domestic product? What is spending as a percentage of our economy?

Spending under Clinton and under Bush, for about 16 years, was between 19 and 20 percent of our GDP. What is it now? It is about 25 percent of our GDP. So under any objective standard, we are spending more than we were previously.

Some would argue—they say: Well, the Bush tax cuts caused this. If we could just get rid of the Bush tax cuts. We are not taxing people enough. But if you look at the numbers, the numbers do not bear out. The numbers are that basically, in 1987, revenue was about 18 percent of GDP.

In 1995, revenue was about 18 percent of GDP. In 2003, Bush passed the tax cuts—Congress passed these tax cuts. In 2006, revenue was still at about 18 percent of GDP. Right now, revenue is under 15 percent. So revenue has gone down in 2008, 2009, and 2010.

But what happened in 2008? A severe recession, the worst recession since the Great Depression. When we have fewer people working, we have fewer people paying taxes. It has absolutely nothing to do with the Bush tax cuts. They happened in 2003. Revenue stayed steady at

18 percent, which it has historically for 60 years until 2007, 2008. The recession hits, revenue goes down. So we have a lack of revenue. But if you raise rates, you will not get more revenue. If you want more revenue to try to balance our books, you need an economy that employs more people, you need a growing economy. It is all about getting out of the recession. But that is why some of us fear raising rates now, because we think that will harm us and make it more difficult to come out of a recession.

Many on the other side say: Well, the rich just need to pay more. They think the rich are not paying enough. They want to somehow say: If the rich would pay more, we could get out of this. But you have to once again look at the facts.

There is a resolution on the floor now that the Democrats are promoting. It says that the rich—the people who make more than \$1 million a year—that they earn or bring in 20 percent of the Nation's economy. Well, that is true, but they pay 38 percent of the income tax. So the question is, Are the rich paying enough? Well, they bring in 20 percent of the income, and they are paying 38 percent of the revenue. I do not know.

The other question is, If you just stick it to the rich and say, well, let's make the rich pay more, what will that do to the rest of us? Do you think we will have more jobs or less jobs if we tax people more?

The question also is, Will you get more or less revenue if you do this? Historically, no matter what the rates have been, we bring in about 18 percent of GDP. For example, back in the 1950s, we had tax rates as high as 70 percent on the wealthy. When we did, we brought in 18 percent of GDP. When Reagan came in, he lowered tax rates to 28 percent for the upper limit. We still brought in 18 percent of GDP. The difference was when we brought in lower rates, we brought in a booming economy, more jobs, and we expanded the number of people paying taxes. You expand the tax base.

Now we get back to the impasse. There is an impasse up here. The other side says: The rich must share more of the burden. There is a way to do it without raising taxes. There is ultimately a compromise that I think brings both sides together, gets beyond the debt ceiling. If they would talk about it, if we would have a debate down here or an informal discussion, we could fix this tomorrow.

If you want the rich to share more of the burden, ask them to pay for their Medicare. I see no reason why the wealthy should not pay the full cost of Medicare. Ask the rich to take less in Social Security benefits. If you mean test Social Security benefits—if you say: If you are a wealthy person, guess what, we don't have enough money to give you what we said we were going to give you and you will have to take less—I am perfectly willing to accept

that. So there are ways you can do it without damaging the economy.

I think raising taxes damages the economy and damages jobs for the working class. We tried this before. About 10 years ago we said let's get those rich people. They put a special tax on yachts. Guess who it hurt. The guy making \$40,000 a year building the yachts lost his job; the rich went to the Caribbean and bought their yachts somewhere else. It does not work. It is not good for the economy. It hurts the working class to raise taxes.

But if you want to say the rich need to absorb more of the burden, simply have the rich pay more for their benefits or get fewer benefits. I am willing to accept that. Many Republicans are. It is the compromise. Republicans aren't willing to raise taxes. Democrats want to raise taxes. Where do we compromise? Come together and say that the rich can absorb more of the burden by paying more for their benefits or getting fewer benefits. This is a compromise that would work. We could actually get together and raise the debt ceiling.

I have said I will vote to raise the debt ceiling if and only if we decide to do something different in this Congress. Congress really has done a poor job. Do you wonder why Congress has a 14-percent approval rating? Because they have been a poor steward with your money—a poor steward. The Congress has not done a good job watching over your money. They have been profligate spenders.

So I think that in order for the American people to believe we are going to do a better job, we need a new rule. We need a balanced budget amendment. So I will propose, along with other Senators, to raise the debt ceiling contingent upon a balanced budget amendment so that we balance our budget by law.

Some have said: Well, let's just promise to cut spending over the next 10 years. Let's raise the debt ceiling \$2 trillion, and then we will promise to cut spending \$2 trillion.

The problem is that we are not very believable because we have not kept our word in the past and we cannot bind the next Congress. The next Congress will be elected by a new set of people. They will come up here, and they do not have to go by what we are promising. If we amend the Constitution, though, the next Congress will be bound by this, and the next Congress would have to live within its means.

I believe this is very important. There is becoming a consensus in our country that says the debt is a real problem. I think the two sides could come together—Republican and Democrat—and say: This is how we would work it out. But I think it means significant cuts in Federal spending. It means statutory caps, meaning government should have to live within its means each year. And I believe we need to amend the Constitution. But if the Democrats say they have to have it

that the rich pay more somehow, let's have the rich pay more for their benefits. That is ultimately the compromise. I think you can get the vast majority of Republicans to agree to that, Democrats could agree to that, and we could fix the problem. The American people would be amazed that we got together and we fixed the problem and we moved on. That is what needs to happen. It is not happening in this body.

This body needs to debate the debt ceiling, we need to come up with a solution, and we need to move on. We have not had one committee hearing about the debt ceiling. We have not passed a budget in 2 years. We have not passed an appropriations bill in 2 years. We are not doing what we are supposed to be doing. The American people say they want results. They want us to at least have a debate. We do not have to agree on everything, but let's debate and admit what the problem is and move forward. But instead we get obfuscation, and we talk about something that is not really pertinent to what our problems are. We have to, like the drug addict, admit we have a problem. Our problem is spending. It is not a taxation problem. It is not a revenue problem. We have less revenue because we are in a recession. We have a spending problem. The numbers are clear as day.

I would say to this body and to the American people, let's balance our budget. Raise the debt ceiling, but let's go ahead and have a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

I hope we will recognize those problems and move forward.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, like many of my colleagues, I was back in my State for the Fourth of July celebrations, and what struck me about those visits I made and visiting and interacting with people—and I remember riding my bike around my neighborhood on the Fourth, and there were lots of families, lots of lawn parties and pit fires and get-togethers, family get-togethers, people shooting off fireworks, and all of that sort of thing. It occurred to me as I was riding around that a lot of the people who live in those neighborhoods probably are not thinking about what is going to happen if we do not do something to address this spending and debt problem we have in this country. And we are very near a debt crisis.

We have seen what has happened in other countries around the world. When you start looking at the increase in interest rates that occurs when you get into a debt crisis—and Greece is

perhaps a good example of that because now they are facing, on 2-year debt, 24-percent interest rates.

As we all know, Treasury interest rates, Federal borrowing, Treasury notes, bonds, bills—those sorts of things are sort of what drive interest rates in other areas of our economy. So if you are one of those homeowners in South Dakota and you are looking at perhaps refinancing your home or buying a new home or being a first-time home buyer, if you are looking at an auto loan, if you are looking at a loan for your child's education, you could very well, if we do not get things turned around here, be looking at much higher interest rates. That would put an even bigger crimp on the budgets of most families across this country.

It was interesting because last week there was an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal in which Larry Lindsey, who was a former Federal Reserve Board Governor and also served in the Bush administration as an economic adviser, pointed out that if you had interest rates return to their 20-year average—in other words, if you went back to a more normalized type interest rate environment—it would actually increase the borrowing costs of the Federal Government over the next 10 years by \$4.9 trillion. So think about how much money, how much we are spending every single year now to pay for our borrowing, and compound that by increased interest rates. It would make the fiscal situation we are facing much worse and even more dramatic than it already is.

So the point I am making is that we have to get the spending and the debt issue addressed here in Congress. Why? Well, because we are saddling future generations with an enormous burden of debt. We are putting the country on a path to a debt crisis, which would be a huge mistake for this country for so many reasons, but probably most fundamentally is because it has a profound impact on the economy.

I think most Americans are concerned right now about jobs and the economy. That is the No. 1 issue in front of most Americans. And it strikes me that if you look at what we can do to get people in this country back to work, obviously creating conditions for economic growth means keeping taxes low, balancing the Federal budget, having an energy policy that promotes American production, improving market access through moving some of these free-trade agreements, and clamping down on the overreaching regulations we are seeing coming out of a lot of the agencies in Washington, DC.

There are a whole series of things that can and should be done if we are serious about getting people back to work. But it means we can't be raising taxes on the job creators. There is a big debate right now about how do we get ourselves out of this fiscal mess. I submit to my colleagues that the real

issue here is spending. If you go back to the foundation of our country, in the year 1800, we were only spending 2 percent of our economic output on the Federal Government. This year, we will spend 24 to 25 percent. The historical average over the past 40 years is about 20.6 percent. We are now dramatically higher in terms of what we spend on the Federal Government as a percentage of our entire economy.

To me, clearly, we have a spending issue, not a revenue issue. That suggests we ought to get after Federal spending—particularly spending that is duplicative, redundant. There is so much in the Federal Government we spend money on that is wasteful, and we need to cut that type of wasteful spending out of Washington, DC.

We have to also focus on long-term programs, such as Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, entitlement programs that drive much of Federal spending—around 60 percent of the money that is spent by the Federal Government. So far there is no appetite among our Democratic colleagues to do that. We have now gone 798 days without a Federal budget. The only votes we have had on the budget in the Senate were on the Ryan plan and the Obama budget. The President's budget—the Obama budget—that was voted on in the Senate, prescribed more taxes and spending and more debt. It failed by a vote of 97 to 0. Again, the budget presented by the President failed 97 to 0 in the Senate.

We don't have a budget in the Budget Committee that has been shown to us yet. This week, we are voting on a non-binding sense-of-the-Senate resolution that doesn't even say how we should contribute to deficit reduction. Is it going to put higher tax on people? Are people going to have fewer deductions? Are people going to be ineligible for farm income payment programs? Should they have to contribute more to Medicare or receive less Social Security benefits than those who are less fortunate? We don't know. We don't have a budget presented to the Senate for consideration. All we have in front of us this week is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, which is very vague and could be interpreted lots of different ways.

The White House meeting is tomorrow, with leaders of both parties. I hope it will lead to substantive cuts and an agreement about how we are going to reduce spending and get this debt and year-over-year deficits under control. It should not lead to more taxes. The reason is that higher taxes only hurt job creation and make our economic situation much worse.

We were reminded of the need to do this this week when Moody's downgraded the status of the Portuguese debt to junk. This is despite the fact that their government is pushing through an austerity plan that cuts spending and hikes taxes. We have seen that in lots of European countries that are dealing with sovereign debt crises.

That is our future if we don't get this issue under control. It has been 798 days since this Senate has passed a budget. That is where it starts—determining how we are going to set priorities, and how we are going to spend taxpayer dollars, and rein in runaway Federal spending and make a dent in this \$14 trillion debt that we are saddling on future generations.

I hope we can get a budget before the Senate. This sham of a resolution this week—the sense-of-the-Senate resolution—is certainly not the way to do that. I hope we can get to a meaningful discussion of what we are going to do about spending and debt and jobs in this country.

I yield the floor.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:33 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CARDIN).

#### SHARED SACRIFICE IN RESOLVING THE BUDGET DEFICIT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 6 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I want to make note of the fact that this is the first time since the Watergate scandal the Senate has canceled its Fourth of July recess, and the reason is so that we can continue working on this issue of reducing our deficit and our debt, and—from my point of view, and I know I speak for many—doing it in a way that doesn't savage our senior citizens, our children, our families, our environment, and our economic growth, but doing it in a way that is fair, doing it in a way that is fair so that we don't wind up with people such as Warren Buffett or Donald Trump paying less of an effective tax rate than their secretaries or a nurse or a firefighter. That is why we are here. That is why I am here.

I want to apologize to my constituents in California. I had to cancel several events that were scheduled, but we will do those things certainly at another time. It is critical to end the current standoff, and that, it seems to me, means sticking to three principles: First, we must agree great nations do not default on their debt. Both sides need to compromise so that doesn't happen. Nobody gets everything they want in a compromise. I speak as a Senator, a former House Member, a former county supervisor, a mother, a grandmother, and a daughter. The fact is you don't get everything you want if

you truly are negotiating and compromising. You don't take your marbles and go home, and you don't take your little teddy bear and leave. You stick with it and understand that in true compromise everyone gives just a little bit.

Now, let's look at the government as it is today—as the people wanted it. The people decided they wanted a Democratic President, and we have one in President Obama. They decided they wanted a Republican House of Representatives, and they have that. They decided they wanted a Democratic Senate, and they have that. So we have the three arms, and two-thirds of them are controlled by Democrats and one by Republicans.

If I then said, because of this, I want two-thirds of what Democrats want, I might have a leg to stand on. But I am not even saying that. I am saying let's meet each other halfway. That is fair. That is very fair. And I think most Americans of independent mind would think so.

This is not a parliamentary system. In the parliamentary systems we see around the world, the ruling party gets everything they want and the others get to talk and maybe somehow work themselves into the equation. So first and foremost, we need to compromise.

Second, we need to take a lesson from history and follow what worked the last time we balanced the budget in the mid-1990s—the early to mid-1990s. Believe me, we did it. With President Clinton, we did it. We passed a budget that some of my friends on the Republican side said would be a disaster; that it would never balance. It did. As a matter of fact, it produced surpluses. We passed a budget without one Republican vote, and it laid out the plan that some of my Republican friends said would put us into a depression. We went into the longest period of sustained economic growth and 23 to 24 million jobs were created.

So we know how to do this because, guess what. We did it before. We had a plan that cut unnecessary spending, and it asked the upper income people—the very wealthiest among us—to pay a fair share, and it created all those jobs and we had surpluses.

Our friends on the other side say: Don't talk to us about that. We don't want to talk about it. But we have to talk about it because otherwise we are going to do what the Republicans did to the seniors in their House budget, which is to end Medicare as we know it and to put the burden of all this on their backs and on the backs of the middle class.

So, first, we need to compromise; second, we need to do what works—cut the things you don't need, invest in the things that will create the jobs, and ask the wealthy to pay their fair share.

Third, we have to put our country ahead of politics. Let me read from a couple of very interesting recent editorial comments. Actually, they were yesterday. This is from USA Today.

GOP rigidity on taxes threatens debt deal.

Let me repeat that:

GOP rigidity on taxes threatens debt deal. . . . if the GOP walkout is anything more than a negotiating tactic, it is breathtakingly irresponsible, considering the risks of default. . . . the Nation has used trillions of dollars in borrowed money to finance two wars, Medicare's prescription drug program and President George W. Bush's broad tax cuts—all initiated with the GOP controlling both the White House and the Congress. Now Republicans have belatedly decided that borrowing is bad, too, but they dogmatically resist even the most sensible and painless tax hikes.

This says it all. This, again, is from USA Today.

Then there is a David Brooks article—a leading Republican columnist— which says:

If the debt ceiling talks fail, independent voters will see that Democrats were willing to compromise but Republicans were not. If responsible Republicans don't take control, independents will conclude that Republican fanaticism caused this default. They will conclude that Republicans are not fit to govern. And they will be right.

Again, this is written by a leading Republican—well, actually, I would call him a leading intellect in the Republican Party.

So we see that people on the outside are noticing what is happening. You cannot take your marbles and go home when the full faith and credit of the United States of America is at stake.

A lot of people think raising the debt ceiling is so we can do more spending in the future. No, no. Raising the debt ceiling is to take care of the debts that were incurred in the past—two wars, unpaid for; a huge tax cut to the millionaires and billionaires, unpaid for; a prescription drug benefit, unpaid for. While my Republican friends said, no; Medicare could not negotiate for lower prescription drug prices. So the cost of it is just going through the roof.

So if we don't put revenues on the table, if we don't talk about closing those tax loopholes that benefit millionaires and billionaires, all the cuts go to the middle class. All we have to do is look at the Ryan budget that passed the House to understand what is going to happen if we don't do this.

Now, the Republicans had this budget, and they gave it a name over in the House: "The Path to Prosperity: Restoring America's Promise." Well, I took some liberty and wrote my own title. I think their budget is "The Path to Poverty: Breaking America's Promise" because that is what that budget does.

The Republican budget would end Medicare as we know it. A 65-year-old who becomes eligible for Medicare would pay more than \$12,000 in health care costs the first year the plan goes into effect—twice as much as what they pay under current law. Imagine a senior citizen—a grandma or great-grandma—who maybe lives off Social Security, who is paying \$6,000 for health care, is suddenly paying \$12,000. We might as well tell her to forget it.

She is going to have to get down on her knees and pray she doesn't get sick.

But that wasn't enough to pay for the tax cuts for their rich friends, so their budget cuts Medicaid by 49 percent by 2030. By the way, a lot of that is paying for nursing homes for the poorest of the poor.

The Republican budget would cut education grant awards by one-half, so that 1.4 million students would lose access to financial aid. That is what this country has been about—giving hope to our young people, and hope means an education. So Pell grants, cut in half.

They say over and over: Washington doesn't have a tax problem, we have a spending problem. Well, let's take a look at that. If we look at nondefense discretionary over the years, what we find when we add in inflation is that it hasn't grown at all, while the military spending has gone up 74 percent. So, clearly, we have a roadmap just in terms of fairness that shows we can get to where we have to get.

Let's not keep cutting what we have already cut. Let's cut the waste, let's cut the fraud, let's cut the abuse, and let's cut these tax expenditures.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes, and then I will yield to my friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair.

So defense spending, they may look at it, but they are not happy about it even though it has gone up 74 percent over the last 10 years.

Now, again, we should look at Warren Buffett. Warren Buffett made the point that he paid only a 17.7 percent tax on his \$46 million in earnings while his receptionist paid 30 percent on her wages. Imagine, in 2008, the 400 richest income-tax filers paid an effective rate of about 18 percent.

Take ExxonMobil: They paid an effective rate of 18 percent on \$7 billion, whereas the average family making a combined \$100,000 had a higher effective rate. Let's give tax breaks to the middle class, not to the wealthiest who have everything and more and whose children's children's children's children will be fine. This is America. This isn't prerevolutionary France, where the King had everything. If there was a family supported by two teachers, and they made \$106,000, they had a higher tax rate than ExxonMobil. But, still, if we look around the country at Republican legislators and governors, they are going after the teachers—who are so wealthy—while the people who are making the millions and the billions they give more and more to. I don't understand it. It is trickle down, I guess. Somehow somebody will spend something at the very top, and it will trickle down. That is all fine, but they have enough to trickle down already, so we don't have to add to it.

A family supported by a truckdriver and a dental hygienist who made a combined income of \$107,000 had a higher tax rate than ExxonMobil.

The tax break for corporate jets is \$3 billion over 10 years. Subsidies to the biggest five oil companies are costing us \$21 billion over 10 years.

So what I am saying is, we don't have to balance the budget on the backs of the senior citizens who need their Medicare or on the students who need their Pell grants. We don't need to do that.

I am the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee. The House budget, which I say breaks America's promise, is so bad on transportation, it cuts 36 percent across the board. Thousands and thousands of construction workers, whether they are in Utah or California or Maryland—or you name your town, your city—will be cut. This is an area where there has been so much unemployment because of the housing crisis that we could fill 20 Super Bowl stadiums with unemployed construction workers—2 million. That is how many there are.

So look at what President Clinton did. He increased taxes on the wealthiest and created tax incentives for small businesses. He invested in education, retirement savings, research and development, and the Republicans fought us tooth and nail. As a matter of fact, Senator GRASSLEY said at the time:

I really do not think it takes a rocket scientist to know this will cost jobs.

That is what he said created 24 million jobs—23 million on the low side—and surpluses of \$236 billion.

Let me conclude by saying this is a tough time in our history. We are at the precipice for the first time in my lifetime of hearing threats of defaulting on the full faith and credit of America. When we lift the debt ceiling, we do it in order to pay for the debts that were incurred. Sadly for us, after having a surplus under Bill Clinton, the policies of George W. Bush caused us to go into deep holes and deficit and debt. We were on the way to a great place, but never forget when George W. Bush came out and said these surpluses we are running belong to the American people. What he meant was the rich people because that is who got the lion's share of that. So we can keep the tax rates low for the middle class, we can make sure the wealthy pay their fair share, we can come to the table and negotiate with an open heart and an open mind and knowing well that we will not get everything each of us wants.

I will close by reading a quote from Ronald Reagan. President Reagan wrote the following:

The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of default—are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate. Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and on the value of the dollar in exchange markets. The Nation can ill afford to allow such a result.

President Reagan was right. It is time to stop playing politics with this, the greatest country that gave us everything we have ever hoped for.

I say to Americans, call the Senate. Ask for a fair budget plan, with the parties meeting each other halfway.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is nice to hear asking for a fair budget plan. We haven't had a budget from this administration now in almost 800 days. They have control of the Senate. Yet we haven't seen a budget from this administration.

I get a little tired of the Obama approach toward shared sacrifice. Shared sacrifice is something. It sounds good. But I would prefer the Republican approach to shared prosperity, and that is what I think we are all about.

When we talk about what shared sacrifice is, think about this. It is pretty irrefutable that the bottom 51 percent of all wage earners of all households do not pay income taxes. The top 1 percent of the so-called wealthy pay 38 percent of all income taxes; the top 10 percent are paying 70 percent of all income tax; the top 50 percent pay somewhere near 90 percent of all income taxes; 51 percent don't pay anything.

But Democrats say, well, they pay payroll taxes. Everybody does that because that is Social Security, and they pay about one-third of what they are going to take out over the years in Social Security. On ObamaCare, a family of four earning over \$80,000 a year gets subsidies. Think about that. And that is what we call the poor? We wonder why the money doesn't go far enough? When are we going to wake up and realize that the other side just spends and spends and spends. They want to tax and tax and tax so they can spend some more. My gosh. When are we going to wake up in this country and realize they are spending us into oblivion?

I hear how they are so caring for the poor and so forth. The poor need jobs, and they also need to share some of the responsibility. We don't want the very poor people who are in poverty to pay income taxes—but 51 percent of all households? That is going up, by the way, because of our friend down in the White House and his allies.

I wish I didn't like him so much. I would like to be able to let go here. I like him personally, and I want him to be successful, but he is not going to be successful by just taxing the daylight out of everybody around here.

This Congress is currently engaged in as consequential a political debate as this Nation has seen in decades. Whether and what we raise the Nation's debt ceiling is a question that has consumed the markets in the Nation.

I serve the people of Utah and I hear about this issue every day and the sustainability of a government that has grown far beyond any reasonable or

constitutional limit and the cost of paying for all this government is foremost on the minds of tax-paying citizens who will be left holding the bag, even when President Obama is back in Hyde Park and Members of Congress no longer serve. The decision to spend less is only for a moment, but the debt incurred to pay for these government programs lasts forever. Fifty-one percent of all households don't pay income taxes.

The Democrats say: Well, they pay payroll taxes. Yes, they do—everybody does because that is Social Security—and 23 million of them get refundable tax credits that are more than they pay in payroll taxes.

I wish I could report to my constituents that Washington is serious about addressing this spending problem. Unfortunately, in the last week, we seem to have hit a new low. President Obama's contribution last week was a press conference temper tantrum, where he offered policy proposals that might appeal to his leftwing base but will do nothing to avoid our coming national bankruptcy.

Not to be outdone, Democratic leadership in the Senate has offered a non-binding resolution designed solely to score some cheap political points that will jazz up the activist left through demagogic class warfare against individuals with high incomes. He is going to raise \$3 billion over 10 years by taxing jet planes. It would take 1,000 years to reach what we have as a deficit for this year just from that one tax to jack up enough money to pay for just the deficit this year.

Facing a full-blown debt crisis, this is how the Senate Democrats, following the President's lead, have chosen to spend this week, debating a nonbinding resolution. Episodes such as this leave me convinced the only real solution to our Nation's spending problem is a balanced budget constitutional amendment. Only a specific constitutional restraint will force Congress to make the tough decisions necessary to restrain the size of government, restore the integrity of the States, and protect the liberties of the American citizens and taxpayers.

To demonstrate my commitment to restoring constitutional limits on the Federal Government, I have signed the cut, cap, and balance pledge. Along with a growing number of my colleagues in the Senate, Members of the House, grassroots groups, and Presidential candidates, I have committed myself to cutting spending, capping spending, and passing a balanced budget constitutional amendment as a condition for any debt limit increase.

As this debate over how best to address our growing debt and annual deficits continues, I wish to address a technical but critical matter in these negotiations. I am talking about tax expenditures. I am ranking member on the Senate Finance Committee and I know a little bit about these. Over the next few days I am going to discuss



this matter of tax expenditures and debt. Today, I am going to talk in general about what a tax expenditure is and what a tax expenditure is not. I will next turn to the tax policy areas implicated by current tax expenditures.

For instance, home ownership is favored in our tax base with a tax expenditure. There is a deduction for home mortgage interest, a deduction for real property taxes, and an exclusion for income from home sales. These are tax expenditures.

The Tax Code also encourages charitable contributions. Charitable deductions are available to citizens when they give to a nonprofit crisis pregnancy center, when they put money in the basket at church or when they give to their alma mater, just to mention a few charitable donations.

In a third speech, I will attempt to shed some light on a widespread misconception about tax expenditures. That misconception is that tax expenditures disproportionately benefit high income taxpayers. But let's not get ahead of ourselves.

My remarks are remarks about what a tax expenditure is. Unfortunately, my remarks are also largely about Democrats' plans to increase taxes. President Obama and his liberal allies are calling for a balanced approach on a revenue piece to deficit reduction. They want shared sacrifice. I want shared prosperity.

We hear this from the press all the time. New revenues need to be a part of any deal to reduce the deficit. These are simply code words for a tax hike. I guarantee this. If we raise taxes, my friends on the other side will spend every dime of it. That is how they have kept themselves in power. Yet claiming they are helping the poor. Are 51 percent of our households so poor they can't participate in saving this country?

It is clear the professional left is insisting that President Obama include tax increases in any negotiated agreement to raise the debt ceiling. Threading this tax hike needle through an electorate resistant to giving the government more money to spend is no easy task. Although his campaign team talks a big game about the popularity of tax increases, the President's own words suggest otherwise.

Last week, in a shameful display of class warfare, the President did specifically call for some tax increases on the rich. That includes 800,000 small businesses, by the way, where 70 percent of the jobs come from. But that is the exception that proves the rule. By and large, the President avoids the effectual truth of his mission to get rid of tax expenditures—massive tax increases on the middle-class American families, to whom he promised immunity from tax increases when he was running for President. Instead, he and other members of the party of tax increases refer to tax expenditures as spending through the Tax Code. How seriously should we take his rhetoric?

When the President said he wanted to address the Nation's debt by reducing spending through the Tax Code, it proved too much for even Jon Stewart. This is Stewart's analysis of the President's contention that we could reduce the deficit by attacking spending through the Tax Code:

You manage to talk about a tax hike as a spending reduction. Can we afford that and the royalty checks you are going to have to send to George Orwell? That's the weirdest way of "just say tax hike." That's like saying, I am not going on a diet. I'm going to add the calories to my excluded food intake.

That was Jon Stewart. He hit the nail on the head. For sure it is easy to make fun. But what the President is trying to do with tax expenditures is no laughing matter.

Liberals talk about tax expenditures as though they were just getting rid of wasteful spending. First, as a legal matter, tax expenditures are not expended. Outlays are checks cut from the Treasury Department and are defined as spending under the Congressional Budget Act. Yet most tax expenditures only lose revenue and do not include an outlay portion. Tax expenditures that only lose revenue contain no spending as defined by the Congressional Budget Act and as scored by the official scorekeepers for Congress, the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Congressional Budget Office.

Second, as a policy matter, when it comes to tax expenditures, one person's loophole is another person's opportunity to save for college and retirement, finance a home, and tithe to your church.

Here is the bottom line. Taking away or reducing tax expenditures is a tax increase, unless a tax cut of an equal or greater amount is enacted.

One crucial myth I would like to dispel is that tax expenditures are spending. This chart, "Revenue Loss Does Not Equal Spending," the Federal Government cannot spend money it never touched and never possessed.

What tax expenditures do is let taxpayers keep more of their own money. The American people are the ones who earn their money through their ideas, their risks, and their labor. Whether we are talking about a successful business owner or a part-time worker just starting out, the money they earn is theirs. It is their money, and only by their consent is the government permitted to take some of it in taxation to pay for certain public goods.

But Democrats have a different view. It is this view—one that is fundamentally at odds with our classical liberal Constitution and our Founders' respect for property rights—that contributes to the confusion over tax expenditures.

Liberals think that all of the money that you earn belongs to the government. You have no independent right to the fruit of your own labors, because only by dint of big government are you ever able to make something of yourself. This view is foreign to most Americans—Republicans or Democrats. It is

a view that Alexander Hamilton and Benjamin Franklin and Abraham Lincoln would take issue with. But this is the political philosophy of the modern left.

So when you hear tax hike proponents come to the Senate floor and say we are giving these businesses and individuals all this money in tax expenditures, they are incorrectly assuming that the government has that money to give in the first place. The government does not have this money to give. That money belongs first to the people that earn it—those businesses and individuals who are the American taxpayers.

There are critical differences between spending and tax expenditures. For one thing, the government never touches the money that a taxpayer keeps due to benefitting from a tax expenditure; whereas, with spending the government actually collects money from taxpayers and then spends it.

Here is a more telling difference. Reducing or eliminating a tax expenditure without lowering rates enough to reach a revenue neutral level will cause the size of the Federal Government to grow, while reducing or eliminating spending causes the size of the Federal Government to shrink.

I am open to looking at eliminating or reducing some tax expenditures as part of comprehensive tax reform but only if tax rates are lowered enough to reach a revenue neutral level. Alternatively, reduction or elimination of tax expenditures could be balanced with new tax cuts that are of equal or greater value to the revenue generated by the eliminated expenditures. But if tax expenditures are reduced or eliminated without tax rates being lowered enough to reach a revenue neutral level, that is a tax increase, plain and simple.

We have made clear that as a matter of law and political theory, tax expenditures are not spending.

Now let's turn to an examination of what they are.

Fortunately, we have definitions available.

The Joint Committee on Taxation generally defines tax expenditures as deliberate departures from generally accepted concepts of net income, usually by way of special exemptions, deductions, credits or exclusions. Therefore, tax expenditures generally arise for individual income taxes and corporate income taxes.

The Treasury Department differs from the Joint Committee on Taxation slightly in how it defines a tax expenditure. For example, the Joint Committee on Taxation labels deferral as a tax expenditure but Treasury does not. But whichever definition one uses, it is clear that the President and the liberal proponents of tax increases are using their own politically motivated dictionary.

Tax expenditures have been erroneously described by many as loopholes. This is deliberately inaccurate.

A loophole is something that Congress did not intend and would generally shut down, at least going forward, once it learned of the loophole. Tax expenditures, by contrast, were generally placed by Congress into the tax code deliberately. For example, the largest tax expenditure is the exclusion for employer-provided health insurance and benefits. The second-largest tax expenditure is the home mortgage interest deduction. We all know why they are there, and they are there for good reason.

Tax expenditures are not loopholes. We are not talking here about some fancy tax scheme that a lawyer or accountant has discovered and now promotes to his clients as a way to game the system. These are broad-based tax incentives that benefit many Americans. The deduction for charitable contributions is not some loophole. It was a deliberate inclusion in the code that acknowledges the need for religious citizens to contribute to their churches.

Even some of the smaller dollar tax expenditures were designed by Congress to go to particular industries or types of taxpayers—for example, the tax expenditure to encourage the purchase of corporate jets that Democrats included in the stimulus and that the President is now criticizing.

Whether you agree with these particular tax expenditures or not, an honest debate requires recognition that they were designed by Congress with economic or social goals in mind and are not inadvertent loopholes.

As a matter of law, policy and constitutional government, I fundamentally disagree with those who are pushing these tax increases as part of a deal to raise the debt ceiling.

Our problem is spending that has grown out of control, not a lack of revenue.

According to CBO's June 2011 long term budget outlook, taxes are already heading higher than they have historically been. From 1971 to 2010, revenues as a percentage of GDP have averaged 18 percent. Since the post-World War II era, from 1946 to 2010, revenues have averaged 17.7 percent of GDP.

Yet CBO also projects that revenues as a percentage of GDP will exceed 20 percent by 2021. Even if all the bipartisan tax relief contained in the 2001 and 2003 tax acts is extended, revenues as a percent of GDP will increase to 18.4 percent.

So I ask the question: With taxes already going higher than where they have historically been, should we raise them even more?

For me, the answer is no.

I know that most Utahns would agree, I believe most people in this country would agree, and I suspect that even most Democrats would as well. They certainly would if President Obama and the liberals who pose as advocates for the middle class came clean about just how high taxes on working families would have to go to pay for

the hard core left's preferred level of government. The numbers do not lie.

The deficit is a symptom of out-of-control spending that has grown dramatically in recent years and is reaching crisis levels.

It is not a result of too little in taxes. Democrats can close all the loopholes they want, and it still won't balance the books.

And the Democrats who are talking about the need to close loopholes and eliminate spending through the Tax Code need to be asked which middle class tax relief they want to get rid of as part of their deficit reduction plan.

Do they want to get rid of the charitable deduction or maybe the mortgage interest deduction?

Maybe they want to go after people's 401(k)s or IRAs or 529s.

What is it going to be?

Let me say something here. I am very concerned about where we are going. We have risen this year to 25.3 percent of GDP in spending. The last time we hit that figure was in 1945 at the height of the Second World War, when the government was taking over almost everything to keep us from losing that war. It is certainly over 23 percent right now. What is it going to be?

At a press event tantrum last week, the President answered absolutely none of these questions. He needs to. He needs to get serious about cutting spending.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the division of time under the quorum call be divided equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, it has been almost 800 days since the Senate Democratic majority produced a budget. I do not expect one to appear from the majority today, but at least the Democratic majority canceled the Fourth of July recess to work toward an agreement to deal with our budgetary crisis. With the possibility of default looming, our caucus, led by Senator SESSIONS, has been pushing the Democratic majority to keep the Chamber working over the recent re-

cesses. After refusing past calls to remain in session, the Democratic majority finally recognized that we cannot sort this out if we are not here to focus on it. I, for one, am glad the Democratic majority listened.

The American people deserve an honest and open conversation about the very difficult situation we are in. More importantly, they deserve a commitment that we will work in good faith to end this impasse. Unfortunately, I am not sure we will get that from the Democratic majority or the President. We are in session this week specifically to deal with the budget ceiling crisis, and the only vote the majority leader had scheduled from the outset was a resolution on the Libya conflict. I say "had" because the Democratic majority rightly canceled that vote after intense pressure from our side to keep the Senate focused on the debt ceiling issue.

President Obama has been absent from this debate for months. Only recently he started showing up to tell Americans that his solution to the crisis is raising taxes instead of cutting spending. Meanwhile, we have inched closer and closer toward defaulting on our obligations.

It is interesting that we are here today specifically to work out a solution to our financial crisis 1 week after scenes of Athens on fire as a result of rioting over Greece's own debt crisis dominated the airwaves. One week after passing tough austerity measures to secure further financial aid—the very same measures that sparked the rioting—the Greek Government is far from out of the woods. Standard & Poor's says the proposals for restructuring Greek debt would effectively constitute a default instead of helping the country avoid one.

I mention all of this not to generate fear but, rather, to shed light on the gravity of our situation. We could very well end up like Greece if we do not handle this crisis properly. This is the last thing we want to experience in our great country, and that is why we need to reform our fiscal policy in the way that we have done business in the past. There is too much at stake not to take action now. We are at the point where our Nation can no longer borrow money. The IMF has harsh words for our soaring budget deficits, and credit rating agencies such as Moody's and S&P have threatened to downgrade our government's AAA rating.

President Obama likes to blame our economic mess on the previous administration, but the reality is that over the past 2 years, our debt has increased 35 percent under his watch. That is not the previous administration's fault, nor is it their fault that the annual deficit is now three times greater than the highest deficit during the Bush years. If American families ran their households like Washington runs its budget, the utilities would be shut off and the collection agencies would be knocking on their doors. If they maxed

out a credit card, they wouldn't have the luxury of telling someone else to pay their bills. Yet this is what the President is demanding by sticking to tax increase proposals.

I said this last week, but since the President continues to push tax increases as the answer, I will say it again: President Obama, take tax hikes off the table. We got into this mess by excessively spending. We can't fix the problem unless we stop excessively spending.

The White House remains focused on tax hikes. If we look at their agenda, we can see why. The big-ticket items they have already passed, specifically the President's stimulus and health care bills, have put our country on the path of unprecedented levels of spending that will keep us in the red for my lifetime, my children's lives, and well beyond. The administration's refusal to cut excessive spending, much of which the Nation never asked for, will put us on the course for a Greek-like catastrophe. Without action, annual interest payments on the national debt alone will exceed 40 percent of GDP by 2080.

So with that in mind, the President is working behind closed doors with his allies in Congress to figure out ways to raise revenue. As we all know, revenue is a Washington euphemism for taxes. Instead of further exasperating our economy by raising taxes and putting us in a position that will affect our recovery and our Nation's future, the solution must be tailored to the problem. Washington does not have a revenue problem; we have a spending problem. Any proposal that does not start in that truth should be taken off the table.

If the White House-engineered agreement for raising the debt ceiling does not include significant cuts and a spending cap mechanism, such as a balanced budget amendment, to prevent us from having to raise it again, then I can assure you they will not get my vote. Anything short of that is irresponsible. I know I am not alone in these demands. Many of my colleagues feel just as strongly and will not back down either. The President and the Senate Democratic majority need to understand we are committed to these principles because millions of Americans feel exactly the same as we do. We are here to do the people's work. Let's listen to them instead of trying to tell the people what is best for them.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

#### COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, we just went through the July 4 weekend celebrating our independence on July 4, 1776. On July 5, 76 years ago, something else happened that was very important in our country and very symbolic of what we stand for as a nation. I heard the Presiding Officer from Maryland talk a moment ago about the values we hold as a nation and how important it is to convey those values in everything we do in this body.

What happened on July 5, 1935, was President Roosevelt signed something called the National Labor Relations Act, and we know what came out of the National Labor Relations Act and the other reforms of that era, in addition to Social Security and the CCC and some other things, was the concept and the implementation of collective bargaining. Collective bargaining is a right the American people have to join voluntarily in a collective bargaining unit—generally a labor union—and negotiate on behalf of hundreds or thousands of fellow workers for wages, health care, pensions, vacation days, and other things.

I mentioned that because just late last week something remarkable happened in my State of Ohio. In Columbus, in response to the State legislature taking away those collective bargaining rights and a radical departure from 75 years of collective bargaining, national private sector success, and 30 years of Ohio collective bargaining for public employees' success, the legislature passed a radical act earlier this year to take away those collective bargaining rights for public employees. We know it is a direct assault on the middle class. We know it will mean a declining and shrinking middle class. We know the biggest threat to this country today, to our economy, to our country, and to our country's families is that the middle class is shrinking and the middle class is declining. I call them radicals because it is a direct hit, a direct violation of what we stand for as a nation: the right to organize and bargain collectively and voluntarily.

We have seen these public employees—and who knows what is next—have those rights taken away. We know what will be next: prevailing wage, the right to work—all the kinds of things that incorporate conservative politicians have tried to do for some years. We basically had a consensus in this country. We had a consensus on Medicare, a consensus around minimum wage, a consensus about safe drinking water and clean air, a consensus about collective bargaining rights on which 80 percent, 90 percent of the country agreed. We had disagreements around the edges on the environment or safe drinking water, Medicare, but by and large there was a consensus on what we did here. What we saw earlier this year in Ohio was an assault directly on those values. They are going after collective bargaining rights.

In another piece of legislation they are going after voter rights. In another

piece of legislation they are going after women's rights. In Washington they are going after Medicare.

Let me go back to collective bargaining. What happened last week is something remarkable. In Ohio, unlike many States, after a bill passes and becomes law and is signed by the Governor, there are 90 days to gather signatures. I believe in Ohio's case 250,000 signatures are needed to place on the ballot a referendum. In other words, if this goes on the ballot, the voters have a chance to repeal that bill.

When the radicals in the legislature took away collective bargaining rights and the Republican Governor signed it, a group of Ohio citizens put on the ballot a repeal of taking away collective bargaining rights. They needed about 250,000 signatures. You know how many they had? They submitted last week 1.3 million signatures. Mr. President, 1.3 million people signed saying: We want this to go on the ballot to repeal this radical measure of the State legislature Republicans. No Democrats in either House voted for this to repeal what they were doing. That's 1.3 million signatures.

In fact, they brought a truckload of boxes of signatures. In the Office of the Secretary of State they had to send in a structural engineer, literally, to make sure the floor—I think it is on the 14th floor—could support the weight of these 1.3 million signatures.

I note Senator CARDIN and Senator WHITEHOUSE, when they come to the floor, oftentimes talk about the overreach, the radical nature of what conservative far-right politicians are doing in this country right now. The overreach, going after bargaining rights, going after Medicare, going after minimum wage, putting tax breaks—tax breaks are really earmarks for the rich in the Tax Code—all of these kinds of things they are trying to do are unravelling so much of what we fought for as a nation for so many years.

The good news in Ohio this week: 1.3 million people said they have had enough. We are not going to stand for this. We are not going to tolerate this radical overreach that Governor Kasich and legislators are doing in Columbus and House Republicans and far too many Members of the Senate are doing in this body. That is good news. I think we move forward from there.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, let me thank the senior Senator from Ohio, Mr. BROWN, for his leadership for working families. We were colleagues in the House of Representatives and there was no more effective voice on behalf of working families than Congressman BROWN, now Senator BROWN. I just want to thank him for bringing these issues to our attention.

He is absolutely right, there has been an all-out assault on the dignity of

working families in this country at all levels. I will talk a little bit about the budget deliberations because I believe here, also, we find an assault on the middle-income families. As President Kennedy said, "to govern is to choose." We have never had a clearer choice of two different visions of America.

I wish to talk a little bit about that because I know we are all working hard to reach a fair compromise, and I am one of those who believe the final agreement will not be what the Democrats want or what the Republicans want. We will have to do a compromise. But I think the people of this Nation need to know the types of choices we are making here in Washington.

I see the Republicans—and I have heard some of the speeches that were recently given on the floor—are really trying to protect the very wealthy, the millionaires. In the Republican budget, millionaires would get another \$200,000 of tax cuts, where at the same time that budget would cost our seniors, who live on fixed incomes, an extra \$6,000 a year in health care costs if their plan on Medicare were to become law.

Those are the types of choices we are being asked to make here, being asked to continue the gas subsidies—the tax subsidies for the five biggest oil companies in this country. That is what the Republican budget would protect. They would protect those tax breaks. Let me remind you that those five companies in the last decade made \$1 trillion in profits, that during the time we saw escalating gas prices here and our economy being hurt by it, people could not afford to fill up their gas tanks. Yet at the same time those five oil companies had record profits. So we say: Let's take away the government subsidies. Yet the choice for our Republican friends is to say: No, we can't do that. Instead, they look at cutting nutrition programs and Pell grants to make it more expensive for children to be able to go to college or nutrition programs to try to have a healthier America.

Well, what we are pushing for is a balanced approach in how we deal with this budget deficit. We could talk a long time about how we got here, the policies of the previous administration. Just 10 years ago, we had these large surpluses. The previous administration cut taxes not once but twice, the second time using the credit card in order to pay for those tax cuts, went to war not in one country but in two countries and used the credit card in order to pay for those wars, and are wondering why we have all this debt today.

Well, it is our responsibility to take care of this deficit because this deficit is affecting the strength of America. We know we need to have a balanced approach in order to do it. I, along with the Presiding Officer, am a member of the Budget Committee. We are working hard on the Budget Committee to come up with a way we can deal with it. The Democrats on that committee are united that there is a better way than

the Republican budget that came over from the House of Representatives.

Let me talk a little bit about whether this is class warfare. I have heard that mentioned many times. This might surprise you. I might agree with my Republican friends. I think the Republican budget is an attack on class. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities said the Republican budget "would produce the largest redistribution of income from the bottom to the top in modern U.S. history." We are asking the poor and working families to contribute so the wealthy can get more tax breaks. That is just wrong.

What we want to see is a balanced approach, an approach that says: Look, this deficit is very serious. We have to ask and save money wherever we can to balance the Federal budget. It starts by looking at our domestic spending. We have been willing to say: Look, for programs that are not high-priority programs, we have to cut back on them. Programs that are not working we are going to have to eliminate. Let's get rid of duplicate programs.

We say we are prepared to do that. But you also have to look at the non-domestic programs—our military programs and security programs. We know we are in the process now of bringing our combat troops home from Afghanistan. That can produce savings. Let's use that to reduce the budget deficit. There are ways we can get this deficit down.

I was listening to one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about the so-called tax expenditures. Let me put this in context for one moment. Our Tax Code spends about \$1.4 trillion a year in special provisions to give special breaks to different taxpayers. I think none of us are saying all of those should be eliminated. What we are saying is, when you find tax loopholes, when you find shelters, when you find tax havens, let's get rid of them.

I have taken to the floor to talk about two areas where I think there is broad consensus. The ethanol subsidy—we do not need it any longer. It is questionable whether we ever needed it. The industry will do just fine without the subsidy. But let me tell you what the subsidy causes. It causes my poultry farmers in Maryland to pay a lot more for their corn, costing jobs in Maryland. So there is a tax subsidy we can get rid of. We had a vote on the floor, and it was quite obvious that the overwhelming majority agrees with that. Why can't we use that for deficit reduction?

We talked about the gas industry. Why are we giving them subsidies? There is no need for them. So we can take those tax shelters, we can take those tax havens, and we can take those loopholes and use that.

And, yes, I think there is a question as to why millionaires are going to continue to get a tax cut that was meant to be temporary in nature when we need as much revenue as we can get

to pay off our bills. I think there is an issue here as to whether that is fair. How do we tell students they have to pay more for college, how do we tell families that fewer will be able to go to Head Start, how do we tell our seniors they have to pay more and yet we tell the millionaires they are going to get additional tax cuts? That is not fair, and it does not make good sense for our economy.

There is a better way. I know my colleague from Rhode Island will speak next. He also serves on the Budget Committee. We Democrats have a better way of doing this. We know how we can reduce the budget deficit by even more than the Simpson-Bowles deficit commission proposed, where we can bring in the deficit and bring it under control to make it a reasonable amount of our economy rather than uncontrolled, as it is today. We can do that by bringing in not just domestic spending but also our defense spending in order to reduce spending more in this country.

We can do that, and we can do it in a way that protects the integrity of Medicare. We do not want our seniors at the risk of private insurance companies. We do not want private insurance companies telling our seniors when they can get care and when they cannot. We tried that before we created Medicare, and we know the problems that were created by that. So in our budget, we want to protect the integrity of Social Security and Medicare and the programs that are critically important to our seniors.

We will close the tax loopholes. We will eliminate shelters. We will make sure everybody is part of the solution. We can do it in a way that will help build this great Nation.

Let me tell you what our objectives are, quite frankly. Our objectives are to manage our deficit, bring it down, bring it under control in a real way, to protect those who are most vulnerable in our country, and to invest in America's future so we can create more jobs, so we can continue to build our roads and our bridges, our water systems, so we can continue to invest in education, and, yes, so we can protect our Federal workforce and pay them decent salaries and compensation benefits. We can do all that. But if we are going to get the job done, Democrats and Republicans have to be honest in their debate and their compromise. It will not be what one side wants. We are going to have to compromise for the good of the American people.

I took the time today to share with the people of Maryland and the Nation where I believe our vision should be in regard to the budget of this Nation. I hope we are able to achieve those objectives because I really do believe our children's and grandchildren's future depends on us getting this right. If we work together, we can pass a budget that is in the best interests of the American people and will allow our economy to grow to create jobs, which

is the best answer to deal with our deficit.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am honored to follow my distinguished colleague from Maryland in this discussion about our priorities as we address the debt limit we are approaching. I think Leader REID was wise to choose to cancel the scheduled Fourth of July recess so we could continue to work toward an agreement to prevent defaulting by the United States on our government debt and the financial consequences that would ensue here in America and around the world.

As we negotiate an end to this debt limit standoff, we also, obviously, have to address our looming budget deficits and our looming debt, which threaten to cripple our potential for economic growth in years to come. Where we are on this, of course, is that President Clinton put our budget on course to permanent surpluses. We would be a debt-free nation right now if the predictions the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office had put in place when President Clinton left office had been kept. In fact, there were changes. President Bush and a Republican Congress squandered away those surpluses with unnecessary tax cuts and unwise spending increases. Our multitrillion-dollar deficits have resulted. We must now fix the budget and bring it back into balance.

So where are we in this standoff? Well, we need to cut spending. Democrats and Republicans agree on that. We need to protect ordinary families who enjoy ordinary levels of income from tax increases. Democrats and Republicans agree on that. The disagreement is whether we also need to raise some revenues in other areas to help balance the budget, areas such as oil and gas and ethanol subsidies, closing corporate tax loopholes, and putting an end to high-income tax-dodge schemes.

On that front, I rise in support of Leader REID's resolution calling for a deficit reduction package that includes a "more meaningful contribution" from millionaires and billionaires.

The Republicans are threatening that they would rather let this government default on its obligations than to what they call "raise revenues" by requiring the wealthy to pay their fair share. Just last week, Senate Republican leader MITCH MCCONNELL called on President Obama to take any raised revenues "off the table" and to balance the budget solely on spending cuts that affect the middle class and lower income families. In an opinion piece on *cnn.com*, Senator MCCONNELL proclaimed that "tax hikes can't pass the Congress."

Well, let's pull the curtain back and take a little glimpse behind it as to whom the Republicans are fighting so hard to protect.

As shown in this picture I have in the Chamber, here is a building in New

York City on Park Avenue, the Helmsley Building. Because this building is large enough to have its very own ZIP Code, we know from actual IRS information—not projections, not guesses, not conclusions drawn from rates; from actual paid-in IRS information—that the wealthy and successful individuals and corporations that call this building home paid a 14.7-percent total Federal tax rate in the last year they have done the calculation, 2007. That is lower than the actual tax rate, on average, of the New York City janitor or doorman or security guard who would work in this building. It is upside down. The people who serve the occupants of this building pay a higher tax rate than the occupants of this majestic building. The tax gimmicks that let those occupants pay a lower rate than the people who take care of the doors and the cleaning and the security for them—that is what the Republicans are fighting to protect.

This problem is not just a fluke in the Helmsley Building. Each year, the Internal Revenue Service publishes a report that adds up all the taxes paid by the 400 highest income earning Americans. I spoke earlier this year—several times, actually—on last year's report, which included data from 2007, like the same year as for the Helmsley Building. In that year, these super-high-income earners, making, on average,  $\$1\frac{1}{2}$  billion, approximately—billion with a "b"—paid a lower tax rate in 2007—the 400 of them did, on average—than an average hospital orderly who is a single payer pushing a cart down the halls of a Rhode Island hospital at night.

In May, the IRS published updated data on the top 400 income earners for 2008. Let's take a look at the status of the top 400 earners in that more recent year. Well, they are down from  $\$1\frac{1}{2}$  billion, on average, to over  $\$1\frac{1}{4}$  billion each. Certainly we can applaud that kind of success in America. That is definitely the American dream come true. But, on average, they paid an average tax rate of 18.2 percent. That is what they actually paid. That is what they put into the IRS. Once you get through all the tax dodges, all the different schemes, all the different deductions, all the different rates, when you actually put the pen to the paper at the bottom line, it is 18.2 percent.

We spent a lot of time around here debating whether the top income tax rate should be 35 percent or 39.6 percent. Folks, that is not what they are paying. The Tax Code is so filled with special provisions that tend to exclusively or disproportionately benefit the wealthy that the highest 400 income earners, earning more than  $\$1\frac{1}{4}$  billion in 1 year, paid an average tax rate of 18.2 percent.

This means that the 400 highest earning individuals in the Nation, in 2008, paid the same effective tax rate as a truckdriver in Rhode Island. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, on average, an ordinary truckdriver earns

$\$40,200$ , which is about the place in the Tax Code, on the way up, where you first hit paying 18.2 percent of your income in taxes.

So what the Republicans are asking as part of the debt limit compromise is that we cut employment and job training support now, at a time of record joblessness, while they continue to fight to make sure that people making a quarter of a billion dollars a year pay lower Federal tax rates than average middle-class families.

Here is another building that has a little story to tell. This is a building called Ugland House. It is over in the Cayman Islands. This building does not look like much. It is pretty nondescript. But over 18,000 corporations claim to be doing business out of this building—18,000 out of that little building. Clearly what is going on is that those corporations are hiding through shell companies, phony corporate identities that they and wealthy taxpayers use to hide assets and play tax games with the IRS.

This kind of mischief down in the Cayman Islands and elsewhere through these tax dodges is estimated to cost us as much as  $\$100$  billion every year. As part of a debt limit compromise, the Republicans are asking us to cut America's investments in science, cut America's investments in technology at the same time they are fighting to protect corporations that hide in offshore tax havens so that the honest American taxpayer has to pick up the burden for them. That is what they are fighting for when you pull back the curtain.

When all is said and done, everyone, Democrat and Republican, agrees that there needs to be cuts. And everyone, Republican and Democrat, agrees there should be no tax increases on ordinary middle-class families. Those concerns are not at issue. Where is the dispute? What is the blockade? Again, pull back the curtain and you will see that the Republicans are willing to let us as a nation default for the first time in our history on our debt, which would devastate our economy, all to defend tax rates for millionaires and billionaires that are lower than those paid by regular hardworking Americans; all to defend offshore tax havens that are used to evade taxes while ordinary families are expected to pay their taxes; all to defend corporate and special interest tax loopholes, earmarks for the wealthy and well-connected. That is where they have chosen to stand their ground. That is where they have chosen to pick a fight.

As our Nation rushes toward the August 2 deadline and the agreement deadline before August 2 when we must have something in place in order to get the President's signature on a bill by August 2—as we rush toward that, as the world's economy and America's economy are imperiled by the threat of our debt limit not being lifted, what are they fighting for? That is what they are fighting for, for the super-privileged, for the super well-connected, for the tax dodges they take

advantage of, and for the lower rates the superrich pay compared to the rest of all of us. Those are the interests that Republicans are protecting when they reject any revenue increases to bring down our unsustainable deficit. They say it is tax increases they are against. Well, the answer to that should be Americans asking the question back: Tax increases for who? Because if it is tax increases for the guy who is making a quarter of a billion dollars, and is paying a lower tax rate than a truckdriver, that is okay with me. That is a tax dodge we can get rid of. If it is a tax increase for a company that is going to hide in this building in the Cayman Islands to shelter its incomes so that Rhode Island corporations and Oregon corporations, American corporations have to make up the difference—American taxpayers have to make up the difference, and they cannot hide their income down there any longer, that is a tax increase I can live with. I do not think that is what ordinary Americans have in mind when they say we do not want tax increases. They mean we do not want our rates to go up. But ordinary Americans know that our Tax Code is filled, riddled with gimmicks and tricks and loopholes and deductions that have been put in it over the years by lobbyists. They are earmarks, they just happen to be earmarks in the Tax Code. They spend America's money through the Tax Code just as much as if it were an appropriation.

But what is the big difference? The big difference is it takes being a very wealthy individual or a very big corporation to be able to take advantage of those tricks, to be able to hire a lobbyist who can build that trick into the Tax Code, and to have the revenues and the resources to be able to maneuver through the Tax Code in that way. Ordinary Americans do not do that.

You can ask pretty much anybody in Rhode Island, show them the thousands of pages of the Internal Revenue Code and ask them: Who has a special provision in it for you? Nobody does. They are regular Americans. They pay regular taxes. They do things the way they are supposed to be done. The gimmicks and the tricks are all at the upper end, and it is time to clean house, particularly now when we so badly need the revenues to balance our budget.

It is simply inexcusable that our tax system permits billionaires to pay lower tax rates than truckdrivers, that it allows the wealthy to avoid taxes by hiding assets in phony offshore corporations. Even if we had no budget deficit, just being fair, honoring the principle of equality would demand that we address these inexcusable discrepancies that favor the wealthy and the well-connected. Our budget crisis, however, brings real urgency to the problem. So as we continue to work to avoid a debt default by the United States of America and to bring down our budget deficits and to reduce our

crippling national debt, I hope Senator MCCONNELL and the Republican Conference will revisit the potential to significantly cut the deficit by addressing tax loopholes, tax gimmicks and, frankly, outright injustice to the ordinary American taxpayer that they are now defending here in the Senate.

I see the distinguished Senator from Alabama arriving.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I understand that President Obama has summoned certain congressional leaders to the White House tomorrow to discuss spending, debt and deficits, and the debt limit we now operate under. The President has summoned congressional leaders to the White House on at least eight different occasions in recent weeks to discuss budget and debt issues, not including the private talks involving Vice President BIDEN.

Yet with only weeks to go before the debt limit deadline—we are told August 2—secret discussions have failed to produce any grand bargain. Talk is not an action. I do think that is a problem the President has. He thinks making a speech or having an announcement is something that actually involves changing course in America and it has some effect, when it is pretty clear it does not.

We have had lots of talks and we have heard lots of speeches, so I think we should stop paying attention to these private talks, from which no details emerge and no public discussion is heard. We are getting much too close to the point at which it will be too late to involve the public and allow Congress to fulfill its constitutional duty on spending and taxes.

In remarks yesterday, the President said, "To truly solve our debt problem, we need to take on spending and domestic programs and defense programs and entitlement programs." Well, I agree. Yet the only plan he has put forward proposed increases in his spending for next year in the budget he submitted. He submitted a budget earlier this year. He made a speech backing away from it a little bit but not a lot, because his speech, when we carefully tried to study it, did not do much to change what the trajectory is in his budget.

But this is what the budget calls for next year that we are supposed to be working on now and are not. This budget proposes to increase spending in 2012, beginning October 1, 2012—well, the inflation rate is projected to be 1.3 percent. It may be a little higher than that. Defense called for a 4.3-percent increase in spending. The Energy Department called for an 8.9-percent increase in spending, that big bureaucracy that is trying to make sure we block production of American energy. It proposes for the State Department a 9.3-percent increase in spending, and the Education Department a 13-percent increase in spending, at a time this

country is in incredibly difficult straits. We are having double-digit increases.

Then in the Transportation Department, he proposes a 62.4-percent increase. Do we really need to have high-speed rail within walking distance of 80 percent of all Americans? We do not have the money to do that. Most of the high-speed rails are not working—are not paying for themselves around the world. They can work in certain highly congested areas in good locations, perhaps. This idea that we are going to have a massive national interlocking system of maybe \$700 billion of high-speed rail is not realistic in the short term. But his budget called for a 62-percent increase.

We asked where the money would come from. They said it is a tax.

What kind of tax?

Well, it is not a gas tax.

So I called it the "not gas tax tax." What tax then do you propose, Mr. Secretary, before the Budget Committee?

Well, we will talk with Congress about that.

Well, the Congressional Budget Office, which is required to analyze expenditures against revenues, said that is not a proposal of revenue, and they scored that as all expenditures without any revenue, because we are not going to pass a big tax to increase this kind of spending. Give me a break. If we do, we ought to use some of the money to pay down the debt, not continue to surge spending in this fashion.

I wish again to point out that President Bush in his last year in office had the largest deficit I believe the country had had in recent modern times. The largest he had was \$450 billion. That was large. It was roundly criticized. It included a lot of the TARP money that they threw in at the last minute.

But what about President Obama's first year? That was \$1.2 trillion in deficit. The second year: \$1.3 billion. And this year, it is projected around \$1.5 trillion, going into 2011, ending September 30. Then September 12, he has got these kinds of increases. What kind of responsible behavior is that? For the President of the United States to say that we need to truly solve our deficit problems, we need to take on spending in domestic programs and defense programs and entitlement programs, and this is what we get as a proposal, to increase spending at double-digit rates, basically. I mean what is this? There is no proposal whatsoever to deal with entitlements. Those long-term unsustainable programs threaten the future of our country economically. Indeed, we are in more trouble right now than a lot of people realize from our debt situation.

So the only plan the President put forward, as I said, is increasing these expenditures and not confronting entitlement programs at all. And when the House Members passed a far-reaching, historic, honest, fact-based budget that would have actually changed the debt trajectory of our country over a period

of years, it was considered to be tough, but even it did not balance within 10 years.

We are in a deep hole. It is hard to balance this budget. The House proposed that and they laid out a plan, after 10 years, altering Medicare so that it would help put Medicare back on a sound basis. All of it was slammed by the President of the United States. He even had a speech at the White House and invited Congressman RYAN, who is the brilliant chairman of the House Budget Committee, and had him sit right in front of him, and then he slammed his bill. Congressman RYAN had courage and integrity and he produced an honest budget that would have made a difference for America. Would we have agreed with everything in it? Of course not. But he didn't deserve to be hammered by the President of the United States.

To begin to change the debt trajectory we are on, we need to cut at least \$6 trillion of spending over 10 years. That is not enough, but we need to do that. If we do that, it will make a huge difference. Just \$1.5 trillion or \$2 trillion in cuts will not be enough. It will not be enough. The President's budget, which he submitted in December—the only budget we have gotten from the Democratic side—would increase the debt by \$13 trillion, and \$2 trillion in spending cuts is not enough.

We are long past the point when the President needs to share his vision with the country and admit that he cannot keep up this spending rate. His budget was a failure to confront the reality that we don't have the money to keep up unsustainable spending.

According to Bloomberg News, Democratic officials claim that a deal will have to be reached between July 15 and July 22 "in order to write a bill and comply with congressional rules requiring advance publication before consideration." In other words, we have as little as 3 days to see the legislation.

I have proposed legislation that says we ought to have 7 days to consider this historic piece of legislation that would raise the debt ceiling. We want to see how much change in spending the bill would mandate. In other words, if we are going to raise the debt ceiling, because we have limited how much debt America can approve—Congress has—and to keep borrowing—we are borrowing 40 cents of every dollar we spend—if we keep borrowing, we have to raise it. What we, and the American people, are saying is we don't like raising it, but if we do, you better show us that you have changed your ways and you are not continuing this reckless spending, when we don't have the money.

Every bit of that increase is borrowed. We can't continue that. I truly believe that Congress needs to assert its role, step up and accept responsibility for the crisis we are in and begin to develop the procedures openly and publicly and get us out of this fix.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the daunting fiscal challenges our country faces and the urgent need for comprehensive bipartisan action to address our Nation's debt.

As we debate the path to securing our country's fiscal future, Greece is battling to keep from defaulting on its bonds. It is in the news. There are legitimate concerns that a default in Greece would send shock waves through the world financial markets, with an impact potentially as devastating as the 2008 collapse of Lehman Brothers.

To avert bankruptcy, Greece has enacted austerity measures so drastic that violent rioting has broken out in its streets. Despite these measures, and despite the aid of other European countries, many economists believe Greece will eventually succumb to its rising debt burden and default. Standard & Poor's warned Monday that even with the planned bailout by European banks, Greece's credit rating could be still downgraded to "selective default." While better than a full-blown default, this will almost certainly roil the markets and cut off Greece's access to credit.

Alarming, Standard & Poor's gave a similar warning to the United States last week. In a statement to Reuters, Standard & Poor's said it would drop the United States triple A rating to "selective default" if the Treasury Department misses its repayment on \$30 billion in maturing bills on August 4.

Although our long-term fiscal challenges are serious, they are not what caused Standard & Poor's to issue this warning at this very moment. Instead, what caused the warning was a growing concern that the Congress would fail to come together to pass a bipartisan deal on the debt ceiling—something Congress has done without incident almost 100 times since the limit was established.

We must get serious about tackling the deficit and putting our country back on sound fiscal ground. But the problem we are facing now is not only a crisis of the dollars and the cents, it is also a crisis of the divide and the deadlock.

We know what we need to do in order to avoid default and bring down the deficit. We have all the tools and information necessary to do it and avoid a situation such as we are seeing in Greece. Yet instead of working together to craft a fair and responsible path forward, some have chosen to draw lines in the sand and take the debt limit—and our Nation's economy—hostage.

Addressing our country's fiscal challenges is something I have taken seriously. Since coming to the Senate, I have worked to reform the way Congress conducts its own business—reducing the budget of Congress, fighting for appropriations project reform, and

working to restore the pay-as-you-go rule. I was one of a handful of Senators who fought for the creation of the fiscal commission, and I have supported efforts from both Republicans and Democrats to responsibly reduce the deficit.

While I believe we have reached a defining moment as a country which should not be wasted, I also know we can't afford to play Russian roulette with our economy.

What our country needs is for Congress to come together and build consensus around a comprehensive long-term deficit reduction package that will put us on the track to prosperity.

Ever since the economic downturn, families across the country have huddled around the kitchen table, making tough choices about what they hold most dear and what they can learn to live without. They expect and deserve their leaders to do the same. The American people are counting on us to put politics aside, pull together, not pull apart, and agree on a plan to live within our means and make America strong for the long haul.

If we are going to succeed in this challenge, we will ultimately have to accept things that we don't necessarily agree with. It is the only way to develop a plan that is both balanced and comprehensive.

We already know much of what will need to be done. Our failure to act has not been because we lack solutions, but because too often Congress has lacked the political will to get behind a consensus proposal. After months of debate, it is clear what sort of plan is needed to garner the support necessary to get us across the finish line.

First, a solution should match the scale of the problem. I want to see one that produces around \$4 trillion in deficit reduction over the next decade.

Second, it should include a mix of revenue with realistic spending cuts. One example we are seeing right now is biofuels. The biofuels industry has been willing to put a big chunk of change on the table, right in the middle of the year, as we are working with Senators THUNE and FEINSTEIN on an agreement in which it would be a template, where one industry says, OK, we understand that we have a big problem, and we are willing to put money upfront for the debt. We are willing to look at what we need to do in the long term to have a secure energy policy, but also help with the debt and end this subsidy. We want to see oil do the same thing. We want to see a lot of these loopholes closed, a lot of these subsidies end, and do it in a smart way. The budget Senator CONRAD has been working on with the Budget Committee is an example of a mix of those revenues and spending cuts. That is what we have to look at.

Third, we must be able to achieve bipartisan support with a proposal, which is why I continue to support the work that has been done by the Gang of 6.

It is time we get serious about advancing a plan that is both fair and

achievable. On August 2, the borrowing authority of the United States will be exhausted. No one benefits if we are unable to reach an agreement by this deadline. Every day that passes without a deal only increases uncertainty in the markets and puts the brakes on economic activity. Failure to bring the national debt under control threatens America's future, but the danger of default threatens our economy today.

The way I see it, we have two options. We can either set a precedent of holding our debt hostage to political maneuvering, raising the cost of borrowing and increasing the deficit, or we can show the world that we are serious about addressing our fiscal challenges, reducing the cost of borrowing and strengthening our financial outlook. I believe the choice is clear.

The sooner we can agree on a long-term package, the better for our economy and our country. I hope we can put partisan differences aside to work on an agenda that strengthens our economy, promotes fiscal responsibility, and increases global competitiveness, because if we refuse to have an honest conversation about this, if we insist on using the debate as a vehicle for rhetoric only, we will not just be doing ourselves a disservice, we will be cheating our children and grandchildren out of knowing the America we grew up in. The deficit isn't going to fix itself. We all know that. We all know we can't close our eyes, click our heels, and wish the debt would go away.

In their report, the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility wrote that "every modest sacrifice we refuse to make today only forces far greater sacrifices of hope and opportunity upon the next generation." They are right. The longer we wait, the more wrenching the choices become. Look at Greece. Who will be making those painful choices? Our children and our children's children.

None of us wants to see interest rates soar by playing Russian roulette with our economy. Democrats don't want it, Republicans don't want it. So what are we waiting for? It is time for Congress to step forward and show some leadership. It is time for us to work together to show the American people that Washington isn't broken, and that instead we are willing to put aside politics to do what we were elected to do—to do what is right for America.

This is our challenge, and it will be a hard challenge to meet. But I am confident we can come together to make these tough choices, to do what is right for our economy, and to renew the American promise of progress and opportunity for generations to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the debt crisis our Nation is facing and how we can come together to fix it. We do talk about how we are putting this debt on our children and

grandchildren. The time is on us right now. The bill is coming due.

We are facing the most predictable crisis in our Nation's history with our current financial situation. It is a problem we can all see and that we can all acknowledge must be fixed. Of course, acting is not as easy as talking. If it were that easy, we would not be so far in debt.

For some time, we have been talking about reining in spending and making sure that our grandchildren aren't saddled with the enormous debt our country is facing. Now we are facing the reality of reaching the debt ceiling—a cap that has increased to \$14 trillion—that is trillion, with 12 zeros—more than \$2 trillion over the previous debt limit of \$12 trillion—a little over a year ago, in February of 2010.

We have raised the debt ceiling 74 times since 1962, and we have raised the limit 10 times since 2001. Listen to this. In the last 4 years, we have raised the debt ceiling five times. It is accelerating.

What does this tell us about our spending habits? The numbers don't lie. It tells us we have had to raise the debt ceiling to keep up with increased Federal spending. It tells us we have forgotten entirely how to live within our means, and that we need to make serious decisions about cutting Federal spending. We need to make those decisions now.

We have all been talking about it. Republicans have come to the Senate floor and talked about the country's financial future. They have talked about our debt, projections for the future, and agreed that this path is unsustainable.

Republican and Democratic administrations and Congresses for decades have continually increased Federal spending. No one party holds all the blame for the situation we are in, but clearly the road we are traveling on is leading to a crisis.

Last week, the President held a press conference where he lectured Republican Members of Congress. He told us we need to stay in Washington to get things done. After listening to his press conference, we invited the President to meet with Senate Republicans. We hoped to explain to the President that the political reality makes it so that a bill containing tax increases cannot pass the House or the Senate. After lecturing us about the need to be in Washington and the need to get our work done, one would assume the President would take us up on our offer to meet. Instead, his spokesperson said meeting with Senate Republicans was "not a conversation worth having." Rather than staying in Washington to work on the debt and deficit, the President chose to fly to a fundraiser in Philadelphia.

Republicans have been engaged in efforts to fix the debt and deficit since the election last fall. House Republicans passed a serious budget that would cut \$6.2 trillion over the next

decade—not enough but substantial. After demagoging the Ryan budget as an effort to kill Medicare and push grandma off the cliff, Senate Democrats have yet to bring any budget to the floor.

I heard just a few minutes ago that one is being considered, but it is being considered in a very partisan way, and I don't know if we will get to see it before it comes to the floor. But we have gone 800 days without passing any sort of budget. Even though the media reported that Senate Democrats have reached a budget agreement, they still haven't brought the budget to the floor or shared it with Republicans. Why? I can only assume it is because it includes trillions of dollars in tax increases that would be unpalatable to the majority of Americans.

The President presented a budget and we voted on that budget. In fact, it was voted on 0 to 97. The President couldn't get a single vote for his budget. I didn't see that in many headlines, but it happened. Check on it.

While Democrats continue to ignore the problem, Republicans look for solutions. All 47 Senate Republicans have signed on as cosponsors of a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. Senator TOOMEY and Senator PAUL put forward their own budget efforts that would balance the budget. I have introduced legislation that creates 2-year budgeting and other legislation that would reduce spending by 1 percent each year for 7 years until we balance the budget. If Congress can't reduce spending by a single percentage point each year, it basically has given up and decided to leave this huge and growing pile of debt to tower over our children and our grandchildren and us, casting a grand shadow over their future and ours.

I remember a hearing we had in the Finance Committee and pretty much what everybody said was: Quit digging. You are in a big hole, quit digging. Phil Gramm talked on taxes and said: Don't penalize America with a tax every time Congress fails to do its job, which is to balance the budget, to spend reasonably. Failure on Congress's part doesn't warrant taxing Americans.

So where do we go from here? Republicans are ready to work, but we need Democrats to work with us. We need the President to take a realistic look at the situation and realize that tax increases are not the answer because the votes aren't there to pass a tax increase. We need to come up with a solution to the budget crisis we face and we need to do it now.

If we are serious about fixing the problem—and I believe many of us are—we have to come to the table willing to work. We have to stop pointing fingers. We have to stop playing political games. We have to stop demagoging ideas that are proposed. We need the President to step to the plate and explain to the American people the problem we face if we don't get our debt and deficit under control and



then give the solutions, not just tax raises.

The President is the only person in the Nation who has the bully pulpit necessary to teach the American people what happens if we don't get a budget and don't get timely appropriations. The President talked about some of the taxes he would increase. The deficit commission suggested those taxes could be used, but they suggested they should be used to lower company rates so we can compete internationally, which would increase revenues. They didn't suggest they should be used to pay for new programs, and they are not even being suggested to reduce the deficit.

Rather than taking the lead in selling the plan, the President has tried to stay above the fray and instead spent his time criticizing Republicans who have come up with a variety of plans. That isn't productive, it isn't helpful, and it will not lead to a deal. We need to end the finger-pointing and show the plan. Show us the plan. Bipartisanship is not about compromise, it is about what we leave out or finding an alternate way to accomplish a mutually agreeable way.

I know it works. I have seen it happen. The late Senator Ted Kennedy and I were able to put this theory into practice when we worked together on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. He and I came from opposite sides on most issues, but we chose to focus our time and energy on what we knew we could get done. It amazed people, but we sure got results. All in all, when Senator Kennedy and I led the HELP Committee, we got 35 bills reported out of committee and 27 signed into law.

These kinds of results are possible today, but we have to get to work. We can't keep raising the debt ceiling. We can't tax more every time we have a good idea. We have to address the spending problem in Washington, and we have to figure out some solutions to correct our long-term budget outlook. These aren't easy issues to address, but we have been sent to do a job, and that job includes rolling up our sleeves and finding a way out of the mess.

We are here through this July recess, but we are still not doing anything that is proactive or productive. The Democrats are in the Senate majority. They control the floor. Yesterday, we did a nothing vote to see if everybody was back. We will not vote until tomorrow now, and it is just a political ploy put up by the leader. It is messaging, and messaging will not pay the bills. Let's get something done in this session.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, what is the order at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is on the motion to proceed to S. 1323 until 6 o'clock, with Senators permitted to speak for 10 minutes.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to proceed for 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, I listened to my colleague just now and I have listened to colleagues over the last weeks and there are a lot of crocodile tears being shed on the floor of the Senate about why we are not doing something, all of which completely ignores the fact that everything we try to do, the folks on that side of the aisle make us take longer and longer and longer than we have ever taken before because they push every single procedural objection possible. Even the most routine thing we try to do on the floor of the Senate requires 60 votes or requires a motion to proceed. The most perfunctory, simple thing requires us to go through every procedural hoop and parliamentary process because they have persistently pursued a strategy aimed at gridlock.

The idea is to make Americans see the dysfunction and then blame it on the party in power and run against them. It is the most cynical, craven, and dangerous policy I have ever seen in the 27 years I have been in the Senate, and I regret it for our country.

There is a reason Democrats are standing, as a matter of principle, against the Ryan budget and against the proposals our Republican friends keep proposing. That is because they are the only party who have consistently stood and said: We are not going to consider everything. We are just going to give you a tiny, little menu, and you have to balance the budget out of spending cuts only. That is all that is in their budget. The only thing in their budget is spending cuts. Twelve percent of the entire budget is all they have put on the table in order to try to do something responsible about the deficit of our country.

We, on the other hand, have consistently said: We will put everything on the table—everything—Medicare, Medicaid, reforms—not benefits. We are not going to cut the benefits on people because we don't have to in order to deal with this problem, but we can reform them. We can certainly be more effective and efficient, and we are prepared to do that. There are a lot of other things we are prepared to do—defense spending, wars, and a whole series of things.

Last week, one of our newest colleagues made a very interesting and I thought revealing observation. The Senator from Delaware, CHRIS COONS, who balanced budgets in county government, who took cases all the way to the Supreme Court, who has seen decisions made in the business world as well as in the nonprofit world and who is an enormously capable person but new to the Senate, made the observation that some people are actually looking into the language of the 14th

amendment and the debt limit in order to learn whether "there might be some way to save us from ourselves."

That observation brought home to me how absurd this place must look right now, not just to a new Senator who came here with hopes of getting the business of our Nation done but to the average American, to people who invest in the extraordinary mythology that surrounds this great institution we are all a part of—the greatest deliberative body in the world. We can laugh at that one today. There is an absence of deliberation—a great absence of deliberation—and I think a lot of people are alarmed by the dysfunction they see with respect to this great institution.

It is extraordinary when we have to look at the language of the Constitution to find possible ways to do what Congress and the Senate are supposed to do on their own—take tough votes, look at the tough issues, make tough decisions but, most importantly, do it in the interest of the United States, not in the interest of either party or of some ideology.

Here we are, less than 5 weeks from August 2, the day the U.S. Government will default on its obligations for the first time in its history, and Washington is still playing the same old political game—a dangerous game of chicken—with enormous consequences for our economy and our future in every respect—economic, social, and national security.

I hear this in my travels. Senator MCCAIN and I were in Egypt recently, and we had people turning to us and saying: Hey, how about you guys? Can you get your act together before you are telling everybody else what they ought to be doing with respect to their future?

You are promoting democracy. How is your democracy doing back there in the United States? Working out all right, right now?

Washington is stuck, and it is stuck because we have a few ideologues and some people outside of the U.S. Senate who cower our fellow colleagues with threats of primaries. People are going to run against them if they move off of the orthodoxy of extremism. The result is that nothing is happening. Fear has gripped the Senators who raised their right hand and said: I swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

Well, everyone here I think acknowledges that defaulting on our obligations would be disastrous for our country. Everyone here simultaneously says they don't want the default to happen. But here we are with a small minority holding the debt limit hostage to an ideological agenda, saying they will not consider an approach that most observers consider indispensable and reasonable in reaching an equitable solution to our crisis.

Frankly, the consequences of not doing something are not far off in the future. Every day that we are here not getting this decision made, we are

weakening our economy and we are making our government and, through it, our country look helpless and adrift. The fact is that it is already having consequences with respect to business decisions. Capital is holding back. Businesspeople are reluctant to invest, uncertain of what the budget of the United States is going to look like, uncertain of what kinds of signals we are going to send to the marketplace. Certainty. I keep hearing colleagues say we have to send certainty. But when they look at this chaotic debate, what kind of certainty could any businessperson possibly take from what is not happening in Washington today?

Our friends on the other side of the aisle say they want to create jobs, but Moody's chief economist, Mark Zandi, has said that hiring is only going to resume if we can get our act together and settle this debate, and the sooner, the better. At the beginning of the month, Moody's announced that it might downgrade our country's credit rating if Congress isn't able to come to an agreement by the middle of July. That is a week away. If that happens, I promise you our economic recovery is going to halt in its tracks. Maybe some people want that. I hope not. But today investors are looking at the scene here in Congress, and they are wondering if we are ever going to get it together. And the longer we wait to get serious, the higher the interest rates are going to move. That hurts everyone in America. Everyone who owns a home or runs a small business is going to be squeezed while Congress is in this ideological standoff.

I read David Brooks' column this morning in the *New York Times*, a brilliant column talking about the unreasonableness of taking things off the table in this discussion.

Recently, 235 economists, including 6 Nobel Prize winners, sent a letter to congressional leadership urging them to raise the debt limit immediately. Not doing so, they said, could have a substantial, negative impact on economic growth at a time when the economy looks a bit shaky, and, at worst case, it could push the United States back into recession. So are we going to listen to 235 economists, including 6 Nobel Prize winners, or are we going to be driven by this extremist position that does not allow for reasonable discussion about what ought to be on the table?

I think this is a dangerous and irresponsible moment in our country. Not raising the debt limit would result in a crisis potentially far more severe than the financial crisis of 2008 and 2009. The consequences would include any number of things, from increases in State and local government borrowing costs, increases in corporate borrowing costs, including mortgage interest, declines in equity prices and home values, declines in 401(k)s and other retirement savings, reductions in the willingness of investors here and around the world to invest in the United States, and job losses on a significant scale.

Now, as I have said, I don't believe that is going to happen. But the question is, Are we going to get a deal that hurts America or helps America? If we eat America's seed corn in this deal—by that, I mean don't invest in America's infrastructure, don't invest in education, don't invest in the research and development that is so critical to the creation of new jobs—if all we do is what the other folks in the House said we ought to do by just looking at 12 percent of the budget and cutting spending, if that is all we do, we will eat America's seed corn, and the next generation will pay the price. Without investing in our future, we could face an economic downslide unlike anything we have seen in recent memory.

In 1983, President Reagan wrote:

Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and on the value of the dollar in exchange markets. The Nation can ill afford such a result.

Nearly 30 years later, we are facing that kind of incalculable damage.

The fact is, Chairman Bernanke and Secretary Geithner have already used extraordinary measures to try to keep the Nation from default and keep the economy moving.

Already, Treasury Secretary Geithner has used extraordinary measures to keep our Nation from default. And, these measures have bought us some time to deal with congressional negotiations, but it happens that some Republicans have proven themselves willing to sacrifice our Nation's economy in a misguided attempt to score political points. I know they will protest and say "we're just trying to solve our debt crisis," but the truth is there is more than one way to do that not just their way and particularly not when that way can have disastrous consequences on the economy.

Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke says failing to raise the debt ceiling on time could cause "severe disruptions" in the markets. He said:

We should avoid unnecessary actions or threats that risk shaking the confidence of investors in the ability and willingness of the U.S. government to pay its bills.

As of this moment, no one knows for sure how much time our financial markets will give Congress to come up with a solution before severe disruptions could occur. According to a J.P. Morgan analysis, the delay in raising the debt ceiling is likely to negatively impact markets, as investors undertake risk management actions in preparation for a potential Treasury default.

These effects could include immediate liquidity shortages as borrowers attempt to raise additional cash and increase the tenor of their borrowings, large auction concessions especially if Treasury were to postpone an auction, increases in open volatility that cover the June/July period, and general weaker demand for Treasury securities. As time goes on, failure to raise the debt ceiling could touch off a mini-fi-

ancial panic, perhaps throwing the fragile economy back into recession.

If you don't believe me about moments like this, just look at our history and you don't have to look far. Just look back 3 years to September 2008, when Congress initially voted down Treasury Secretary Paulson's \$700 billion plan to provide assistance to financial institutions. Investor confidence was brutally shaken and the Standard & Poor's 500-stock index plunged 8.8 percent that day.

If we do not act and act very soon indeed those who lend us resources will eventually demand higher interest rates. Government borrowing will crowd out private investment. A larger share of our Federal budget will be devoted to interest payments instead of productive investments like education, national security, and programs for our elderly and most vulnerable. Higher borrowing costs for American households and businesses will discourage future private investment, lowering our capital stock, reducing our economic growth and depressing our standard of living.

Mr. President, this isn't half as complicated as some have chosen to make it. We are not as far apart as this debate would imply. We can all agree that deficits are too high. We can all agree that we shouldn't be borrowing 40 cents on every dollar that we spend. We even agree that we need \$4 trillion in deficit reduction to put us on a sustainable path.

But in the end, this budget debate can't just be about just cutting spending which is all the Republicans have offered. Our future is at stake—literally. Everyone says that job creation and investments in infrastructure, clean energy, and medical research are essential. We need to give the economy the tools to recover. As Ben Bernanke affirmed just the other day, we can't just cut our way to jobs and recovery. The Americans who sent us here understand that and want investment in our future.

I believe there are better choices that we face. This is not half as complicated as some have chosen to make it. In fact, I don't think we are as far apart in this debate, when you talk to a lot of our reasonable colleagues on the other side of the aisle, as some want to imply. Everybody can agree deficits are too high. We can all agree we shouldn't be borrowing 40 cents on every dollar we spend. We can all agree we need about \$4 trillion in deficit reduction to put us on a sustainable path. But in the end, this budget debate cannot be just about cutting spending, even though it must include cutting spending.

Everyone has said that job creation and investments in clean energy, infrastructure, and medical research are essential, and I think we need to do the things that would make our economy move. Let me give an example of this. In America today, we are living off of the investments our parents and our

grandparents made. The Interstate Highway System didn't just sprout up one day; it was a government program investing taxpayer dollars in building a nationwide road system that helped America to grow and be unparalleled in its strength compared to any other nation in the world. That was a President Eisenhower program.

The truth is that today we are falling further and further behind other nations in terms of our investment in the infrastructure of the future. The United States is spending less than 2 percent of its GDP on infrastructure. Compare that. China is spending 9 percent of GDP on infrastructure. Europe is spending 5 percent of GDP on infrastructure. They have trains and airports and other things that work and get people where they want to go faster than our trains.

We are looking at a country now that has about a \$2.2 trillion deficit in the infrastructure of our Nation. We have 69,000-plus bridges that are structurally deficient. We need to invest in them so they don't fall down like the bridge in Minnesota. We need to invest in our airport structures so we don't have airport delays or potential of collisions in our aircraft.

According to one study, \$1 billion in investment in infrastructure results in 18,000 jobs. So at a time when America is begging for more jobs, why would we not be investing in infrastructure in this country? You go to Germany or Brazil, and they are investing huge amounts in their future, and right now both countries are threatening to leave the United States behind with respect to alternative and clean energy investments of the future.

Millions of Americans know we can do a lot better. Frankly, in the 1980s you couldn't find three more ideologically different people than Tip O'Neill, Bob Dole, and Ronald Reagan, but they put politics aside and they saved Social Security. And they didn't capitulate. They compromised. They found common ground. They did it because they knew America's future was more important than either party.

I often hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle only talking about the spending problems of the country.

Madam President, may I ask how much time I have used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 14 minutes.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Chair.

I often hear my colleagues talking about the spending problem. What they forget about is we had a surplus we created in the 1990s by making the tough decisions. We invested in the future of our country, and we created 23 million new jobs. And in the 1990s, when we balanced the budget—let's not forget that. Some of us were here and made those tough votes, and we balanced the budget, and we created 23 million jobs. Every income level in America went up—every single income level—and we did it at a time when the total rela-

tionship of spending-to-GDP was exactly where many of us believe we ought to take it today, somewhere around 21 or 22 percent.

The fact is that it was President Bush's tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans that we couldn't afford and a war that he refused to pay for in Afghanistan and then Iraq—both wars totaling approximately \$2 trillion. The tax cuts and the wars account for approximately \$7 trillion in deficits in 2009 and going forward.

The facts are clear. The tax cuts President Bush put in place contributed to the deficit, and the revenues have to be addressed if we are going to go forward and deal with this. Federal revenues today—the money the government takes in—is at its lowest level since 1950. We have had a 60-percent reduction in revenue and a 60-percent increase in expenditures, and right now we are at the lowest level of revenue taken in that we have been at since the 1950s, and they are only about 14 percent of the total GDP. The fact is that the last five times we balanced the budget, those revenues were about 19 or 20 percent of GDP. So here we are at 14 percent, we have balanced the budget five times previously, and the revenues were at about 19.5 to 20 percent of GDP. Doesn't that tell us something?

There is another problem we have. It is right here on my desk. We have a Tax Code. The Tax Code has 8 volumes, over 72,500 pages. This is the Internal Revenue Code, 4,052 pages. I would ask any American, do you have your own page in this Tax Code? How many Americans have their own page in this Tax Code? Well, I have got news for you: 72,500 entities—a lot of businesses—have found a way to get their little break in the Tax Code.

Last month, the Senate, by a vote of 73 to 27, sent a clear signal that we ought to start looking at some of these subsidies. This entire Tax Code is riddled with special deals which lobbyists have worked against the interests of average Americans in most cases. Let me give you a couple of examples.

Section 168 in this Code has a special rule for racehorse depreciation. How many folks in America are worried about their racehorse today and the depreciation on it? But they have a provision in here that allows the depreciation of racehorses to go from 7 years to 3 years, and the difference of 7 years to 3 years costs the average American money. The average American is supporting that because it is a foregone revenue. We are giving away the revenue, and we are giving it back to somebody who doesn't fundamentally need it.

The Tax Code includes a definition of 3-year property. Get this: any horse other than a racehorse which is more than 12 years old at the time it is placed in service. I mean, who writes this stuff? Where does this come from? Not only is that a waste of taxpayer money, it makes the Tax Code more complex, and it requires more regulations and more confusion.

A lot of tax lawyers love these eight volumes, but the average American ought to be furious at these volumes because these volumes are stealing America's opportunities in a host of other choices we could be making, such as education, investment in energy, energy independence, taking care of our veterans—doing a whole bunch of things that are substitutes for some of the choices that are made.

Let me give a couple of other examples. Here is a provision. It is included in one of the regulations.

On April 2000, E acquires a horse to be used in E thoroughbred racing. On October 1, 2003, F buys the horse from E and will use the horse in F's horse breeding business. The use of the horse by E in its racing business prevents the original use of the horse from commencing with F. Thus F's purchase price of the horse does not qualify for the additional first year depreciation deduction.

How ridiculous can it get that we are getting into specific cases like that which run contrary to the common sense of average Americans? One has to be able to afford a lobbyist to be on one of these pages.

Last year, more than \$3.5 billion was spent on lobbying in Washington, DC. There are more than 13,000 lobbyists trying to influence the legislation in Washington. Believe me, it works. Look at the last 50 years.

Back in 2004 we passed a bill which the New York Times described as including "goodies for almost every kind of corporation" and that "perhaps the most amazing provision might be called the foreign gambler relief act."

Under prior law, if a person is lucky and they win big at the horse or dog track, their winnings are subject to a withholding tax. It is kind of logical. But now foreigners do not have to pay tax on their winnings. They found a lobbyist and they got it in the Tax Code and we passed it somehow.

Section 872 of the Tax Code excludes from gross income, "income derived from wagering transactions in certain parimutuel pools." It specifically says, "gross income derived by a nonresident alien individual from a legal wagering transaction initiated outside the United States in a parimutuel pool with respect to a live horse race or dog race in the United States."

Until I read this I was not absolutely certain what a parimutuel pool was, but I do know a provision like that does not get in here without lobbying. It comes at the expense of a lot of other choices because the problem is all these breaks—whether it is subsidies for oil or subsidies for gas exploration—which made sense 60 and 70 years ago, but here we are with record profits coming into these companies, \$35 billion of profit just for the last quarter, 3 months. Yet they get a break. That break comes at the expense of average folks having the school they deserve, having the road they want to ride on properly, and having decent public transportation. Those are the choices and those are some of the things for which we are fighting.

Not only are lobbyists arguing for tax breaks, highly skilled tax lawyers have a history of finding looping holes for corporations to exploit. We use to have a provision in the Tax Code which was finally eliminated that provided a tax credit for synthetic fuels for coal. I found this process questionable and one company admitted it was profitable just because of this tax credit. Some firms getting this credit were simply spraying newly mined coal with diesel fuel or some other substance. We need to work together to find these type of provisions and remove them.

If there is a loophole, someone will find a way through it. I think we all remember how one oil company was getting a tax credit for co-processing animal fat with biodiesel from biomass. We shut that one down but other loopholes have opened.

Last year, we thought that we had seen the end of the "black liquor boondoggle." Paper mills were using a mixture of diesel fuel and a byproduct of the pulping process as an energy source for the mill. The intended purpose of this credit is to produce motor fuels from biomass. These companies were getting a windfall that was never intended. I am now hearing that some companies are still finding a way to benefit from black liquor. I have also heard that some are trying to benefit from this same credit for alternative fuels by adding cow waste and other waste to diesel fuel. This was not the intended purpose of this provision. In past Congresses, I have introduced line-item veto legislation which included tax benefits. These are abuses that we can all agree to end.

For years, we have been trying to repeal subsidies for major oil companies. Just last month, we failed to eliminate \$2 billion a year in tax incentives for oil companies. These incentives are no longer needed. We needed to jointly review the Tax Code and remove the deadwood. Some subsidies are no longer needed. And some are completely necessary. The Tax Code has become riddled with special interests. Over the past 25 years, Congress has introduced billions of dollars of worth of special tax breaks, loopholes and subsidies into the Tax Code—making total tax expenditures now exceed \$1 trillion.

With the future of our country at stake we have to decide if we want to care for our elderly and educate our children or provide tax breaks for those who do not need them. Would we rather invest infrastructure or allow race horse owners a shorter period to depreciate their horse?

As we consider legislation to increase our debt limit, our colleagues in the minority refuse to even discuss eliminating any of the tax expenditures that these lobbyists have helped enact into law. Not one permanent tax expenditures. I guess they prefer to increase the spending cuts that hurt low and moderate-income families.

I think we need to review the \$1 trillion in expenditures and decide what is

really needed instead of slashing programs which will weaken our economy. It is time for us in Congress to stop falling prey to corporate lobbyists and stand up for our future. To reduce the deficit we need to make hard choices and we should not be afraid of saying "no." If we do not start eliminating tax expenditures, we will not be able to reduce the deficit without gutting Medicare or Medicaid.

We hear a lot about the Ryan budget, but make no mistake: the House passed budget does not eliminate the deficit. It just makes a series of spending cuts to provide tax cuts to those at the very top even greater than the existing 2001/2003 tax cuts.

And Chairman RYAN may call his budget the "Path to Prosperity," but that is not where its path would take our seniors. At least two-thirds of the over \$4 trillion in budget cuts come from programs serving those of modest means. To be clear, the House budget is not about reducing the debt. It is about putting in place Republican priorities—increasing tax cuts for the wealthy and slashing social programs that people depend on.

We should examine all spending and not leave defense spending off the table. For example, we should be cutting programs like the Medium Extended Air Defense System, MEADS, which had a budget request of \$406 million for fiscal year 2012 but the Pentagon said was running over schedule and running over cost. Or the F-22 raptor fighter jet, which in 2009 we were able to cut \$1,750,000,000 in procurement funds of a plane that was costing too much money and wasn't appropriate for the 21st century wars we are engaged in. We should aggressively go after fraud and abuse, eliminate erroneous payments to health providers, and better coordinate health care for people who receive both Medicare and Medicaid. These dual eligible beneficiaries account for only 15 percent of Medicaid enrollment but constitute nearly 40 percent of Medicaid spending.

Instead of digging more ideological trenches, we should look at the last time we actually achieved a path to fiscal stability. The bipartisan 1990 budget agreement included discretionary caps and revenue increases. It was a real compromise that looked at both sides of our budget equation. And in January of 2001, the Congressional Budget Office projected that the debt would be erased by 2006 and that by 2011, there would be a \$2.3 trillion surplus.

Yet somehow, in the years since this real bipartisan success, too many people in this building seem to have forgotten that there are two sides of the budget ledger.

Just look at the balanced budget amendment House and Senate Republican leaders proposed. It caps Federal spending in any fiscal year at a completely unrealistic 18 percent of GDP. It wouldn't just result in unthinkable cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and

Medicaid; it would also impose arbitrary limits on the Federal Government's ability to respond to the recession. So the recession could be deepened by increasing the number of unemployed, decreasing business investment, and withholding services needed to jump-start the economy. And yet this same proposal would require a two-thirds vote to increase revenues, making it nearly impossible to eliminate wasteful tax loopholes or unnecessary tax giveaways.

So let's be realistic. We need to set ourselves on a course to rein in deficits and debt. No one disputes it. To do this, the budget negotiations should include a budget enforcement mechanism—and it can't result in a sequestration of spending only; if a budget enforcement mechanism only focuses on spending cuts, we are only addressing part of the problem. It would slash essential programs while ignoring revenues. That is simply not a responsible long-term budget solution, and it would never get bipartisan support.

For an enforcement mechanism to work, both sides should not want the trigger to occur. We shouldn't be hoping for automatic spending tax cuts or increased revenues. A tough budget enforcement mechanism will force us to make difficult choices, both substantively and politically.

It is time to end the polarization over how to resolve our budget crisis. We can't hide behind global spending caps, unrealistic constitutional amendments, or pledges vowing opposition to tax increases. The cuts that would be required to meet the spending targets of a cap would have to be as drastic as or even worse than proposals included in the House-passed budget resolution.

Spending for Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid are driven by factors beyond the programs' control. Under spending caps, their percentage cuts would be bigger than the percentage cut in discretionary programs and they would be subject to automatic large cuts.

We need to think hard about what is fair in America. The only tax President Obama or we Democrats have talked about is on the wealthiest people. Millionaires. People who earn more than \$1 million a year. That is about 7,000-plus lucky families and individuals in the United States. All we are doing is talking about asking those who benefit enormously from the strength of our economy and the strength of our military and all the things we need to do—we are just asking them is it too much to go from 36.9 percent up to 39.6 percent, which is where they were in the year 2000, before President Bush gave them a tax cut we could not pay for.

It is not as if they have done badly these last 10 years. The fact is, more wealth has been accumulated in the hands of the smallest part of America, the top 1 percent, than at any time in America's history. The wealthy are far wealthier than when we had no income tax and when we had the great names

of the 1920s and 1930s and the industrial revolution: Pierponts, Morgans, Carnegies, Mellons, Rockefellers, and so forth. They are much wealthier today. Yet they are paying far less of their share than at any time in modern history.

Here we are with a deficit problem. They are talking about cutting Medicaid. They are talking about cutting Medicare. They are talking about cutting education loans, making it more expensive for kids to go to college—the one thing we desperately need in order to compete with the rest of the world, people who have a college education. I do not hear anybody in America saying make it harder for my kid to go to college, but that is what they are doing in their budget. That is exactly what they are doing. But they stand up adamantly and say: No way will we allow people earning more than \$1 million a year to pay anything additional into the system. It is just wrong. It is morally wrong. It is repugnant in this country we are condoning the institutionalization of a larger and larger gap between the haves and the have-nots, between the people who have already gotten their brass rings and the people who are trying to reach it. That is not the American story. I believe we need to fight to have a balanced approach.

President Obama and the Democratic proposals I have seen and we have talked about—and I hope people will hear more about in the next days—give a tax cut to about 98 percent of America. The only people we are talking about asking to kick in and give us some more revenue are people earning the most.

If a person is earning \$500,000 a year, they would not pay any additional tax on their first \$250,000. On the next \$250,000 all they would pay is \$12,000 of additional tax. Let me ask—no, I will say I know this. There is not one business person, there is not one millionaire for whom \$12,000 will change one consumer purchase, one decision of investment—not one. All this talk about how it will slow down the economy or hurt America is just bunk. It is not true.

We need to have a real discussion. We need to have a real effort that I think matches the greatness of this institution with this moment. This can be the world's greatest deliberative body, but we need to put all of these issues on the table. We need to debate them openly. We need to have the courage of our convictions and vote up or down and do what is needed to put our country on track because right now we are losing countless investment opportunities, countless job opportunities. If we do not make the right choices we are going to have a very difficult time living up to the promise all of us hope to live up to in our time in this office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 15 minutes to address this body as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, it is well known to all Americans who have observed, and certainly the media and certainly Members of this body, the Congress, that the debt limit talks are bogged down. There has been little if any progress, certainly not any perceptible to the American people. We are in a gridlock, a gridlock that is not favored by many Americans. In fact, I continue to hear from my constituents the call: Why can't you all sit down and work this out? Why can't we not be faced with a shutdown of the government and the loss of the important services that the Federal Government gives to the American people—most of which they have earned and all of which they deserve?

Here we are with the President of the United States demanding that there be tax increases and the Republicans, certainly many of them, are insisting on a balanced budget amendment which cannot pass the Congress of the United States.

On the one hand, President Obama and my friends on the other side of the aisle insist on tax increases and argue somewhat inflammatory and populist issues such as corporate jets, carried interest for private equity, oil and gas. Those are hard to defend.

At the same time it is very clear that the American people spoke and administered what the President of the United States called a "shellacking" last November. They want us to stop mortgaging our children's and our grandchildren's future and get the spending under control. I have yet to meet a constituent who wants their taxes increased.

We are in a gridlock. There will be a meeting tomorrow on the debt crisis again, this time between the President and leaders of Congress. We all hope it will succeed, but it is my view the way to break this gridlock is to agree to certain tax increases and closing loopholes, but only in return for an overall reduction of the corporate tax rate. That way, Republicans can say we have not raised taxes overall, and the administration and the Democrats can say they eliminated loopholes and indeed made the taxation of Americans more fair.

It is time we got serious. The debt, as we all know, is \$50,000 for every man, woman, and child living in America today. That is why we have seen the rise of the Tea Party and the fiscal conservatives. I hope these negotiations can be made visible to the American public by C-SPAN so they can see what is being discussed.

As I said, the debt stands at \$14.5 trillion. We cannot continue to sit idly by while saddling future generations of Americans with the burden. So if we are serious about our commitment to reduce our debt and eliminate the deficit, then Congress needs to start making some serious decisions, and we need to start now.

I would like to remind my colleagues, particularly in light of the impassioned speech I just listened to from my friend from Massachusetts, here is what President Obama's thoughts on the debt limit were in 2006 when he was a Member of this body. I quote him from a speech he made on the floor of this Senate:

The fact we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. It is a sign that the U.S. Government cannot pay its own bills. It is a sign that we now depend on ongoing financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our Government's reckless fiscal policies. . . . Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means that "the buck stops here." Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.

Then-Senator Barack Obama on the floor of this Senate.

I guess it shows on some issues with then-Senator Barack Obama it is not where one stands, it is where one sits. I could not agree more with what then-Senator Obama said in 2006. Americans do deserve better. We are in this mess today because of a serious lack of leadership. It is not the fault of just one of the political parties; it is the fault of both parties. Year after year of uncontrolled spending by both Republicans and Democrats has brought us to the brink of bankruptcy. The point at which we will begin to default on our obligations is now just weeks away, and it is shameful. It should be inconceivable that the greatest Nation in the history of the world should face such crippling debt while its leaders engage in such partisan bickering instead of solving this problem.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the lead editorial in today's Wall Street Journal, which I believe holds the answer to this stalemate.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that today's editorial in the Wall Street Journal entitled "A Debt-Limit Breakout" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 5, 2011]

#### A DEBT-LIMIT BREAKOUT

The debt-limit talks in Washington are bogged down in the hedgerows, with some Republicans insisting on a balanced budget amendment that can't pass Congress and President Obama insisting on tax increases that Republicans oppose. What this debate needs is a breakout strategy—to wit, Republicans should answer Mr. Obama's tax call by accepting his business tax increases in return for a lower corporate tax rate.

We've long favored such a reform, and last year so did the Simpson-Bowles deficit commission and the White House economic advisory council headed by Paul Volcker. But the cause has now acquired no less a convert than Bill Clinton. Speaking Saturday at something called the Aspen Ideas Festival, the former President admitted that he had once raised tax rates on corporations.

"It made sense when I did it. It doesn't make sense anymore. We've got an uncompetitive rate," he said. "We tax at 35% of income, although we only take about 23%. So we should cut the rate to 25%, or whatever's competitive, and eliminate a lot of the deductions so that we still get a fair amount, and there's not so much variance in what the corporations pay."

We opposed Mr. Clinton's tax increases, not least because corporations don't pay taxes so much as they serve as a collecting agent. But on the rest of Mr. Clinton's riff, Milton Friedman and Robert Mundell couldn't have put it better, though perhaps they'd think that 25% is still too high.

We'd prefer 15% ourselves, but Mr. Clinton is exactly right on the failure of the 35% rate (39% on average including the states) to capture that share of corporate income in government revenue. We wrote earlier this year about Whirlpool, which had an effective tax rate of zero due to its many write-offs. Everyone knows the notorious case of GE.

The average effective corporate rate varies by industry but is far less than the 35% rate, and the injustice is that some pay much less than others if they can afford lobbyists to write loopholes or they invest in politically correct purposes. Anyone not in thrall of class-war symbolism understands that the U.S. corporate tax code provides the worst of both worlds: It makes U.S. companies less competitive even as it raises much less revenue than advertised. Mr. Obama and Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner have acknowledged this in the past, the President as recently as this year's State of the Union address.

As for the debt-limit politics, this is also a winner. Democrats and Republicans say they've agreed privately on sizable spending cuts over a 10-year budget window. No doubt some of those cuts are less real than others, and future Congresses could rewrite any enforcement provisions passed this year. But Republicans still have an incentive to set spending on a downward path, and Mr. Obama has an incentive to show he is no longer a hostage of Nancy Pelosi as he runs for re-election.

The political sticking point is Mr. Obama's desire for some Republican buy-in on raising revenues. His political left is still sore that he agreed to extend the Bush tax rates through 2012. Thus he's pounding Republicans to agree to eliminate certain business tax deductions that political advisers David Axelrod and David Plouffe have told him will be hard for Republicans to defend. Corporate jets. Carried interest for private equity. Oil and gas. Even LIFO accounting, which few understand but can be made to sound nefarious.

Whatever their individual merits, each of these would be a tax increase on business, and Republicans campaigned last year on not raising taxes. But the politics is different if they can offset these revenue raisers with lower tax rates. That would let Republicans honestly claim they didn't support a net tax increase, even as Mr. Obama could say he raised revenue.

Our own guess is that such a reform would raise far more money than the official scorers would predict, since it would lead to a more efficient allocation of capital and less tax evasion. This would also promote economic growth, breaking out of the austerity mentality driven by debt reduction. If Mr. Obama really is worried that lower federal spending will hurt the economy, then this tax reform is also his best growth policy.

In offering his grand bargain on Saturday, Mr. Clinton included the caveat of "how can they do that by August 2?" Mr. Geithner says that is the date when he can no longer finagle federal finances to escape a potential

default on the debt, or must at least cut some federal spending, to avoid breaching the \$14.3 trillion debt limit.

But where there's political self-interest there's always a way. Both sides could agree to a short-term debt-limit reprieve of a month or two with some spending cuts that everyone agrees on. That would give them more time to cut a larger deal that includes corporate tax reform.

Think about it. On the current path both sides are headed at best for a de minimis deal that makes everyone look bad, at worst for a major political crack-up. Perhaps Mr. Obama wants a crack-up to portray Republicans as extreme. But Republicans should at least call his bluff and answer his demands for fewer business tax deductions by saying yes—in return for lower tax rates.

Mr. McCAIN. I quote from it:

The debt-limit talks in Washington are bogged down in the hedgerows, with some Republicans insisting on a balanced budget amendment that can't pass Congress and President Obama insisting on tax increases that Republicans oppose. What this debate needs is a breakout strategy—to wit, Republicans should answer Mr. Obama's tax call by accepting his business tax increases in return for a lower corporate tax rate.

The Wall Street Journal goes on to say:

We've long favored such a reform, and last year so did the Simpson-Bowles deficit commission and the White House economic advisory council headed by Paul Volcker. But the cause has now acquired no less a convert than Bill Clinton. Speaking Saturday at something called the Aspen Ideas Festival, the former President admitted that he had once raised tax rates on corporations.

"It made sense when I did it. It doesn't make sense anymore. We've got an uncompetitive rate," he said. "We tax at 35% of income, although we only take about 23%. So we should cut the rate to 25%, or whatever's competitive, and eliminate a lot of the deductions so that we still get a fair amount, and there's not so much variance in what the corporations pay."

The editorial goes on to say:

Anyone not in thrall of class-war symbolism understands that the U.S. corporate tax code provides the worst of both worlds: It makes U.S. companies less competitive even as it raises much less revenue than advertised. Mr. Obama and Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner have acknowledged this in the past, the President as recently as this year's State of the Union address.

As for the debt-limit politics, this is also a winner. Democrats and Republicans say they've agreed privately on sizable spending cuts over a 10-year budget window. No doubt some of those cuts are less real than others, and future Congresses could rewrite any enforcement provisions passed this year. But Republicans still have an incentive to set spending on a downward path, and Mr. Obama has an incentive to show he is no longer a hostage of Nancy Pelosi as he runs for re-election.

The political sticking point is Mr. Obama's desire for some Republican buy-in on raising revenues. His political left is still sore that he agreed to extend the Bush tax rates through 2012. Thus he's pounding Republicans to agree to eliminate certain business tax deductions that political advisers David Axelrod and David Plouffe have told him will be hard for Republicans to defend. Corporate jets. Carried interest for private equity. Oil and gas. Even LIFO accounting, which few understand but can be made to sound nefarious.

Whatever their individual merits, each of those would be a tax increase on business,

and Republicans campaigned last year on not raising taxes. But the politics is different if they can offset these revenue raisers with lower tax rates. That would let Republicans honestly claim they didn't support a net tax increase, even as Mr. Obama could say he raised revenue.

Our own guess is that such a reform would raise far more money than the official scorers would predict, since it would lead to a more efficient allocation of capital and less tax evasion. This would also promote economic growth, breaking out of the austerity mentality driven by debt reduction. If Mr. Obama really is worried that lower federal spending will hurt the economy, then this tax reform is also his best growth policy.

The Journal argues that we can offset the costs to businesses of closing loopholes and eliminating subsidies with a cut in the corporate tax rate. I completely agree. We should be open-minded when considering what should be eliminated. For instance, the distorting effect of subsidies is clearly evident in the energy sector. We should eliminate these subsidies, lower the corporate tax rate, and allow the marketplace to pick winners and losers, not the government.

The ethanol tax is a perfect example. This year the ethanol tax credit cost taxpayers almost \$6 billion in addition to the \$41.2 billion we have already spent in subsidies on ethanol since 1980.

A recent CRS, Congressional Research Service, report indicates that tax credits and subsidies for solar, wind, and geothermal power will cost \$8.6 billion from 2008 to 2012. For the oil and gas industry, the eight tax breaks recommended for elimination by President Obama would eliminate \$43.6 billion in spending over 10 years. The largest among these tax breaks is the section 199 manufacturing tax subsidies that will cost approximately \$18 billion over 10 years. We should eliminate the section 199 tax subsidies for all industries to avoid arbitrarily picking winners and losers. Why should we value manufacturing over other service providers?

Additionally, we should eliminate all agricultural subsidies, including sugar programs, end corporate welfare, and end tax breaks for corporations for things such as corporate jets. We need to put aside the rhetoric of corporate jets, which is just a poll-tested political phrase concocted behind one-way mirrors. Everyone knows eliminating all tax breaks on corporate jets would not amount to any real progress, but if we seriously looked at curbing corporate subsidies, such as the ethanol subsidy I just mentioned, then all Americans would benefit.

I feel the need to provide my colleagues with some straight talk. As the Journal notes, some of my Republican colleagues are "insisting on a balanced budget amendment that can't pass Congress." Let me be clear—I am an avid supporter of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. Since 1983, I have introduced or cosponsored more than a dozen bills or amendments calling for a balanced budget amendment, and I have had the privilege of

voting in favor of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution no less than 13 times in my Congressional career. I applaud my colleagues for their tireless dedication to this cause. But our reality today dictates that we do not have the votes in this body to enact such a measure. Perhaps that will change after next year. I hope so. But for our purposes today, in order to avoid what could be disastrous consequences for our markets, our economy as a whole, and our standing in the world, I encourage my colleagues to lay aside, at least temporarily, their insistence that amending the Constitution be a condition of their support for a solution to this terrible problem.

The Wall Street Journal editorial ends with this:

Think about it. On the current path both sides are headed at best for a de minimis deal that makes everyone look bad, at worst for a major political crack-up. Perhaps Mr. Obama wants a crack-up to portray Republicans as extreme.

As my colleague from Massachusetts just did.

But Republicans should at least call his bluff and answer his demands for fewer business tax deductions by saying yes—in return for lower tax rates.

I couldn't agree more with the Wall Street Journal. This debate desperately needs a breakout strategy. I am pleased to see that President Clinton has joined the Wall Street Journal in embracing a commonsense solution to this problem. I hope President Obama will follow former President Clinton's lead and the example set by the great Ronald Reagan and put aside politics, work with the Congress on this matter, and accept a compromise that will allow us to responsibly deal with our debt while creating jobs and spurring economic growth.

I would like to point out again:

The average effective corporate rate varies by industry but is far less than the 35 percent rate, and the injustice is that some pay much less than others if they can afford lobbyists to write loopholes or they invest in politically correct purposes. Anyone not in thrall of class-war symbolism understands that the U.S. corporate tax code provides the worst of both worlds: It makes U.S. companies less competitive even as it raises much less revenue than advertised.

So the fact is, the corporate Tax Code needs to be reformed anyway, and we need to cut it to 25 percent. It is either the first or the second highest tax rate in the world. Yet somehow major corporations such as Whirlpool and GE end up paying no taxes, but yet small businesspeople who can't afford a lobbyist here in Washington end up paying the 35-percent rates if they are incorporated. It is time we tell the American people who are frustrated by our lack of leadership, by our failure to come together. It is time to end the rhetoric, fulfill the commitment we made to the American people last November who resoundingly sent the message that they want the spending cut and the mortgaging of our children's future stopped. This is a reasonable

proposal that I believe, with spending cuts, can be a breakthrough that we can proudly return to our constituents and say we are taking care of them, not the special interests and not hide-bound ideology.

I yield the floor.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the debate of the previous order be extended until 7 p.m., with all the provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent I be able to speak for 15 minutes as in morning business and that Senator COONS be allowed to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, I believe we may be in a situation where we are exchanging speeches one side and the other. May I withdraw my unanimous consent request for Senator COONS?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The consent is vitiated.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, I came to the floor to deliver a speech on the debt ceiling and all the activity surrounding the need to increase our debt ceiling, but I took the time to listen to Senator MCCAIN while I was here, and I have to say I agree with Senator MCCAIN. We need a breakout strategy. We need cooler heads to prevail, and I think many, if not all, of us can agree our tax system is overly complex. It ought to be simplified. We ought to lower rates. We ought to end the loopholes and the subsidies and the deductions and let the free market reign. I look forward to working with the Senator from Arizona as we, hopefully—and hope sometimes is a strategy—but we get a broad agreement, we go big. We deal with our debt, we strengthen our entitlement programs, we reduce spending, and find ways to generate more revenues.

I thank the Senator from Arizona for his comments.

I rise, as I just implied, because I think the fiscal challenges that confront us demand a bipartisan solution. Both parties approach the issues before us from very different points of view, but time is truly running out on our Nation's structural deficits and our long-term debt and the need for us to address those. I want leaders in both parties to show genuine commitment to action. How about if we set aside our talking points so we can get some work done. If any other Members believe the solution to our deficit and debt demands comprehensive and bipartisan solution such as the fiscal commission or the Gang of 6, I would invite them to come down to the floor and let our colleagues know we are clearly racing to-

ward a crisis that seems like we can't let go of the partisanship and the political posturing that creates gridlock in the Capital City of Washington. It sure strikes me as childish. I think it strikes many Americans and Coloradans as that way as well.

We are more broadly having this debate because the time is upon us to decide the economic future of our country. Yes, we have to raise the national debt, but this is about our economic future, and this is the country we inherited by our children and grandchildren. Quite simply, we are not going to win the global economic race of this 21st century unless we start taking action now to improve our economy, grow American jobs, and get our debt under control. With these challenges, as large as they are facing us, this is the time to set aside our political differences and challenge ourselves to put our country first.

A few basic facts focus the attention. Our national debt is \$14 trillion and it is growing. Today, each citizen's share of that debt is over \$46,000 per individual. If we remain on this path, which is irresponsible, there is no question about that. The Government Accountability Office projects that by 2050, our Nation could owe more interest on our debt than the Federal Government raises in taxes in a given year, and our sky-rocketing debt is not only spooking international markets, but it is a serious threat to our national security. Listen to Secretary of Defense Gates or Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Admiral Mullen, they will make that point in a compelling fashion. Look, we got here in ways that are not simple. But unquestionably two unpaid-for wars, two rounds of massive tax cuts, unpaid-for prescription drug benefits, and drastic rescue measures needed to address the most serious economic downturn since the Great Depression have all contributed to the current situation.

The solutions are even more difficult. While we may disagree about the path forward, I think we all know in our hearts that we cannot get to a solution unless we all agree to come to the negotiating table willing to compromise to ensure that our country, the United States—the largest economy in the world—can honor our bills and begin to pay down our debts. That is the challenge, that is the problem, that is the opportunity, as I see it, that brings us to the Senate floor today.

We began this year with serious and, I believe, earnest conversations about this in not one but two groups of lawmakers in the House and Senate. Yet, despite all the talk and a lot of hard work, rather than nearing an agreement, we seem to be coming to an impasse. In the last few weeks, the state of negotiations seems to have fallen apart, with key players choosing to walk away rather than compromise. We hit the same roadblock that always inhibits action when things get tough: Politics get in the way.

In fact, it seems as if everybody in the world except the Congress seems to know time is running out. Think back to April. Standard & Poor's cut the U.S. ratings outlook to "negative" due to the uncertainty over budget deficits and the debt ceiling. This month, Moody's piled on, warning that it too may downgrade the U.S. ratings outlook to "negative" as early as July—it is July 6—because of concern over gridlock in Washington.

I have to say the American people are running out of patience as well. Back home in Colorado, people are wondering what in the world we are doing in Washington. I was not up for reelection in 2010, but I was listening to what the voters were saying. They clearly said to us they want us focused on jobs, the economy, and the debt. And they want us to work together.

Consider the direction I got recently from Curt, who is a constituent in Arvada, CO. He wrote:

I am counting on you to put the interests of everyday Americans above party politics and join your legislative colleagues on both sides of the aisle in finding sensible solutions to our long-term national debt problem.

Many more Coloradans have sent me similar messages. I got one from a Boy Scout, David, in Evergreen, CO, whose words were stronger than mine. He said:

I think the United States government should stop spending unnecessary money. We should first focus on what is necessary. . . . It is amazing how much money our country owes. It is constantly going up! I just looked at information about the United States debt clock, and I think this debt is way too high. People in the federal government in Washington D.C., are spending money as if they had all the money in the world.

David, if you are listening, I agree.

No question, Americans want quality roads, a safety net for the sick and elderly, and strong investments in education and research that will spur innovation and good-paying jobs. But we need to commit to ensuring we have the financial stability to pay for them.

For too long, the American people have collectively been told by us here in Washington that they can have more of everything they want without us fully paying for it. But to preserve a promising future for our children—for Curt's children, for David—we are going to need to face up to some hard truths.

Fifty years ago, my father, former Arizona Congressman Mo Udall, supported what should only seem natural: tying spending directly to revenues. Let me give you a couple examples. If we want to give oil companies \$1 billion in tax subsidies, then let's raise taxes by \$1 billion to pay for them. The same thing, though, goes for overseas conflicts, agricultural subsidies, infrastructure, and, yes, even entitlements.

Coloradans from across my home State have told me they want to see their leaders try using some common sense—the kind of common sense Americans use when they are faced with the hard job of balancing their own budgets when money is tight.

As a Senator, I have successfully led the fight to end wasteful earmark spending, proposed measures to cut redundant government programs, demanded line-item veto authority for the President, and, yes, pushed—and I see my colleagues from the other side of the aisle here—for a very sensible balanced budget amendment to our U.S. Constitution. But these measures only serve as tools to get Washington to clean up its act, and that is not enough. We need to suck up our courage and actually make the tough budgeting decisions.

If we are going to get anywhere, we have to realize we all have skin in the game and we have to check ultimatums at the door—especially on issues such as Social Security and taxes. The challenge facing us is so great we cannot afford to let partisanship or electioneering get in the way—and both parties are guilty.

For example, we cannot seriously address debt reduction without looking at Social Security. If we do nothing, by 2036, Social Security benefits will have to be cut by 20 percent. Congress will undoubtedly be under enormous pressure to fill in that hole in lieu of telling seniors their benefit checks would be reduced. To say Social Security—when you look at it that way—must be divorced from deficit reduction, as many Democrats do, is to ignore the problem.

In a similar vein, it is unrealistic to maintain, as my Republican colleagues do, that raising revenues cannot be a part of the deficit and debt reduction equation. We should all be honest enough to admit a simple fact: No amount of spending cuts alone will reduce our deficits without unreasonably harming Social Security and Medicare. For some to say that revenues should not be part of the deficit reduction picture is either a sign that they are not serious about getting our debt situation under control or they are being disingenuous about the dangerous implications spending cuts alone would have on our hard-working constituents who rely on these important programs.

What is so agonizing about the last 6 months is that we have a bipartisan solution in front of us, one that I know—I don't just believe but I know—would responsibly reduce our debt while also allowing the economy to grow and protect our middle class.

In December 2009, I know the Presiding Officer and I, along with a number of other Senators, pushed for the creation of the President's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, which was then chaired by Erskine Bowles, a North Carolinian, and Alan Simpson, a Wyoming resident. They did an exhaustive study of what it would take to get our debt under control, and last year they delivered a report on how to reduce the debt by over \$4 trillion in the next decade and bend the curve back to a much more sustainable Federal budget situation. They comprehensively addressed

all of the issues that must be on the table; namely, spending cuts, reasonable entitlement reform, and some new revenues. The plan has already received bipartisan support, including from Senators of each party who were members of the commission. Rather than arguing, we could be acting on these recommendations. And, look, if we do not want to follow those exact recommendations, let's all at least agree that everything must be on the table in these ongoing debt discussions.

Many of us here simply want to roll up our sleeves and get to work. I see some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I know they share that sentiment, even if our leaderships in both parties are demanding that we be quiet. But I think we can all focus our attention on a sensible, bipartisan plan, work together, and pass it into law before our national credit rating is downgraded and we damage our chances of winning the global economic race.

The Presiding Officer knows, my colleagues know, I am not a particularly dramatic person. But I have to tell you, I believe that nothing less than the fate of the U.S. economy hangs in the balance, and I am certainly willing to stay here day and night, weekends and holidays, in Washington, DC, to help put a plan in motion.

Madam President, thank you for your attention.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I rise to follow the comments of my colleague from Colorado, and I appreciate the forbearance of my colleagues from Florida and New Hampshire.

I simply want to follow on the comments of the Senator from Colorado in emphasizing the sense of urgency, the sense of frustration and of deep concern I know many of us feel in the Senate of the United States.

On the Fourth of July, as I went up and down the State of Delaware to different parades and picnics and gatherings, I had the opportunity to meet with and talk to thousands of Delawareans. Over and over, I would go up to men who were wearing hats that showed they served, whether in the Korean war, the Vietnam war, the Second World War, and I thanked them for their service. Repeatedly, I would hear the same thing back: We have done our job. We hope you will do yours.

When I was elected in 2010 to serve in the Senate, I heard the same message from the folks across Delaware that I just heard Senator UDALL reflect from the people of Colorado: Help the private sector create good jobs, deal with the deficit and debt, and do it in a bipartisan and responsible way.

I am gravely concerned we are on the verge of the most predictable financial crisis in modern American history as we slowly grind toward the predicted default on America's mortgage on August 2.



Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner has warned us since the beginning of this year with a letter he sent to us on January 6, with repeated testimony in front of various committees of the Senate. We have gone well past the May 16 deadline, and the Department of the Treasury is now using extraordinary measures to prevent us from defaulting on America's commitments.

I have heard other analogies used, but they are mistaken. This is not about cutting up the credit cards or ending the blank check for our current President. This is about whether we will continue to meet the commitments America has already made, whether we will continue to make the payments that were already committed to for our troops in the field, for contractors who are providing military supplies and equipment, for our Federal workforce, and for all the different programs and benefits the Senator who spoke before me mentioned: Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and others.

We cannot afford the consequences of default. One study says we would lose 640,000 jobs—more than a half a million additional Americans needlessly thrown out of work because of a foolish game of chicken. The cost to home mortgages, to car loans, the daily cost of living, including for food and gas, would go up needlessly if we simply fail to uphold the tradition of meeting our commitments as a nation.

I am here to say today that we cannot afford to have America become a bad investment. The best thing we can do going forward is to restore certainty to our markets, to put some confidence back in the American economy, to make certain the international community continues to regard us as the safest and best investment in the world. The way to do that is to come together in a bipartisan way around a big deal, around \$4 trillion in savings, at least.

The Senator from Colorado went into some detail as to the bipartisan Debt and Deficit Commission, chaired by Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson, the Democratic former Chief of Staff and the Republican former Senator from Wyoming, with the 11 members of that commission, including Members of this body, currently serving Senators, Republican and Democrat, who came together around a plan that would make \$4 trillion in savings over the next decade.

I think we should do no less than that. I think the plan we should be working on in detail now should include all four major areas where we have to have savings: reductions in discretionary domestic spending, reform to our entitlement programs, reductions in Pentagon spending, and increases in Federal revenue through tax reform. All four of these have to be on the table. In my view, our values ask no less than that.

As we work through a recovery, we need to continue to invest in education, in infrastructure, in innova-

tion. But we also need to responsibly put together a bipartisan path that will take on the sacred cows of this institution and of America's Tax Code.

Three weeks ago, we had more than 70 Senators cast votes to end the \$6 billion in needless annual ethanol subsidies. I hope that was an opening door toward a recognition that on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers of this Congress we need to be willing to make the tough votes even though they will upset treasured constituencies, even though they will end up causing us potential political harm, to reduce reckless Federal spending, whether through the Tax Code or through unsustainable Federal programs.

In the end, I simply wanted to come to the floor today and add my voice to that of many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are expressing our grave concern. As the clock ticks away and as the hours left to August 2 shrink, we need to come together.

What Americans have done for generations is sacrificed. What legislators need to do now is compromise. There are in front of us reasonable, solid, bipartisan proposals that have been available to us since March and that this body and our leadership need to be willing to make responsible compromises to make happen.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE.) The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to enter into a colloquy with my Republican colleague Senator RUBIO for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, it is an honor to be here with my esteemed colleague from Florida, Senator MARCO RUBIO. My husband Joe and I are blessed to be the parents of two wonderful children, our daughter Kate, who is 6 years old, and our son Jacob, who is 3 years old.

This Fourth of July we walked together as a family in the parade in Wolfeboro, NH. As I watched my children in the parade hand out candy to other New Hampshire children while they were standing with their parents, it reminded me again of why I am here and how concerned I am about the future of our country for Kate and Jacob and for all of our children.

As parents, we all want to provide our children with a brighter and at least the same if not greater opportunities we have all had in the greatest country on Earth. That is the American dream, that a young woman like me from a middle-class family can have the opportunity to serve in this Chamber; that someone like Senator RUBIO, the son of Cuban immigrants, could serve as a Senator from Florida, a leader of our great country who has come here to address our challenges.

I am fearful that we are the first generation that will not pass on the Amer-

ican dream to the next generation. With the accumulation of \$14 trillion in debt, we are borrowing 40 cents on the dollar to fund our government. Half of our debt we have borrowed from other countries, including the country of China, a country that does not share our values. I am concerned with the amount of debt we have accumulated, that if we do not address this debt crisis right here and now, we are ensuring our children will have less opportunities than we have all had.

We have seen what is happening in Greece. If we do not address our debt, with real, substantive legislative proposals, ideas we have already proposed in this Chamber, Members of both side of the aisle—the balanced budget amendment, spending cap legislation, how about a real budget resolution that reduces spending and puts forth a responsible fiscal plan for this country—we will be setting up our children to pay for our failure to act today with either massive tax increases or the value of our dollar will be diminished and everything they own will be worth less and everything that we own, and it will diminish their economic opportunities in this great country.

I know Senator RUBIO is the father of four young children. What is it the Senator is most concerned about with respect to the future of our great country?

Mr. RUBIO. Well, first I want to thank the Senator from New Hampshire for allowing me the opportunity to do this together because it is important. She brings a tremendous amount of credibility to this discussion. She is not just a mother and a Senator, but she is also a small business owner who has run a small business, been there on the front lines with her husband running a small business, who recently got off the campaign trail, as I did, and heard from job creators all across the State as to what they are talking about, and we are going to get back to that in a moment.

But as the Senator rightfully outlined, I am the father of four young children, four children whom I think deserve to inherit a country that is as great as the one my parents and their generation left us, and that is what we are debating here at the end of the day.

If you look at the numbers, they are absolutely startling. I think these numbers have been said before, but you cannot say them enough—\$14.3 trillion of debt. Trillion is not a number or a figure I have ever used in my life until I got to Washington. I do not know where else in the world that applies other than in the Congress, the term trillion—\$14.3 trillion is our debt.

Our kids already owe \$46,000. My oldest is only 11 and already owes \$46,000. Our total debt is about to reach the size of our entire economy. That is kind of the framework in which we are operating when we discuss this.

I actually think we are closer to some sort of an agreement than a lot of people realize. I have heard the term

thrown around in the last couple of days, “a balanced approach” to dealing with it. And I think there is agreement that there has to be a balanced approach. I certainly have always said you cannot simply cut your way out of this problem. You have to have a combination of cuts and growth, growth in revenues to government. I think the debate is—the debate is—how do you accomplish these two things. I am not going to focus so much on the cut part of it today. I want to focus on the revenue part of it, because that is the part the President and some of my colleagues here have focused on over the last days, this idea of getting more revenue, or this new term “revenue enhancers” which is Washington talk for more money to the government.

According to the President, for some in his party—most in his party, I should say—the idea is simple. They think there is a bunch of people out there in America who are making a lot of money, more money than maybe they should be making, and they need to pay more in taxes; if these people pay more in taxes, then all of these problems will get a lot easier to deal with. That is kind of the viewpoint they bring to this debate.

I know tomorrow we will be voting here on the floor on something the majority leader has offered, something called a sense of the Senate, which people watching at home are probably wondering what that is about. Well, that basically means what is on the Senate’s mind.

The sense of the Senate we are going to be voting on tomorrow is basically that you have a bunch of people in this country who make over \$1 million, and that these people need to do more to help with the debt. That is basically the sense of the Senate that there is going to be a vote on tomorrow. It is very interesting. So I looked at it, because ultimately this is a serious issue. So let’s explore this with an open mind. Let’s not be doctrinaire. Let’s not be blindly ideological. Let’s look at this from a commonsense perspective, this idea that if all of these millionaires and billionaires paid more taxes, these problems will be solved. Let’s analyze it, because this is all about math.

Here is the fact. The fact is it does not solve the problem. First of all, if you taxed these people at 100 percent—basically next year you said: Look, every penny you make next year the government is going to take from you—it still does not solve the debt.

Not only does that not solve the debt problem, but I looked at a host of other—there are some great publications that came out today from the Joint Economic Committee. Our colleague Senator DEMINT is the chairman. It kind of outlines some of the tax increases being proposed by our colleagues in the Democratic Party and the President to solve the debt problem.

You add them all up, you add all of these things up—the jet airplanes, the

oil companies, all the other things they have talked about. You put them all together in one big batch, and you know what it does? It basically deals with 9 days and 23 hours worth of deficit spending—9 days and 23 hours—it does not even get to 10 days of deficit spending. That is how much it solves.

So all of this talk about going after people who make all of this money, it buys you 9 days and 23 hours. Let’s round it off. Let’s give them the benefit of the doubt. It buys them 10 days of deficit spending reduction. That is what all of this rounds up to.

Here is the bottom line. These tax increases they are talking about, these so-called revenue enhancers, do not solve the problem. So what do we do then? Because clearly we have to do two things. One, we have to hold the line on spending. If you keep digging yourself in the hole, the hole is going to bury you. But the other thing is, how do you start generating revenue for government so it can start paying down this debt. That is what the debate should be about.

We already know these taxes they are talking do not work. So here is what works. Here is what I would suggest works, in a balanced approach—using the President’s terminology. Let’s stop talking about new taxes and start talking about creating new taxpayers, which basically means jobs.

Here in Washington, this debt is the No. 1 issue on everyone’s mind, and rightfully so. It is a major issue. But everywhere else in the real world, the No. 1 issue on people’s minds is jobs. And I will tell you every other problem facing America—the mortgage crisis, home foreclosure crisis, this debt problem—all of these issues get easier to deal with as people are gainfully employed across America. The impact that unemployment is having across this country is devastating. We hear about unemployment in facts and figures. They give us numbers: Oh, X percent people are unemployed. Well, there are stories behind every one of those people.

Do you know who a lot of these people are who are unemployed in America? They are people who have done everything they have been asked to do and they have done it right. Maybe they served their country overseas. Maybe they went to college and got a degree and now came back home. Maybe they worked for 10 or 20 years and did a good job at work. And now you know what, they cannot find a job, or maybe they were lucky enough to find a job after losing their original job, but it pays them half as much and they work twice as long. That is the real face of unemployment in America, of people who are hurting.

Our job here is to do everything we can to make it easier for them to find a job, not harder. I think that is what we have to do when it comes to a balanced approach and when we talk about revenue. We do not need new taxes. We need new taxpayers, people

who are gainfully employed making money and paying into the tax system. Then we need a government that has the discipline to take that additional revenue and use to it pay down the debt and never grow it again. That is what we should be focused on. That is what we are not focused on.

So you look at all of those taxes that are being proposed. Here is what I say: I say we should analyze every single one of them through the lens of job creation, issue No. 1 in America. I want to know which one of these taxes they are proposing will create jobs. I want to know how many jobs are going to be created by the plane tax. How many jobs are going to be created by the oil company tax that I heard so much about? How many jobs are created by going after the millionaires and billionaires that the President talked about? I want to know how many jobs do they create.

Because I will tell you—and I am going to turn it over to Senator AYOTTE in a second, because I am interested in her perspective of this as a job creator, as a spouse of a job creator who runs a small business, as someone like me who just came off the campaign trail.

Let me tell you something. I traveled the State of Florida for 2 years campaigning. I have never met a job creator who told me they were waiting for the next tax increase before they started growing their business. I never met a single job creator who has ever said to me: I cannot wait until government raises taxes again so I can go out and create a job. I am curious to know if they say that in New Hampshire, because they do not say that in Florida.

So my view on all this is, I want to know how many jobs these tax increases the President proposes will create, because if they are not creating jobs and they are not creating new taxpayers, they are not solving the problem.

I do not know what the Senator’s perspective is on that.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I could not agree more with what my colleague from Florida has said, that we need to create a positive climate to create jobs. But one thing we do know is that does not happen by more spending in Washington. The recent report that came out about the President’s stimulus package has shown that it cost \$278,000 per job created by that stimulus package. Yet we had to borrow so much money, nearly \$1 trillion to create a limited number of jobs that cost us \$278,000 a job.

I do come from a small business family. My husband started a landscaping and snow-plowing business. I worked with him to start that business. New Hampshire is a small business State. As I campaigned up and down our State, I talked to so many small business owners. I never had a small business owner tell me they were being taxed too little, please tax me more.

What I did hear was too many burdensome regulations from Washington

were coming down and making it difficult for our small businesses to thrive and grow. Frankly, some of the taxes coming down from Washington were making it difficult. In the health care bill, there was a tax on medical device companies. New Hampshire has nearly 50 of those companies. And what I heard from those companies—and I have heard that even more recently—is the tax in that health care bill on medical device companies is going to take away significant amounts of their research and development budget to create new products that will improve the quality of our health care and save lives.

So with the actions we are taking in Washington, we need to create a positive climate for our small businesses, not thinking that we create the jobs here in Washington. We know that it is those small businesses and the hard-working entrepreneurs and those who have a great idea in this country in the private sector who create those jobs. They do not need more taxes and burdens from Washington. What we need to do is frankly get out of their way and allow them to thrive and grow and to create jobs for all of our children going forward.

I do not know if the Senator heard from businesses in Florida about the regulatory concerns and burdens from Washington hurting economic growth in the private sector.

Mr. RUBIO. Well, the truth is that throughout the campaign and even now, that is what I hear all of the time from people, that these regulations are making it harder, not easier, for them to create jobs. That, combined with the uncertainty of the Tax Code—they do not know what the taxes are going to be next year. But they read the newspaper, they listen to the news, and every time they hear talk about this tax increase stuff, it scares job creators. They make this decision: Oh, wait. You know what, maybe this is not the year to hire people, because we still do not know how much it is going to cost to hire people.

The other great phrase here—both Senator AYOTTE and I have only been here a few months so I think we are still learning the language of Washington; I hope it never becomes part of my permanent vocabulary, but one of the things I have been hearing recently is this notion of everything should be on the table, which is funny because everything is not on the table according to the President and others.

For example, there is no serious discussion of a spending cap. I would love to have a vote. Why do we not have a vote on the balanced budget amendment? Why is that not on the table? Why is a balanced budget amendment not on the table? Why are we not voting on that tomorrow? Because a balanced budget amendment basically says you cannot spend money you do not have, which makes all of the sense in the world for the rest of the people who live in the real world. But, appar-

ently, that doesn't apply here, and the results are these problems we face. I think something should be off the table. Bad ideas should be off the table. If something is a bad idea, it should not be on the table. It is a bad idea to pass things that will make it harder to hire people. How much higher do you want unemployment to be?

Here is what I think we have to ask ourselves: These tax increases Senator AYOTTE pointed out, along with the regulations that kill job creation in America—these do not raise enough money to do anything significant about the debt. They don't create jobs; in fact, they kill them. How could the tax increases they are outlining be part of the solution? Why is it being offered? These are smart people. They know the math. The answer lies in the politics of this, which is clear.

This appears to be an effort to save face. Everybody here knows there will have to be spending reductions at some level because we have a spending problem. It is the reason we are in this mess today. It is not because we don't pay enough taxes. We spend more money—a lot more money—than we have.

It appears to me that the President and others in his party are positioning and looking for some pound of flesh in return for these cuts so they can go to their political base and say: We got something out of this. We went after the people who make all this money—the greedy billionaires and millionaires and the oil companies—even though it has nothing to do with the debt.

That is the only explanation for why this is even on the table. I think anything that kills jobs should be off the table. I think anything that hurts the ability of the job creators to grow their business should be off the table. I think anything that helps increase the unemployment rate should be off the table. I think that is what should be off the table—anything that hurts our ability to grow our economy.

Things that force this government, once and for all, to put itself back on the path of sanity should be on the table. Sanity means we stop having a government that spends money it doesn't have.

I will turn it back over to Senator AYOTTE to close. I thank her for this opportunity. I thought it was important to bring these points to the floor.

Ms. AYOTTE. I thank Senator RUBIO for his leadership on this issue and for the important issues he has raised today because he is absolutely right that class warfare is unproductive.

The proposals the President has made are not serious in terms of how much revenue they would even address—not even 10 days' of our debt. Unfortunately, right now, the leader of the Senate has brought forward a resolution, a nonbinding sense of the Senate, that does nothing to address the spending in Washington, and we are spending over 24 percent of our GDP, or our economy, right now. Historically,

we have spent about 20 percent of our GDP. Our spending is way out of line from where we have been over the 40-year historical level. Common sense tells us, why not a balanced budget amendment? Why aren't we addressing that instead of a nonbinding resolution that, again, will have no effect—will not reduce our deficit, will not help create any jobs, and will not help our economy thrive? We should be addressing real legislation—a balanced budget amendment.

I could not agree more with my colleague from Florida about living within our means. Families sit around their kitchen tables and make the tough decisions. They see the revenue coming in and the expenditures going out. Washington should do the same. Spending caps will ensure that we put handcuffs on Congress to make sure we are not spending this drastic 24 percent of our GDP and putting ourselves on a more responsible spending path going forward, and a budget resolution.

It has been nearly 2 years since the Senate has passed a budget. No business would run without a budget. Families make budgets. Here in the Senate, what we should be bringing to the floor is a real budget resolution that the parties can debate to put ourselves on a responsible fiscal path going forward rather than voting on a sense of the Senate that will, again, not have any impact and the full force of law.

With this August 2 deadline, it is time for real legislative proposals and solutions. We have put some ideas out there—a balanced budget amendment, a spending cap amendment, a real budget resolution. I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will come forward so we can work on this fiscal crisis here and now so that my children and Senator RUBIO's children and all of our children and grandchildren will have greater opportunities in the greatest country on Earth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, there is no question that we are at a point where we have to take substantial and painful steps to get our Nation's fiscal house in order. That is why we are rightfully working to tighten our Nation's belt at a time when American families are doing the same.

I am here to talk about one major difference in the way Republicans have proposed to go about addressing our budget and the way American families, who understand shared sacrifice and equal burden, have done it. I will point out one glaring omission in the Republicans' plan amid all their tough talk about fiscal responsibility.

I am here to ask Republicans why they are asking everyone to sacrifice except those who can afford it the most?

I am here to ask them why they are willing to risk not only defaulting on our Nation's debt but also the health care and benefits our veterans rely on,

pay for our troops, Social Security benefits, and the Medicare system our seniors are counting on—all to defend tax breaks for oil and gas companies, sweetheart deals for corporations, and the most generous tax rates wealthy Americans have enjoyed in 60 years.

Sometimes it is hard for me to listen to some of my Republican colleagues talk at length about their newfound fiscal sensibilities on the Senate floor and in the press. It is difficult because, like many of them, I was here in 2000. I remember when President Clinton left office. We were on a course to completely pay down the \$5.6 trillion debt by 2012. I remember the projection of surpluses. I remember the efforts by many of us to safeguard that funding for our seniors and to pay down that debt. But I can also remember at that time many Republicans could not wait to get their hands on the Nation's credit card. When they did—when President Bush took office—they spent lavishly.

A lot of that spending went to some of our Nation's wealthiest individuals and companies. Throughout the Bush years—and particularly in the Bush tax cuts of 2001 and 2003—trillions of dollars in tax breaks went to the very wealthiest Americans.

There were capital gains tax rollbacks, tax breaks designed to benefit corporate giants, and a new tax bracket that provided wealthy Americans the lowest tax rates they have enjoyed since World War II. These tax breaks were all unpaid for, all handed out to those who could most afford to pay, and they were all put on the Nation's credit card.

Now that that credit card bill has come due, guess who will not be asked to pay their fair share? Unfortunately, under the Republican plan, it is the wealthy companies and individuals who have benefited the most from their spending. It is corporations such as ExxonMobil that despite reporting a profit of over \$10 billion in the first quarter of this year—at the same time, by the way, that gas prices for families across this country are rising—they are being protected from a rollback of tax subsidies for oil and gas giants.

It is corporate CEOs who are lobbying against closing the tax loophole that they enjoy for private jets and yachts. It is companies that all too often ship American jobs overseas but still enjoy offshore tax havens.

Guess who has drawn a line in the sand to protect these corporations and wealthy individuals? It is the very same Republicans who were so quick to break out the Nation's credit card when we were running a surplus, the same Republicans who have repeatedly pledged to block any new revenue—even as we have met them far beyond halfway in these negotiations.

Finally, guess who it is who is left to pick up the credit card tab under the Republican plan? Unfortunately, it is everybody else. It is seniors who, under the Republican budget, will lose access to Medicare as we know it; it is stu-

dents who will be asked to pay more even as tuition rises; it is family farmers and those who can't afford health care for their children; it is the middle-class families who have found themselves living paycheck to paycheck.

If Republicans get their way, it will be everybody but those who can afford it most who will be left to sacrifice alone.

Unfortunately, the Republican approach is something that has become all too common in the aftermath of this recession.

While the effect of this recession is being felt profoundly by working families in lost jobs, lower wages, and less financial security than ever before, the very wealthiest Americans seem to be doing pretty darn fine.

On Sunday I picked up the New York Times and noticed they ran an article that showed that the salaries of CEOs at America's largest companies grew by an average of 23 percent over last year's mark. However, the same article noted that over the past year, the pay for average workers had declined. It didn't even mention the thousands of layoffs at the same companies where those bonuses have skyrocketed.

Unfortunately, that is the same economic theory that Republicans are bringing to the budget negotiations. For those who can't afford it, their budget provides all the perks, none of the sacrifices; all of the tax breaks, none of the revenues; all of the benefits, none of the pain.

It doesn't have to be this way. We can have a plan that works for middle-class families and invests in our Nation's future, a plan that balances tough but necessary spending cuts with new revenues that ensure corporations and wealthy Americans are also paying their fair share; that restores fairness to this process by making sure that in these difficult times we are not balancing our budget solely on the backs of seniors and students and middle-class families; and, most importantly, a plan that recognizes that, yes, we have a budget deficit and we need to address that, but we also have an infrastructure deficit, and we have an education and a skills deficit and, most importantly, we have a jobs deficit.

The only way that we will address those deficits is to invest in education, energy, and infrastructure—areas that will produce jobs both now and in the future.

Workers who lost their jobs through no fault of their own don't just want to hear about cuts, cuts, cuts. They want to hear about how we are going to create jobs. A small business owner who had to shut her doors when the recession hit and customers stopped coming in doesn't want to hear about debt ceilings. She wants to hear about how we are going to get the economy back on track.

It cannot just be about slashing; it also has to be about investing in jobs and workers in America. That is what we should be working together toward.

I understand that time is not on our side in this debate. The truth is, Republicans aren't merely offering their "everybody pays except the rich" philosophy up for debate; they are holding our Nation's economy hostage with it.

By refusing to accept new revenues from corporate tax loopholes and tying that refusal to the Nation's debt limit, they are rolling the dice on default. In fact, in my 18 years on the Senate Budget Committee, I have never seen anything like what Republicans are willing to risk in these budget negotiations and who they are willing to risk it all for.

Last week, the Bipartisan Policy Center put out a report authored by a former Bush Treasury official about what would happen if Republicans continued to play chicken with default and the administration was forced to make desperate spending decisions in August. The scenarios were worse than grim.

Potentially at risk are the benefits and health care we owe our veterans, loans for struggling small businesses, food stamps for people who are struggling to buy groceries, Social Security checks for our seniors, unemployment benefits for millions of workers who are desperately seeking jobs, and even Active-Duty pay for our military. Yet by rejecting revenues in this deal, and by not asking everybody to sacrifice, and by dealing in ultimatums rather than compromise, Republicans are willing to put all these Americans at risk; and they are willing to risk it all in order to go to the mat to protect millions of dollars in tax breaks for the wealthiest few.

They are willing to chance loans for Main Street businesses in order to defend offshore tax breaks for multinational companies. They are willing to jeopardize troop pay in order to stand up for hedge fund managers. They are willing to gamble default on tax breaks for horse tracks.

I believe that is a bet we all lose.

Mr. President, we were elected to work for all Americans, not just the privileged few at the top. It is time for our Republican colleagues to come to the table with flexibility. It is time for compromise. It is time for common sense. And it is time to ask everyone to sacrifice to meet a challenge we all face together.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I have heard a lot of talk on the Senate floor, including from the last speaker, and certainly from the President of the United States about shared sacrifice. The White House spin is that the Democrats in the negotiations about extending the debt ceiling have conceded hundreds of billions of dollars in savings and Republicans have conceded nothing and therefore Republicans need to be willing to raise taxes. That is the mantra. That is the spin.

But there are two things wrong with this spin: First, it is wrong as a matter

of fact, as I will point out, and second, it would result in very bad policy. As Senator RUBIO said a moment ago, the only thing that should be off the table is bad policy, and certainly anything that would hurt our economy and job creation at this time is bad policy.

First with regard to the assertion from some in the White House that Democrats have made all the concessions and so it is the Republicans' turn—the last speaker, as a matter of fact, said, and I will quote her directly, “Everybody pays except the rich.” Well, I would like to point out why that is absolutely not the case.

The negotiations Vice President BIDEN has presided over have talked about two different kinds of savings: on the discretionary side, which is the budget we deal with every year, and on the mandatory side, which is spending programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, some of TRICARE, some veterans' benefits, Social Security, and things of that sort.

If the savings the White House has attempted to portray as all coming from Democratic concessions refers to the discretionary part of this pie, then I would simply say that is a false statement because we haven't discussed it. What we have talked about is setting a top-line budget number—a so-called 302(a) number in budget parlance—and that is what the Members of the House and Senate would then have to spend. But there has been no discussion of where those savings come from, so it simply would be wrong to say there has been any kind of negotiation about where those savings come from and the Democrats have made all of the concessions. There have been no concessions made by either side, as a matter of fact.

If it is the mandatory side we are talking about, it is true we have had a lot of discussion about savings that can result from changes in the way we operate some of these mandatory programs. Now, we are not talking about any major reform of Medicare or anything of that sort, but if I can just sort of characterize something in a very loose way as waste, fraud, and abuse, there are a lot of savings that can occur in various programs, and there are even some revenue increases that can result from increased fees and that sort of thing that do result in some additional savings overall on the mandatory side.

In terms of the revenue increases, I would point out that between \$153 billion and over \$200 billion of the money on that side of the ledger actually comes from increased revenues. So when the White House says: Well, revenues have to be on the table, the fact is that revenues have been on the table. We have been talking about increased revenues. We are not talking about increasing taxes. But if the government sells something and gets money from it, that is revenue. If there is a user fee of some kind and we want to raise that to keep up with the times, that is rev-

enue. And if you add up all of the revenues we have agreed to, we Republicans have agreed to between \$150 billion and \$200 billion. So it is simply false to suggest that we haven't been willing to talk about revenues and that all of the concessions have been on the Democratic side.

We have also had some spending reductions or less rate in the growth of spending in some of these mandatory programs on the table for discussion, and about 60 percent of those, in my calculation, are concessions Republicans have made, and about 40 percent are concessions Democrats have made. My Democratic counterparts would probably argue it is somewhat different, from their point of view, but the fact is both sides have made concessions. And even if you concede they are 50-50, the fact is, therefore, Republicans have made as many concessions in these negotiations as have our Democratic colleagues.

By the way, one reason we have both been willing to make concessions is we agree we are in a dire circumstance here, and we sometimes have to get out of what we call our comfort zone and agree to what in ordinary times we would never agree to but we realize now we have to make some changes. So we are willing to make concessions that ordinarily we wouldn't, and we have, and so have the Democrats. The net result, as I said, I think it is 60-40 on our side, plus all the revenues we have conceded. But if somebody on the other side said: No, it is 50-50, or something on that order, I wouldn't argue. But the fact is, it is false and misleading for the White House to suggest that all of the concessions have been made by the Democrats and none have been made by Republicans. That is simply factually incorrect.

The second thing that is wrong with this spin is that, as Senator RUBIO said, bad ideas should be off the table, and it is a bad idea to raise taxes on an economy that is already sick. I mean, the last thing we should be doing is raising taxes, as a result of which job creation would be inhibited. It is the worst medicine for a sick economy.

I asked one of my Democratic colleagues why, since we shouldn't be raising taxes at this point in time, there was such an insistence on his side. His response was: Well, you have to understand, with us, it is kind of theological. Well, maybe it is theological, but I would argue that ideology here has a place to the extent that it is backed up by reality, but ideology that is not backed up by reality has no place in these negotiations. And raising taxes just for the sake of raising taxes, so that somebody can say to their constituency: Well, we did it, we were able to raise taxes, is not a sound way to approach the problem.

Thomas Sowell, one of the most erudite observers of the American scene, wrote, in *National Review Online* on July 5, a piece he titled “Politics vs. Reality.” It goes to this point.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this article at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KYL. The whole point here about raising taxes is this should not be about shared sacrifice. It shouldn't be about sacrifice at all. We are not talking about austerity. We should be talking about prosperity—in other words, the conditions by which everyone can do well, and specifically, how we can create jobs, how we can put Americans back to work, and how our economy can grow.

As I said, the worst medicine for a sick economy is raising taxes, and that is why Republicans oppose tax hikes and not because, for example, I have some interest in protecting some Hollywood movie millionaire. I don't. The person is probably not in my political party. What I have an interest in is protecting America's small businesses so they do not go broke and so they do not have to close up shop because higher taxes were imposed on them. That is exactly what the President's own Small Business Administration Office of Advocacy said would happen with one of the taxes they propose to raise; that is, repealing LIFO, which is an accounting term meaning last in, first out. The SBA Office of Advocacy said repealing LIFO “would result in a tax increase for small businesses that could ultimately force many small businesses to close.” That is from the President's own Office of Advocacy for the SBA. That is what I oppose—putting small businesses out of business just because of some theological attachment to raising taxes.

Accountants have talked for a long time about what the best method of accounting is. The IRS has always said LIFO is perfectly acceptable, and about 36 percent of American businesses—primarily retailers and manufacturers—use this accounting technique. It would be fine if we decide to say: Well, we are going to go to a different technique. What would be wrong is to retroactively impose a tax on people who have been using this accounting method as though they have been doing something wrong. They haven't. The IRS has always said LIFO is fine. But it is all about revenue. We need more money to spend, so we are going to retroactively tax 36 percent of American businesses that use this accounting method. That is wrong, and that is why the Small Business Administration Office of Advocacy has said this could put many small businesses out of business. It is why we shouldn't be considering it.

What are the other taxes they propose? Well, one of them is to cap itemized deductions, so you would only be able to deduct either 28 percent or maybe up to 35 percent of your income. Obviously the first effect of this is to make it much more difficult for Americans to contribute to charity, to buy

homes because they wouldn't have the advantage of the mortgage interest deduction, or to pay medical expenses, and so on. As the Wall Street Journal has editorialized, this is just a backdoor way of raising marginal tax rates without actually appearing to do so.

But the biggest problem with this capping of deductions is not that it is going to hurt the millionaires. They are either going to be caught by the AMT or their income is so high they are even going to be paying above AMT rates notwithstanding these limits on deductions. The real people this hurts are the small business owners who pay in the higher bracket. We know that 50 percent of small business income falls in the top two brackets. Businesses have deductions that are the ordinary and necessary part of doing business. All businesses are allowed to take them, both corporate and noncorporate. Why would we eliminate the ability of small businesses to take the same kinds of deductions corporations can take by capping the amount of deductions that could be taken in income reported in the top two brackets?

The final point about this is we know that efforts to tax millionaires and billionaires always end up taxing a lot more people than that. According to the IRS, in 2008 there were only about 319,000 tax returns that showed an income of \$1 million or more, but the number of returns falling in the top two brackets—the ones affected by this proposal of the Democrats—numbered more than 3.6 million people. These would be the people who are affected by this proposed increase in taxes.

I would just parenthetically note two others. The last millionaire tax was the alternative minimum tax. It was created in 1969 and targeted against 155 millionaires. Guess how many people it will apply to this year. It will apply to 34.4 million Americans. So when you aim for the millionaires, you end up getting everybody else.

The third tax the Democrats talk about raising is the old favorite: Big Oil. This is so targeted, it only hits five companies in the whole world, five American companies. Never mind that we are punishing American businesses—American oil companies—that are in the same business as other companies all over the world that are not being punished. No, we are going to attack American businesses that, by the way, employ 9.2 million Americans. We are going to say they have to pay higher taxes than other businesses just like them.

There are three particular tax provisions.

Other businesses get to take an R&D tax credit—research and development. Aren't we all for research and development? Yes, but not in the oil and gas industry. And where might they put that research and development money? Well, for example, into ensuring that when they sink a well deep in the Gulf of Mexico, it will be environmentally safe. Nope, you can't deduct that. All

other businesses will be able to but not you. What sense does that make? It is bad policy.

How about the usual and necessary business expense, the deduction for writeoffs for business investment? All other companies get to deduct that, but we would say to the oil companies: You don't get that same deduction.

Perhaps most perniciously, we are trying to compete with foreign businesses, so we would say to Americans who earn income abroad: You can deduct against the taxes you would owe here the taxes you pay over there. All of the other world nations get to do that. They would take that away from these particular kinds of companies.

So this is discriminatory, it is job killing but, most of all, it impacts American consumers directly because every dollar of increased taxes is going to find its way into the price we pay at the gas station when we buy gas. Now, whom does that hurt, therefore? Does it hurt some millionaires and billionaires? Who owns the oil companies? Well, a lot of pensions do, a lot of retired teachers and firefighters and so on.

People have to think this through. You are not hitting millionaires and billionaires. I know it sounds like good rhetoric, but when you are hitting American businesses that try to compete around the world and that develop a product we would like not to have to pay four bucks a gallon for, the last thing you want to do is to play politics by saying: Well, for those particular folks, we are going to raise their taxes.

I remember the last time we raised taxes on another millionaire kind of outfit, the yachts. It was a luxury tax that we opposed back in 1990, and it seemed like a good idea, just like this tax they were talking about imposing on airplanes. They didn't actually talk about that in our meeting, so I don't know exactly what it is. But they say it would raise \$3 billion over 10 years, which pays for hardly a fraction of the \$14 trillion debt we have. Nonetheless, they want to go after private airplanes.

I don't know how many people work in the private airplane manufacturing business. But it was interesting that in 1990 when the luxury boat tax was passed, there were 7,600 jobs lost in the boating industry. Very quickly the people who made the boats, a lot of them up in Massachusetts, decided this wasn't such a hot idea and so they repealed the tax in 1993. By the way, it lost revenue because of the unemployment benefits and lost income tax revenue had to be developed in order to offset the loss in business.

The point of all of this is that when the administration and others talk about shared sacrifice, of making some kind of rich business or rich person pay taxes, you have to think through what the effect is on the American economy and on job creation. The reason Republicans oppose these is not because we love the person who pays the tax so much as we wish for American jobs to

be created, or at least not have more jobs lost. And the people who are proposing these tax cuts seem to be absolutely oblivious to the effect their proposals would have on hard-working Americans.

My colleague from Washington State a moment ago said, and I will quote her again: Everybody pays except the rich under Republicans' idea of how things ought to be.

I think I pointed out that is not true. But in case anybody needs a reminder of who pays income taxes in the country: The top 1 percent pays 38 percent of all income taxes. The top 10 percent pays 70 percent. The bottom 40 percent pays no personal income tax.

So is it true that everybody pays except the rich? No. The rich pay by far and away most of the taxes paid in this country, and a lot of people believe that is as it should be. We have a progressive system. The rich can afford to pay more, and so we expect more from them. But let's not demagog the issue and suggest that isn't true. It is true. The rich do pay more, and we have decided in this country that they should. But how much more do you want them to pay? Ninety percent? Ninety-five percent? How about 100 percent? How much revenue do you think we could get from somebody if we said he is going to have to pay 100 percent of what he earns in income taxes? We know there are two rates at which you generate exactly zero revenue: zero and 100.

So when we talk about shared sacrifice, let's put this into perspective and let's realize we are not talking about sacrifice in the sense of trying to hurt people or austerity so much as we are talking about prosperity. And you don't create more prosperity with job-killing taxes.

I want to add one other thing for the record here. There are two publications that note areas in which we could save hundreds of billions of dollars if we were willing to discuss them. When we talk about things that are on the table or off the table, here are two things our Democratic friends have said are not on the table: We will not talk about fraud in the unemployment insurance system or fraud in Medicare and Medicaid. According to these two articles, which I will ask to be put in the RECORD, there are tens of billions of dollars in each where we could save the taxpayers money, money that is being paid out now to either downright crooks or being paid inappropriately to people who don't qualify.

Since 1986, the GAO has published at least 158 reports about Medicare and Medicaid fraud, for example. In 1993, Attorney General Janet Reno declared health care fraud America's No. 2 crime problem, right behind violent crime. These are off the table, some of our Democratic friends say. Well, we think this is a way in which we can save money without requiring others to have to sacrifice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the

piece by Michael Cannon in the National Review On Line dated July 4, and the piece by Paul Davidson from USA Today dated July 5 at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. KYL. I appreciate my colleagues' indulgence here.

Mr. President, the bottom line is that when we talk about shared sacrifice, we need to appreciate that in the negotiations that have been occurring Republicans have made a lot of concessions, and that the reason we oppose the concession of raising taxes is not because we have some ideological attachment to somebody who makes a lot of money but, rather, because we have an ideological attachment to the American worker who needs a job or who needs his or her job protected. From what we understand, the taxes that have been proposed by our Democratic colleagues would all be job killers. At the time our economy is in the unhealthy state it is, the worst medicine is job-killing taxes.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I would be happy to yield. I am also happy to conclude. I think we are rotating between Democrat and Republican.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I don't want to step on your colleagues' time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. One of the things I have been tracking is the share of wealth, income, and taxes at various percentages toward the top. The Senator was good enough to mention that the top 1 percent pays about 28 percent of the taxes, the top 5 percent pays a little over 44 percent of the taxes, and the top 10 percent pays 55.4 percent of the taxes.

But I think in order to get a complete picture, it is also important to note that the top 1 percent controls 24 percent of the income, the top 5 percent controls 39 percent of the income, and the top 10 percent controls 50 percent of the income. If you go to wealth, the top 1 percent controls 33.8 percent of the wealth, the top 5 percent controls 60.4 percent of the wealth, and the top 10 percent controls 71.5 percent of the Nation's wealth.

So if you are in the top 10 percent and you control 71.5 percent of the Nation's wealth, it doesn't seem to be unreasonable that you should be paying 55 percent of the Nation's taxes, particularly if you are taxing based on dollars and not on just number of people.

I don't know if those numbers are wrong. We got them from the Federal Reserve Board, from the IRS, and from the Congressional Budget Office. I think they are accurate. It would appear to show that at the very high end, although these individuals are paying considerable taxes toward our Nation's

economy, they are paying considerably less than the amount of wealth they control and not much more than the amount of income they control. In a graduated system of progressive taxation, which we are supposed to have, that is not surprising. In fact, what is surprising is that the top 24 percent of the income only pays 28.3 of the taxes.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I am not sure where the question is in there. But what I would say in response is, with all due respect to my colleague, his numbers are absolutely wrong. I don't have at my fingertips the precise figures, but I can tell you this—by the way, I don't also know what you mean by "in charge of wealth." In terms of who owns wealth or income, the people in the upper brackets pay far more in taxes than the percentage of wealth as a percent of the economy, and I would be happy to supply those figures to my colleague. And there is a difference between income taxes and all other taxes as well, and that chart doesn't suggest which is which.

I would be happy, though, to demonstrate to my colleague that whether you are talking about income taxes or all taxes, the upper income level pays far and away the higher percentage than those in the lower portion, and in taxes they pay more than the percentage of wealth that they create or that they earn.

The bottom line is that I think anybody making the argument that there is not shared contribution to the revenues of the country by the upper income would be making a false argument. I know that is not the argument my colleague is making, because he agrees with the progressive income tax system and has pointed out that it is progressive even by the numbers you have.

But let's do this, because I respect my colleague. I will get the numbers I rely upon, you get the numbers you think you rely upon and the sources of each, and you and I can agree to come to the floor at an appropriate time convenient to us both, and then we can both have the data at our fingertips from which we can make our respective arguments.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I would be delighted to do that. And I might actually throw in the data from the IRS that shows that the top 400 income earners in the country in the most recent period that they have actually gone back and done the calculation paid 18.2 percent total taxes, which is less than I think the average American, certainly the average middle-class American family pays. So there is this reversal at the high end where people actually end up paying less.

Indeed, in one building in New York, the payment for the most recent year was 14.7 percent from the occupants, whereas janitors and doormen and security guards are paying up in the 20-percent ranges. It is not progressive in that sense. It is regressive at the high ends, according to those things. So

let's get the information together, and we will have that discussion.

Mr. KYL. Sure. And on that last point, it makes a larger point. When Congress tries to get the millionaires and the billionaires, those are the very people who can adjust their way of earning and of giving and of living so that they end up paying less in taxes. That is why it doesn't much matter what the rate of taxes is at the upper income. They are never going to pay more than a certain percentage, because they can afford the lawyers and the accountants to make sure that they don't pay more. It is the people in the middle income who can't do that, and they end up paying up what the IRS says they owe, and they can't adjust their way of living and giving in order to pay less in the way of taxes. Whatever deductions they get, they get, and they are going to have to live with those.

When we try to hit the upper income with higher rates, it generally doesn't work. That is another reason why we think it is an ineffective way.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. That is why I think the loopholes need to be closed, and I thank the distinguished Senator for the colloquy.

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From the National Review Online, July 5, 2011]

#### POLITICS VS. REALITY

(By Thomas Sowell)

It is hard to understand politics if you are hung up on reality. Politicians leave reality to others. What matters in politics is what you can get the voters to believe, whether it bears any resemblance to reality or not.

Not only among politicians, but also among much of the media, and even among some of the public, the quest is not for truth about reality but for talking points that fit a vision or advance an agenda. Some seem to see it as a personal contest about who is best at fencing with words.

The current controversy over whether to deal with our massive national debt by cutting spending, or whether instead to raise tax rates on "the rich," is a classic example of talking points versus reality.

Most of those who favor simply raising tax rates on "the rich"—or who say that we cannot afford to allow the Bush "tax cuts for the rich" to continue—show not the slightest interest in the history of what has actually happened when tax rates were raised to high levels on "the rich," as compared with what has actually happened when there have been "tax cuts for the rich."

As far as such people are concerned, those questions have already been settled by their talking points. Why confuse the issue by digging into empirical evidence about what has actually happened when one policy or the other was followed?

The political battles about whether to have high tax rates on people in high income brackets or to instead have "tax cuts for the rich" have been fought out in at least four different administrations in the 20th century—under Presidents Calvin Coolidge, John F. Kennedy, Ronald Reagan, and George W. Bush.

The empirical facts are there, but they mean nothing if people don't look at them, and instead rely on talking points.

The first time this political battle was fought, during the Coolidge administration,

the tax-cutters won. The data show that “the rich” supplied less tax revenue to the government when the top income tax rate was 73 percent in 1921 than they supplied after the income tax rate was reduced to 24 percent in 1925.

Because high tax rates can easily be avoided, both then and now, “the rich” were much less affected by high tax rates than was the economy and the people who were looking for jobs. After the Coolidge tax cuts, the increased economic activity led to unemployment rates that ranged from a high of 4.2 percent to a low of 1.8 percent.

But that is only a fact about reality—and, for many, reality lacks the appeal of talking points.

The same preference for talking points, and the same lack of interest in digging into the facts about realities, prevails today in discussions of whether to have a government-controlled medical system.

Since there are various countries, such as Canada and Britain, that have the kind of government-controlled medical systems that some Americans advocate, you might think that there would be great interest in the quality of medical care in these countries.

The data are readily available as to how many weeks or months people have to wait to see a primary-care physician in such countries, and how many additional weeks or months they have to wait after they are referred to a surgeon or other specialist. There are data on how often their governments allow patients to receive the latest pharmaceutical drugs, as compared with how often Americans use such advanced medications.

But supporters of government medical care show virtually no interest in such realities. Their big talking point is that the life expectancy in the United States is not as long as in those other countries. End of discussion, as far as they are concerned.

They have no interest in the reality that medical care has much less effect on death rates from homicide, obesity, and narcotics addiction than it has on death rates from cancer or other conditions that doctors can do something about. Americans survive various cancers better than people anywhere else. Americans also get to see doctors much sooner for medical treatment in general.

Talking points trump reality in political discussions of many other issues, from gun control to rent control. Reality simply does not have the pizzazz of clever talking points.

#### EXHIBIT 2

[From the National Review Online, July 4, 2011]

#### ENTITLEMENT BANDITS

(By Michael F. Cannon)

The budget blueprint crafted by Paul Ryan, passed by the House of Representatives, and voted down by the Senate would essentially give Medicare enrollees a voucher to purchase private coverage, and would change the federal government’s contribution to each state’s Medicaid program from an unlimited “matching” grant to a fixed “block” grant. These reforms deserve to come back from defeat, because the only alternatives for saving Medicare or Medicaid would either dramatically raise tax rates or have the government ration care to the elderly and disabled. What may be less widely appreciated, however, is that the Ryan proposal is our only hope of reducing the crushing levels of fraud in Medicare and Medicaid.

The three most salient characteristics of Medicare and Medicaid fraud are: It’s brazen, it’s ubiquitous, and it’s other people’s money, so nobody cares.

Consider some of the fraud schemes discovered in recent years. In Brooklyn, a dentist billed taxpayers for nearly 1,000 procedures

in a single day. A Houston doctor with a criminal record took her Medicare billings from zero to \$11.6 million in one year; federal agents shut down her clinic but did not charge her with a crime. A high-school dropout, armed with only a laptop computer, submitted more than 140,000 bogus Medicare claims, collecting \$105 million. A health plan settled a Medicaid-fraud case in Florida for \$138 million. The giant hospital chain Columbia/HCA paid \$1.7 billion in fines and pled guilty to more than a dozen felonies related to bribing doctors to help it tap Medicare funds and exaggerating the amount of care delivered to Medicare patients. In New York, Medicaid spending on the human-growth hormone Serostim leapt from \$7 million to \$50 million in 2001; but it turned out that drug traffickers were getting the drug prescribed as a treatment for AIDS wasting syndrome, then selling it to bodybuilders. And a study of ten states uncovered \$27 million in Medicare payments to dead patients.

These anecdotes barely scratch the surface. Judging by official estimates, Medicare and Medicaid lose at least \$87 billion per year to fraudulent and otherwise improper payments, and about 10.5 percent of Medicare spending and 8.4 percent of Medicaid spending was improper in 2009. Fraud experts say the official numbers are too low. “Loss rates due to fraud and abuse could be 10 percent, or 20 percent, or even 30 percent in some segments,” explained Malcolm Sparrow, a mathematician, Harvard professor, and former police inspector, in congressional testimony. “The overpayment-rate studies the government has relied on . . . have been sadly lacking in rigor, and have therefore produced comfortingly low and quite misleading estimates.” In 2005, the New York Times reported that “James Mehmet, who retired in 2001 as chief state investigator of Medicaid fraud and abuse in New York City, said he and his colleagues believed that at least 10 percent of state Medicaid dollars were spent on fraudulent claims, while 20 or 30 percent more were siphoned off by what they termed abuse, meaning unnecessary spending that might not be criminal.” And even these experts ignore other, perfectly legal ways of exploiting Medicare and Medicaid, such as when a senior hides and otherwise adjusts his finances so as to appear eligible for Medicaid, or when a state abuses the fact that the federal government matches state Medicaid outlays.

Government watchdogs are well aware of the problem. Every year since 1990, the U.S. Government Accountability Office has released a list of federal programs it considers at a high risk for fraud. Medicare appeared on the very first list and has remained there for 22 straight years. Medicaid assumed its perch eight years ago.

How can there possibly be so much fraud in Medicare and Medicaid that even the “comfortingly low” estimates have ten zeros? How can this much fraud persist decade after decade? How can it be that no one has even tried to measure the problem accurately, much less take it seriously? The answers are in the nature of the beast. Medicare and Medicaid, the two great pillars of Pres. Lyndon Johnson’s “Great Society” agenda, are monuments to the left-wing ideals of coerced charity and centralized economic planning. The staggering levels of fraud in these programs can be explained by the fact that the politicians, bureaucrats, patients, and health-care providers who administer and participate in them are spending other people’s money—and nobody spends other people’s money as carefully as he spends his own. What’s more, Medicare and Medicaid are spending other people’s money in vast quantities. Medicare, for example, is the largest purchaser of medical goods and serv-

ices in the world. It will spend \$572 billion in 2011. Each year, it pays 1.2 billion claims to 1.2 million health-care providers on behalf of 47 million enrollees.

For providers, Medicare is like an ATM: So long as they punch in the right numbers, out comes the cash. To get an idea of the potential for fraud, imagine 1.2 million providers punching 1,000 codes each into their own personal ATMs. Now imagine trying to monitor all those ATMs.

For example, if a medical-equipment supplier punches in a code for a power wheelchair, how can the government be sure the company didn’t actually provide a manual wheelchair and pocket the difference? About \$400 million of the aforementioned fines paid by Columbia/HCA hospitals were for a similar practice, known as “upcoding.”

And how does the government know that providers are withdrawing no more than the law allows? Medicaid sets the prices it pays for prescription drugs based on the “average wholesale price.” But as the Congressional Budget Office has explained, the average wholesale price “is based on information provided by the manufacturers. Like the sticker price on a car, it is a price that few purchasers actually pay.” Pharmaceutical companies often inflate the average wholesale price so they can charge Medicaid more. Teva Pharmaceuticals recently paid \$27 million to settle allegations that it had overcharged Florida’s Medicaid program by inflating its average wholesale prices, and the Department of Justice has accused Wyeth of doing the same. Merck recently settled a similar case.

Most ominously, how does the government know that people punching numbers into the ATMs are health-care providers at all? In his testimony, Malcolm Sparrow explained how a hypothetical criminal can make a quick million: “In order to bill Medicare, Billy doesn’t need to see any patients. He only needs a computer, some billing software to help match diagnoses to procedures, and some lists. He buys on the black market lists of Medicare or Medicaid patient IDs.” With this information in hand, Billy strides right up to the ATM, or several at a time, and starts punching in numbers. “The rule for criminals is simple: If you want to steal from Medicare, or Medicaid, or any other health-care-insurance program, learn to bill your lies correctly. Then, for the most part, your claims will be paid in full and on time, without a hiccup, by a computer, and with no human involvement at all.” These schemes are sophisticated, so Billy might hire people within Medicare and at his bank to help him avoid detection.

Last year, the feds indicted 44 members of an Armenian crime syndicate for operating a sprawling Medicare-fraud scheme. The syndicate had set up 118 phony clinics and billed Medicare for \$35 million. They transferred at least some of their booty overseas. Who knows what LBJ’s Great Society is funding?

And there are other forms of fraud. An entire cottage industry of elder-law attorneys has emerged, for instance, to help well-to-do seniors appear poor on paper so that Medicaid will pay their nursing-home bills. Medicaid even encourages the elderly to get sham divorces for the same reason. It’s all perfectly legal. It’s still fraud.

Medicaid’s matching-grant system also invites fraud. When a high-income state such as New York spends an additional dollar on its Medicaid program, it receives a matching dollar from the federal government—that is, from taxpayers in other states. Low-income states can receive as much as \$3 for every additional dollar they devote to Medicaid, and without limit. If they’re clever, states can get this money without putting any of their own on the line. In a “provider tax” scam, a



state passes a law to increase Medicaid payments to hospitals, which triggers matching money from the federal government. Yet in the very same law, the state increases taxes on hospitals. If the tax recoups the state's original outlay, the state has obtained new federal Medicaid funds at no cost. If the tax recoups more than the original outlay, the state can use federal Medicaid dollars to pay for bridges to nowhere. As Vermont began preparations for its Obamacare-sanctioned single-payer system this year, it used a provider-tax scam to bilk taxpayers in other states out of \$5.2 million. In his book *Stop Paying the Crooks*, consultant Jim Frogue chronicles more than half a dozen ways that states game Medicaid's matching-grant system to defraud the federal government.

Since 1986, the GAO has published at least 158 reports about Medicare and Medicaid fraud, and there have been similar reports by the HHS inspector general and other government agencies. In 1993, Attorney General Janet Reno declared health-care fraud America's No 2 crime problem, after violent crime. Since then, Congress has enacted 194 pages of statutes to combat fraud in these programs, and countless pages of regulations.

Yet federal and state anti-fraud efforts remain uniformly lame. Medicare does almost nothing to detect or fight fraud until the fraudulent payments are already out the door, a strategy experts deride as "pay and chase." Even then, Medicare reviews fewer than 5 percent of all claims filed. Congress doesn't integrate Medicare's myriad databases, which might help prevent fraud, nor does it regularly review the efficacy of most of the anti-fraud spending it authorizes. Many of the abuses noted above, such as those of the Brooklyn dentist, were discovered not by the government but by curious reporters poking through Medicaid records. The amateurs at the New York Times found "numerous indications of [Medicaid] fraud and abuse that the state had never looked into," but "only a thin, overburdened security force standing between [New York's] enormous program and the unending attempts to steal from it."

The federal government's approach to fraud is sometimes so inept as to be counterproductive. Sparrow testified that a defect in the strategy of Billy, our hypothetical criminal, is that he doesn't know which providers and patients on his stolen lists are "dead, deported, or incarcerated." But Medicare's anti-fraud protocols help him solve this problem. When Medicare catches those claims, it sends Billy a notice that they have been rejected. "From Billy's viewpoint," Sparrow explained, "life could not be better. Medicare helps him 'scrub' his lists, making his fake billing scam more robust and less detectable over time; and meanwhile Medicare pays all his other claims without blinking an eye or becoming the least bit suspicious."

Efforts to prevent fraud typically fail because they impose costs on legitimate beneficiaries and providers, who, as voters and campaign donors respectively, have immense sway over politicians. At a recent congressional hearing, the Department of Health and Human Services' deputy inspector general, Gerald T. Roy, recommended that Congress beef up efforts to prevent illegitimate providers and suppliers from enrolling in Medicare. But even if Congress took Roy's advice, it would rescind the new requirements in a heartbeat when legitimate doctors—who are already threatening to leave Medicare over its low payment rates—threatened to bolt because of the additional administrative costs (paperwork, site visits, etc.).

Politicians routinely subvert anti-fraud measures to protect their constituents.

When the federal government began poking around a Buffalo school district that billed Medicaid for speech therapy for 4,434 kids, the New York Times reported, "the Justice Department suspended its civil inquiry after complaints from Senator Charles E. Schumer, Democrat of New York, and other politicians." Medicare officials, no doubt expressing a sentiment shared by members of Congress, admit they avoid aggressive anti-fraud measures that might reduce access to treatment for seniors.

It's not just the politicians. The Legal Aid Society is pushing back against a federal lawsuit charging that New York City over-billed Medicaid. Even conservatives fight anti-fraud measures, albeit in the name of preventing frivolous litigation, when they oppose expanding whistle-blower lawsuits, where private citizens who help the government win a case get to keep some of the penalty.

Sparrow argued that when Medicare receives "obviously implausible claims," such as from a dead doctor, "the system should bite back. . . . A proper fraud response would do whatever was necessary to rip open and expose the business practices that produce such fictitious claims. Relevant methods include surveillance, arrest, or dawn raids." Also: "All other claims from the same source should immediately be put on hold."

Some of the implausible claims will be honest mistakes, such as when a clerk mistakenly punches the wrong patient number into the ATM. And sometimes the SWAT team will get the address wrong, or will take action that looks like overkill, as when the Department of Education raided a California home because it suspected one of the occupants of financial-aid fraud. How many times would federal agents have to march a handcuffed doctor past a stunned waiting room full of Medicare enrollees before Congress prohibited those measures?

"It seems extraordinary," Sparrow said, that the HHS Office of Inspector General recommends "weak and inadequate response[s] . . . to false claims and fake billings" and that Medicare "fail[s] . . . to properly distinguish between the imperatives of process management and the imperatives of crime control." Extraordinary? How could it be any other way? Anti-fraud efforts will always be inadequate when politicians spend other people's money. Apologists for Medicare and Medicaid will retort that fraud against private health plans is prevalent as well, but this only drives home the point: Since employers purchase health insurance for 90 percent of insured non-elderly Americans, workers care less about health-care fraud, and have a lower tolerance for anti-fraud measures, than they would if they paid the fraud-laden premiums themselves.

The fact that Medicare and Medicaid spend other people's money is why the number of fraud investigators in New York's Medicaid program can fall by 50 percent even as spending on the program more than triples. That is why, as Sparrow explained in an interview with *The Nation*, "The stories are legion of people getting a Medicare explanation of benefits statement saying, 'We've paid for this operation you had in Colorado,' when those people have never been in Colorado. And when you complain [to Medicare] about it, nobody seems to care."

The Ryan plan offers the only serious hope of reducing fraud in Medicare and Medicaid. Its Medicare reforms, especially if they were expanded later, would make it easier for the federal government to police the program, and its Medicaid reforms would increase each state's incentive to curb fraud.

To see how the Ryan plan would reduce Medicare fraud, imagine that the proposal

really were what its critics claim it is: a full-blown voucher program, with each enrollee receiving a chunk of cash to spend on medical care, apply toward health-insurance premiums, or save for the future. Instead of processing 1.2 billion claims, Medicare would hand out just 50 million vouchers, with sick and low-income enrollees receiving larger ones. The number of transactions Medicare would have to monitor each year would fall by more than 1 billion.

Social Security offers reason to believe that a program engaging in fewer (and more uniform) transactions could dramatically reduce fraud and other improper payments. As a Medicare-voucher program would, Social Security adjusts the checks it sends to enrollees according to such variables as lifetime earnings and disability status. The Social Security Administration estimates that overpayments account for just 0.37 percent of Social Security spending. Overpayments are higher in the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program (8.4 percent), a much smaller, means-tested program also administered by the Social Security Administration. But total overpayments across both programs still come to less than 1 percent of outlays.

In reality, the Ryan "voucher" is much closer to the current Medicare Advantage program, through which one in four Medicare enrollees selects a private health plan and the government makes risk-adjusted payments directly to insurers. Skeptics will rightly note that, judging by the official improper-payment rates, Medicare Advantage (14.1 percent) is in the same ballpark as traditional Medicare (10.5 percent). Therefore, the Ryan plan should be seen not as a solution to Medicare fraud in itself, but as a step toward a vastly simplified, Social Security-like program in which the task of policing fraud is less daunting.

The Ryan plan would also vastly increase the states' incentive to curb Medicaid fraud. Just as a state that increases funding for Medicaid gets matching federal funds, a state that reduces Medicaid fraud gets to keep only (at most) half of the money saved. As much as 75 percent of recovered funds revert back to the federal government. In a report for the left-wing Center for American Progress, former Obama adviser Marsha Simon noted that "states are required to repay the federal share . . . of any payment errors identified, even if the money is never collected." The fact that Albany splits New York's 50 percent share of the spending with municipal governments may explain why the Empire State is such a hot spot for fraud: No level of government is responsible for a large enough share of the cost to do anything about it. The result is that states' fraud-prevention efforts are only a tiny fraction of what Washington spends to fight Medicare fraud.

Ryan would replace Medicaid's federal matching grants with a system of block grants. Under a block-grant system, states would keep 100 percent of the money they saved by eliminating fraud. In many states, the incentive to prevent fraud would quadruple or more. Block grants performed beautifully when Congress used them to reform welfare in 1996. They can do so again.

The Ryan plan would not reduce Medicare and Medicaid fraud to tolerable levels, but neither would any plan that retains a role for government in providing medical care to the elderly and disabled. What the Ryan plan would do is reduce how much the fraudsters—many of whom sport congressional lapel pins—fleece the American taxpayer. And that is no small thing.

[From USA Today, July 5, 2011]

**JOBLESS-BENEFITS FRAUD IS ON THE RISE**

(By Paul Davidson)

State and federal regulators are cracking down on waste and fraud in the unemployment-insurance system, abuses that have hit record levels as unemployment claims surge in a weak economy.

In the 12 months through March, the overpayment rate was 11.6 percent—more than \$1 for every \$9 paid out. Labor Department figures show.

That's up from the 12 months ending in June 2010, when a record \$16.5 billion, or 10.6 percent of the \$156 billion in unemployment benefits disbursed to Americans, should not have been paid, according to the department.

The overpayment rate was 9.6 percent in fiscal 2009 and 9.2 percent in 2008.

Officials partly blame soaring unemployment, which forced state officials to use fraud-prevention workers to help handle an unprecedented wave of claims.

"They were using every person they could find," said Gay Gilbert, Labor's unemployment-insurance administrator.

Lawmakers say excess payments could go to legitimate jobless claims and help keep state unemployment trust funds solvent. About 9.3 million Americans receive benefits.

The main reason for overpayments is that some workers continue to receive unemployment checks even after they land a new job.

Another problem is that many employers fail to adequately provide state officials the reason an employee left the company so the worker's eligibility can be determined. Also, some workers receive benefits even when they don't comply with state job-search requirements.

How state and federal officials are trying to reduce overpayments:

A national directory of new hires lets states identify workers still receiving benefits even after they get a new job.

By the end of the year, all states must use the directory. Labor officials also plan to provide funds so overtaxed states can more frequently follow up and collect overpayments from scofflaws.

A new computer system makes it easier for employers to report why workers left their jobs. Only a few states use it, but the Labor Department is providing funds to encourage wider adoption.

New rules let states recover improperly paid benefits from U.S. income-tax refunds.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Georgia.

**Mr. CHAMBLISS.** It scared me for a minute, I thought we were almost engaging in a debate on the Senate floor. This could get interesting here.

I have great respect for both my colleagues who were making comments, and it will be an interesting discussion on the floor when they both have their respective numbers and we will look forward to that.

I want to say to my colleague from Arizona that what he says is exactly right. Raising taxes in tough economic times is a very difficult thing to do and is not stimulative of the economy. The way we need to see revenues increased—and I don't think there is any disagreement from anybody in the Senate or in the House that the 14.5 percent of GDP we are now seeing in revenues has got to be increased. But the way we need to increase it is enacting policies, whether they be tax policies or spending policies or otherwise, that

will truly grow the economy, and we can do that with the right kind of policies that will not only in the short term stimulate the economy and show an increase in revenues, but will also have the same impact on the other side of the ledger, which is reducing spending.

We are now at an all-time high since World War II on the spending side, we are at an all-time low on the revenue side, and that is what has gotten us into this terrible fiscal problem we have today.

I concur with what the Senator from Arizona said, and I look forward to continuing to dialog with him as well as the Senator from Rhode Island about what needs to be done to get this gap closed.

**Mr. President,** I rise tonight to discuss the need for the American government to fundamentally change the way it conducts business. Congress and the President can no longer fail to make significant meaningful changes to our fiscal path. We must act now to ensure the safety and security of our Nation.

There is a mutual understanding from all involved in the ongoing debate that the current fiscal path our country is on will lead us to ruin. It is simply unthinkable to believe that we can continue to run deficits in excess of \$1 trillion, on top of \$14.3 trillion in accumulated debt, and remain the leader of the global economy. It is well known that the Federal Government will soon risk a potentially catastrophic default on its credit obligations. Clearly, any increase in the debt ceiling must come with substantial policy reforms and commitments that future spending and deficits are being addressed appropriately. Against this backdrop, we are being provided with a unique opportunity to review the underlying causes of our current path and potential effects we face.

Last week, the Congressional Budget Office released its long-term budget outlook. Their release shows debt increasing to approximately 200 percent of GDP by 2035, unless drastic and immediate changes are made.

Economists have told me that a debt equaling 90 percent of GDP is the tipping point, and that after that it is impossible to turn the situation around.

Under the same CBO scenario, interest costs alone in 2035 would reach 9 percent of GDP, and 9 percent of GDP is more than the United States currently spends on both Social Security and Medicare.

This body spends a considerable amount of time deliberating on matters of national security and, indeed, that is extremely important work. We must stay vigilant that any threats to this country are swiftly dealt with. However, ADM Mike Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, has said emphatically over and over again that our debt is the single greatest threat to our national security.

Admiral Mullen is not alone. The co-chairs of the President's own fiscal

commission warned him of the need for swift action. Mr. Bowles and Mr. Simpson continue to speak almost daily of the importance of addressing our fiscal situation and continue to make impassioned pleas that this situation must be corrected and must be done so in the short term.

It is during these hard times that most Americans look to their elected representatives and the Chief Executive of the United States for guidance on these issues. The American people have waited for leadership on this issue and have demanded fiscal discipline. It is reprehensible that an issue of this magnitude and significance is subject to the partisan bickering and gamesmanship that often rears its head in politics. This is an issue that will determine the fate of our country. It deserves careful, serious, thoughtful deliberation and not political theater.

Not long ago the Senate held a series of votes on budget resolutions that everyone knew were destined to fail. The American people expect and deserve an honest budget debate and a honest budget process. While I am glad the President is now engaging in this debate, he, too, has not been forthcoming in helping to decide America's budget fate. He has not given those in his party instructions or guidance on how to address our fiscal situation, nor has he given the Congress as a whole a relevant plan. It would be reprehensible for these White House negotiations that are now underway to produce a last-minute proposal that leaves Congress no time to review the merits of the legislation or the immediate and lasting effects to the American people.

I have been on record many times before stating everything must be on the table when it comes to solving our debt problems, and I seriously mean that. We see daily the effects of oppressive debt on countries such as Greece and the fear and panic it creates for the citizens of that country. We must take the steps now to ensure we do not fall off the precipice, and that means looking at all of our options.

We must reduce discretionary spending, reform entitlements, simplify the individual and corporate code, and lower tax rates. This is a proven path to prosperity because the solution is based on both spending reduction and economic growth.

We have a model for this. The model is what Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan did in 1986. We saw an economy stimulated at a time when it really needed it by the elimination of tax expenditures and the lowering of tax rates—particularly on the corporate side. It is important on both the personal and corporate, but if we are truly going to expand our tax base and see revenues increase, then we need to put the corporations in this country that manufacture the finest quality of products of anybody in the world on the same level playing field as their competitors across the globe.

So it is of critical importance that we reform our Tax Code, make it simpler and more fair, and, particularly from a corporate level, make it more competitive from a worldwide perspective.

We must cut Federal spending in any way we can. Our current levels of discretionary and mandatory spending simply cannot be sustained. But we cannot solve our problems simply by reducing spending. We have to reform entitlements. We have to look at those issues that are very difficult for a lot of us to deal with, and we have to make some hard and tough decisions. The unfortunate part about this is we do not have a lot of time to do it.

I do not know the window. The window may be 6 months, it may be 12 months, it may be 2 years. No economist will give an exact definite prediction of how long this window continues. But we do know we were not able to predict the financial crisis that occurred in 2008. As Mr. Bowles has said time and time again, this is one crisis we can predict, so now is the time for policymakers in Washington to act.

It is job creation that will ultimately be the benefit to Americans once a strong and balanced Federal budget is in place. Slower economic growth results in dramatic job loss. Christina Romer, the former Chair of the White House Council of Economic Advisers, equated 1 percentage point of GDP with 1 million jobs annually.

We cannot allow the American people to suffer by not providing the economic basis for recovery and growth. A balanced Federal budget that is free of excessive debt will lead to a healthy economy and long-term sustainable job creation activities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today deeply concerned that our Republican colleagues, in their ideological haze, have lost sight of the facts and the real people at home whose lives will be affected by the choices we make. They are lost in an ideological haze, a political dust storm that is distorting the facts and confusing process and policy with political propaganda.

As the conservative columnist David Brooks has said, "A normal Republican Party would seize the opportunity to put the country on a sound fiscal footing." He calls it "the mother of no-brainers." But it is true, as many have said, that this Republican Party is not your grandfather's Republican Party. It is not even Ronald Reagan's Republican Party. This Republican Party is so far to the right that it cannot even see the center, where ideologies converge and good governance begins. This Republican Party sees the processes governing as one-sided—their side and no other.

Today, those on the far right wave the Constitution that established a form of government to protect us from

tyranny yet see any form of compromise as defeat and the only clear victory is total surrender to their position.

Here we are, working to try to ensure that reason prevails. We have offered the largest spending cuts in a generation, asking that those cuts be accompanied by closing tax loopholes and ending tax giveaways and unreasonable subsidies to those who need them the least. But because almost every Republican has signed Grover Norquist's Americans for Tax Reform pledge to never ever raise any tax, and because they define closing tax loopholes as a tax increase even when the recipients themselves have said they do not need those tax breaks, we are forced into this position, hoping that logical, moderate voices on the other side will rise up, demanding that we do what is right for the American people.

In my view, ending subsidies to big oil companies does not fall under that pledge. Only in Washington would Republicans call ending \$21 billion in tax breaks for big oil companies that will make \$144 billion in profits a tax increase. It is not. It is not a tax increase; it is a measure of fairness. It is exactly what we need to do under the circumstances, and it is a reasonable offer by those of us on this side of the aisle.

Our job, in a representative democracy, is to represent the values of those who sent us here to do what is right for them, not have a pledge and conveniently interpret the elimination of oil subsidies for multibillion-dollar profitable corporations or ethanol subsidies to the tune of \$2 billion as a tax increase. That is nonsense. We are offering a reasonable compromise, as that conservative columnist David Brooks says, "the mother of no-brainers."

Even USA Today said in their editorial:

Compromise is an essential part of democracy, but negotiating with Republicans over taxes has become as futile as trying to bargain with the Taliban over whether girls should be allowed to attend school.

That is a pretty stark comparison, I admit, and I may not have gone that far. But, frankly, our Republican brethren seem to hold to their ideology almost as religiously. They see all things in black and white. They act as though they believe those who disagree with that ideology are unpatriotic or heretics, and that the only truth is their truth. What they have forgotten is that negotiating with those with whom we disagree and reaching a compromise is what good governance is all about.

There is another falsehood. Spending is not a Democratic value, as our friends on the other side of the aisle would have us believe, but a Republican reality. It was the reckless spending of Republicans combined with a reckless tax policy and an ideology that let Wall Street run wild, turning a free market into a free-for-all market, that brought us to where we are today.

Let's remember, it was not long ago that the budget was, in fact, balanced during another Democratic administration when we had budget surpluses as far out as the eye could see. The day President Clinton left office he handed the incoming President a \$236 billion surplus with a projected surplus of \$5.6 trillion over the following 10 years.

When President Bush left office he had turned a \$236 billion budget surplus into a \$1.3 trillion budget deficit with projected shortfalls of \$8 trillion over the next decade. He handed the new President an economy that was headed off the cliff into a near depression.

We have spent \$786 billion, unpaid for, on President Bush's ill-advised, wrongheaded war of choice in Iraq because of some false allegations of weapons of mass destruction, a political experiment that distracted us from a war of necessity in Afghanistan, keeping us there far longer than necessary at an additional cost of \$430 billion, unpaid for. The total cost for both wars, unpaid for, was \$1.2 trillion.

The Republican Party that will not now agree to one penny in revenue and demands only more spending cuts has fought to make tax breaks for the wealthy permanent that would cost this Nation another \$5 trillion. They have favored big business and Wall Street in a Tax Code that has resulted in major multibillion-dollar corporations paying no taxes—yes, no taxes at all.

In fact, a detailed Government Accountability Office study of corporate income taxes from 1998 to 2005 showed that 55 percent of large U.S. corporations reported no tax liability for at least 1 of those 8 years. Yet those same Republicans will look us in the eye in defense of their defenseless position and tell us that most individuals do not pay taxes either. What they will not say is that those individuals who do not pay taxes do not pay taxes for a reason: They do not earn enough to pay income tax, and many of them are among the poorest of the poor. Only in Washington could such an indefensible position be accepted as defensible and logical.

Only in Washington could Republicans support policies that benefit the wealthiest at the expense of the middle class. Only in Washington could Republicans tell a construction worker in New Jersey, who has cut his budget to the bone and needs to work another job to pay the bills, that we do not need to end tax loopholes and tax breaks to help pay the Nation's bills; that we only have to cut more spending and give more money to the top 1 percent of the wealthiest in the country who control 45 percent of all of the wealth in America and that they will create more jobs—notwithstanding the fact that 12 years of tax cuts for the wealthiest created virtually no jobs at all. When Ronald Reagan and Bill Clinton increased the revenue side of the equation, it brought the greatest economic progress in the last half century.

But our Republican colleagues do not let the facts get in the way of their ideology.

The fact is, if Joe the construction worker in New Jersey cut his budget and his spending and has made the difficult choices about what he can afford and what he can't and still can't meet the bills he has to pay with the money he earns, then he has to get a second job or work more hours or find a way to increase his income. Yet our Republican colleagues will look that construction worker in the eye and tell him he doesn't need to earn more, he needs to cut more and then cut again. Cut to the bone, if necessary, but never, never do what needs to be done to increase the revenue side. Only in Washington does such an argument seem reasonable. Only in this Republican Party does such an absurd argument try to make sense.

Never before has America waged two wars at the same time, struggled to invest in our infrastructure to create new jobs—and done so at a time of decreased revenue—and not seen the need at least to discuss the idea of closing tax loopholes and tax breaks for Big Oil and multibillion-dollar corporations. Never before has any party claimed we can do all of that and at the same time balance the budget on the backs of seniors, students, middle-class families, and not even consider the shared sacrifice—a sacrifice that would end tax breaks for multibillion-dollar corporations that in many cases don't even pay taxes. Never before has such illogic passed for logic. But our Republican colleagues will not take yes for an answer. We have said yes to spending cuts, more spending cuts than we have seen in a generation. Now they must say yes to common sense, fair increases in revenue, and choose good governance over political ideology.

David Brooks, the conservative columnist to whom I referred, said, "The members of this movement talk blandly of default and are willing to stain their Nation's honor," meaning that the country will not meet its obligations. We teach our children that you have to meet your obligations, but this movement tells the country you don't have to meet your obligations.

He goes on to say:

If debt ceiling talks fail, independent voters will see that Democrats were willing to compromise but Republicans were not. If responsible Republicans don't take control, independents will conclude that Republican fanaticism caused this default. They will conclude that Republicans are not fit to govern.

I would very rarely agree with Mr. Brooks, but I would agree his observations in this case are absolutely right. This is about not only standing up for the Nation's honor, it is about standing up for the Nation's obligations. It is about standing up to make sure there is a fair and shared sacrifice, not just on the backs of middle-class working families in this country and those who have the least among us. That is the

choice Republicans would have us make. It is a wrong choice for the Nation, and I hope we get to some sense of reality in this Chamber that can help us move forward, have the Nation be upheld in its obligations both here and abroad and not start a ripple effect that will cause an enormous consequence to this Nation's economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes, followed by Senator INHOFE for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. We heard the Senator from Georgia talk about the upcoming predictable crisis, and our Nation faces an Olympic crisis right now, and it is a predictable crisis.

Back in 2006, then-Senator Obama called raising the debt ceiling "a sign of leadership failure." So why 5 years later is it now-President Obama who is asking us to raise the debt ceiling, and why is he doing it with no plan on how to pay back the new debt we continue to accumulate?

In his press conference last week, the President called on this party to "go ahead and make the tough choices." When it comes to cutting spending, his allies in Congress refuse to make any choices. The President has attacked this body for not getting a deal done on time. Yet he declined to meet with Republicans about these very issues and about our ideas. According to the White House Press Secretary—the Press Secretary said this was "not a conversation worth having." Well, he has finally agreed to meet tomorrow with leaders from both parties.

The White House and Congress have a choice: Do we want America to be broke or do we want America to be balanced? Facts are stubborn things, and the numbers do not lie. Our debt is swallowing our economy whole. Every day Washington borrows \$4.1 billion more—borrowed over \$4.1 billion yesterday, \$4.1 billion today, and it will borrow \$4.1 billion again tomorrow. That is over \$2 million a minute, every minute. In a single day, Washington borrows enough to buy tens of thousands of new homes. In a single hour, Washington borrows enough to buy 2 million barrels of oil. In a single minute, Washington borrows enough to send 53 students a year to the most expensive colleges in America. In a single second, Washington borrows enough to buy two new Ford Mustang cars. Washington did all of that yesterday, and it will do it all today, and it will do it all tomorrow.

Well, of every dollar Washington spends, 41 cents of it is borrowed. Much of it is borrowed from China. Every American child born today, born tomorrow, and born the next day is born with a debt of over \$45,000. Next year, of every dollar Washington spends, 68 cents will go for Social Security, Medi-

care, Medicaid, and interest on the debt alone.

If those numbers don't sound scary yet, they will. Interest on our debt cost \$196 billion last year. It costs nearly \$23 million an hour. It costs over \$370,000 a minute, every minute. It costs \$6,000 a second, every second, interest alone on our debt. In the time it takes to give this speech, as well as my colleague's previous speech and the speech coming up after that, in those 10 minutes, Washington will have spent millions of dollars on interest payments alone.

The President has railed against tax breaks for private jets. He did it in a press conference last week. He mentioned it six times. What he didn't tell you is that every \$100 of the huge deficit of this year alone—of every \$100, only two cents of that \$100 would be dealt with with the tax he proposes and holds out as the No. 1 thing. What about the other \$99.98? What the President won't tell you is that the interest on our debt costs enough to buy over 100 private jets every day—for the interest we pay on the debt alone. His party wants to end tax breaks for yachts. Yet the interest on our debt would buy over 50 luxury yachts every hour. Most Americans are feeling severe pain at the pump. Yet Washington could buy nearly 2,000 gallons of gas at current prices every second with the money we spend on interest on our debt.

If we, as a nation, continue down this path, Washington will spend all of what it takes in on Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and interest on this colossal debt. Everything else, from defense to education, will be paid for on a budget of borrowed money. So where is the money going to come from? How will we ever pay it back? A lot of it will come from other countries, countries that do not always have America's best interest at heart.

Debt isn't just a disaster for the distant future; our debt is so unsustainable and irresponsible that even our military leaders have condemned it. ADM Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said the biggest threat to our national security is our debt. The debt is the threat. We do not and we should not take the biggest threat to our national security lightly.

The amount of debt we owe right now today is so high that it is hurting our employment at home. Experts continue to tell us that our debt is costing us millions of jobs. Meanwhile, the Weekly Standard reports that every "stimulus job" costs over \$¼ million. In other words, the White House could have just cut a check of \$100,000 for every American who got a job through the stimulus, and taxpayers still would have come out ahead by \$427 billion. Spending like this cannot create jobs because by nature it makes it harder for the private sector to grow, and no growth means no jobs. Because of this, it is harder for American families to

buy gas, groceries, cars, and homes, to pay tuition for their kids to go to college, and it is harder to create jobs for those kids who will be graduating this year and next year and every year until we get this spending under control.

Everyone seems to claim they understand that the situation is irresponsible and unsustainable. Two years ago, back in February of 2009, the President called experts to the White House. He called them in for what he called a fiscal responsibility summit. In his opening remarks, here is what the President had to say:

Contrary to the prevailing wisdom in Washington these past few years, we cannot simply spend as we please, and defer the consequences to the next budget, the next administration, or the next generation.

Well, I agreed with the President. He was right. So my question to the President is, What have you done about it?

One thing he has done is to call together a debt commission. Late last year, the debt commission released their report on America's fiscal situation, and the findings were sobering. According to the report, they said the problem was real; the solution will be painful; there is no easy way out; everything must be on the table. You know what else they said. They said Washington must lead.

Washington has not led. Instead, the administration has offered nothing but empty promises. As the White House makes promise after promise and speech after speech with no action to back it up, it is clearer than ever that in Washington spoken promises have become broken promises.

This administration's allies in Congress have no plan other than raising taxes. While they claim to have already accepted the idea of cutting trillions of dollars from the budget, I have yet to hear the Democratic leadership endorse any spending cuts. Where is their plan to cut wasteful Washington spending? So far, they have only talked about tax increases that will kill jobs and hurt our economy. Raising taxes will only make matters worse.

The fundamental difference in this fight is more than just practical, it is also philosophical. We can argue over whether raising taxes on this or on that industry will lower the debt or just raise the costs for the American people.

Let me make this very simple. I am not interested in raising taxes to expand and sustain the size and scope of our Federal Government. I want less government, less costly government, and that means I am not interested in ferreting out new ways to tax people or businesses. I am looking for ways to cut spending to shrink the size of government. I want to dramatically reshape government, spend less, do less, and put power back into the private sector. That is how you raise revenue—you slash government, you put people back to work. Washington's persistent push to put our fiscal crisis off until

tomorrow is unacceptable and must end now.

So I come to the floor and say, as someone from Wyoming, where we live within our means, where we balance our budget every year, it is time for this body, this Congress, and this President to sign into law a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. That is an amendment which would force Washington to live within its means.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, just one comment on the subject at hand, and then I want to talk about something completely different that is very significant happening today.

I listened to the Senator from New Jersey down here. He kept talking about only in Washington what can happen, only in Washington. Yet never was anything said about cutting spending. It was all about passing tax increases, and that is what we will be faced with tomorrow.

(The remarks of Mr. INHOFE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1335 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEGICH). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate be extended until 7:30 p.m., with all of the provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I wasn't going to come to the floor today, but I was in the chair and I have been hearing some of the debate that is going on about this debt ceiling and I decided that, once again, I needed to stand and remind people what this vote is about when we get to it. The Presiding Officer has heard me talk about this before.

Our failure to lift the debt ceiling is not like the United States cutting up its credit card and saying we are not spending money anymore. It is exactly like a household at home, back in Colorado, saying we overspent, we weren't careful, and we are not going to pay the cable bill this month even though we owe it or we are not going to pay our mortgage this month even though we owe it. Those are the kinds of things that in the real world lead in worst cases to bankruptcy but in a lousy case can lead to interest rates going up because the bank says we are not going to let people pay a lower interest rate for their mortgage because they are not a good credit risk. That is exactly what is going to happen to the United States of America if we renege on the full faith and credit of the United States.

That is why I was so pleased to see an editorial today in the Wall Street Journal called "A Debt-Limit Breakout." The Journal observed that:

What this debate needs is a breakout strategy—to wit, Republicans should answer Mr. Obama's tax call by accepting his business tax increases in return for a lower corporate tax rate.

The Journal goes on to observe directly—and by the way, I said this for 2½ years, the last 2½ years in Colorado—"... the U.S. corporate Tax Code provides the worst of both worlds: It makes U.S. companies less competitive" because we have one of the highest rates, if not the highest rate, in the world, "even as it raises much less revenue than advertised." Because there are so many special interest loopholes that even though we have this high rate we are projecting, we are not, as the Presiding Officer knows, collecting the revenue we need.

Finally, the Journal says:

Think about it.

Talking about these negotiations.

On the current path both sides are headed at best for a de minimis deal that makes everyone look bad, at worst for a major political crack-up.

I think the Journal has it exactly right, and I think both of those outcomes are unacceptable to the people of Colorado and should be unacceptable to the Members of this body. A de minimis deal that somehow gets us through this but doesn't actually address the fundamental structural issues we face is unacceptable, and a political crackup is absolutely unacceptable as well not because of the political fate of anybody in this Chamber, but because of what is going to happen to our economy if our interest resets because we have failed to deal with this debt ceiling issue.

I have spent a lot of time in the capital markets and I know that once those interest rates reset, they will be reset for the rest of my life. I am so worried the posturing and the politicking that has been going on in this Chamber is going to put us in a place where we actually run out of time to do the right thing.

I wanted to come down here today to say thank you to two Republicans who came out today. One is Senator JOHN MCCAIN from Arizona who came out with this Wall Street Journal editorial—and, by the way, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal article I have been referring to be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 5, 2011]

EDITORIAL: A DEBT-LIMIT BREAKOUT

The debt-limit talks in Washington are bogged down in the hedgerows, with some Republicans insisting on a balanced budget amendment that can't pass Congress President Obama insisting on tax increases that Republicans oppose.

We've long favored such a reform, and last year so did the Simpson-Bowles deficit commission and the White House economic advisory council headed by Paul Volcker. But the cause has now acquired no less a convert than Bill Clinton. Speaking Saturday at something called the Aspen Ideas Festival,

the former President admitted that he had once raised tax rates on corporations.

"It made sense when I did it. It doesn't make sense anymore. We've got an uncompetitive rate," he said. "We tax at 35% of income, although we only take about 23%. So we should cut the rate to 25%, or whatever's competitive, and eliminate a lot of the deductions so that we still get a fair amount, and there's not so much variance in what the corporations pay."

We opposed Mr. Clinton's tax increases, not least because corporations don't pay taxes so much as they serve as a collecting agent. But on the rest of Mr. Clinton's riff, Milton Friedman and Robert Mundell couldn't have put it better, though perhaps they'd think that 25% is still too high.

We'd prefer 15% ourselves, but Mr. Clinton is exactly right on the failure of the 35% rate (39% on average including the states) to capture that share of corporate income in government revenue. We wrote earlier this year about Whirlpool, which had an effective tax rate of zero due to its many write-offs. Everyone knows the notorious case of GE.

The average effective corporate rate varies by industry but is far less than the 35% rate, and the injustice is that some pay much less than others if they can afford lobbyists to write loopholes or they invest in politically correct purposes. Anyone not in thrall of class-war symbolism understands that the U.S. tax code provides the worst of both worlds: It makes U.S. companies less competitive even as it raises much less revenue than advertised. Mr. Obama and Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner have acknowledged this in the past, the President as recently as this year's State of the Union address.

As for the debt-limit politics, this is also a winner. Democrats and Republicans say they've agreed privately on sizable spending cuts over a 10-year budget window. No doubt some of those cuts are less real than others, and future Congresses could rewrite any enforcement provisions passed this year. But Republicans still have an incentive to set spending on a downward path, and Mr. Obama has an incentive to show he is no longer a hostage of Nancy Pelosi as he runs for re-election.

The political sticking point is Mr. Obama's desire for some Republican buy-in on raising revenues. His political left is still sure that he agreed to extend the Bush tax rates through 2012. Thus he's pounding Republicans to agree to eliminate certain business tax deductions that political advisers David Axelrod and David Plouffe have told him will be hard for Republicans to defend. Corporate jets. Carried interest for private equity. Oil and gas. Even LIFO accounting, which few understand but can be made to sound nefarious.

Whatever their individual merits, each of these would be a tax increase on business, and Republicans campaigned last year on not raising taxes. But the politics is different if they can offset these revenue raisers with lower tax rates. That would let Republicans honestly claim they didn't support a net tax increase, even as Mr. Obama could say he raised revenue.

Our own guess is that such a reform would raise far more money than the official scorers would predict, since it would lead to a more efficient allocation of capital and less tax evasion. This would also promote economic growth, breaking out of the austerity mentality driven by debt reduction. If Mr. Obama really is worried that lower federal spending will hurt the economy, then this tax reform is also his best growth policy.

In offering his grand bargain on Saturday, Mr. Clinton included the caveat of "how can they do that by August 2?" Mr. Geithner says that is the date when he can no longer

finagle federal finances to escape a potential default on the debt, or must at least cut some federal spending, to avoid breaching the \$14.3 trillion debt limit.

But where there's political self-interest there's always a way. Both sides could agree to a short-term debt-limit reprieve of a month or two with some spending cuts that everyone agrees on. That would give them more time to cut a larger deal that includes corporate tax reform.

Think about it. On the current path both sides are headed at best for a de minimis deal that makes everyone look bad, at worst for a major political crack-up. Perhaps Mr. Obama wants a crack-up to portray Republicans as extreme. But Republicans should at least call his bluff and answer his demands for fewer business tax deductions by saying yes—in return for lower tax rates.

Mr. BENNET. Senator JOHN MCCAIN came out and said we might not like everything in here, but it makes a great deal of sense and we need a game changer to deal with this debt debate we are having right now. I wish to applaud him for that. When someone comes to the Senate they say a person can have two mentors, one is a Democrat and one is a Republican, but one has to ask the person if they will do it. I asked Senator MCCAIN if he wouldn't mind being my Republican mentor and he thought about it a little bit, he came out on the floor and he said, I will take you to lunch. Even though he didn't exactly support me in my last campaign, he has given me a lot of advice over the last number of months. To see him out here today saying, you know what, we may need to think differently about this, gave me some hope that maybe we are not going to run out of time.

The other person I wish to thank is Senator CHAMBLISS from Georgia who was speaking when I was sitting in the chair and said that everything needs to be on the table. This isn't a time to draw bright lines. It is a time to pull ourselves together, roll up our sleeves and do what is right. We have the outlines of a plan from the deficit and debt commission. I don't love everything in it—no one would love everything in it—but we have to find a way to compromise and come together for the benefit of our kids and for our grandkids, and I think importantly, in the short term, to give American business the confidence it needs to invest again in this economy.

There is \$2.3 trillion of cash sitting on the balance sheets of our Nation's businesses. There may be a lot of reasons for that, but I know one is they are uncertain about our ability to straighten out the fiscal quagmire we face.

We have spent a lot of time on this, but we haven't made a lot of progress and we are running out of time. So I urge all of my colleagues to come to the floor in the spirit of people who want to work across the aisle, who are not interested in drawing these bright lines, and come to a big deal—not a small deal—one that gets to the \$4.5 trillion that the deficit commission recommended or in that direction gen-

erally, and gives us the chance to feel as though we have done something useful for our kids, one that will give us the chance to feel patriotic, that we actually have honored the legacy of our parents and grandparents, and that we have passed along more opportunity to the next generation. I want the Presiding Officer to know, and I know he feels the same way, that we will work with anybody on the other side of the aisle to try to get this done.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, it is appropriate that we are here on this July 4 holiday week. I joined a number of my colleagues last week who made it clear it was important for us to be here. Raising the debt ceiling is a significant issue we face, and while I am pleased to see the discussion ongoing on the Senate floor today, we do need actions that speak louder than our words. I say that knowing I am coming here to talk about an issue that we have attempted to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate now for a long time.

We have a looming financial crisis. All the Democratic leadership was capable of bringing up on the Senate floor this week was a sense of the Senate that wealthy Americans should pay their fair share of something.

I suppose we will have a discussion about that, which has begun and will continue for the next few days. But I believe Americans deserve leadership in our Nation's Capital to confront the real fiscal challenges—not just this desire to kick the can down the road and ignore the crisis we face.

In my view, our President and the Senate leadership have failed to lead. They have failed to adopt the President's own Deficit Reduction Commission report. The President has not proposed the results of that report. They have failed to pass a budget in over 2 years. They have failed to introduce a budget even in our committee this year, and the President's budget that he did propose this year is woefully inadequate in addressing the fiscal crisis, the deficits we face.

Crafting a budget is one of the basic responsibilities of Congress, but it has not happened. No country, business, or family can operate responsibly without a budget. I serve on the Appropriations Committee. I would love to have a budget that set the guidelines for us to begin the process of determining how much money we should spend, what things might be increased, decreased, or eliminated. Without a budget, the appropriations process continues to falter and, in fact, it would not be surprising that once again we end up with either an omnibus spending bill or a continuing resolution.

The President and Senate Democrats have said they are serious about dealing with our Nation's debt crisis, but

actions will speak louder than words. The truth is the President's budget and the policies of this administration have made our problems worse.

During the last 2 years, the government has spent more than \$7.3 trillion and increased the Nation's debt in just 2 years by more than \$3.2 trillion. The President is missing and the Senate is dysfunctional. The struggling economy we are experiencing and the financial collapse around the corner is the most expected economic crisis in our lifetime. Yet nothing is being done to stop it.

The cochairs of the President's own Fiscal Commission have said the same thing and have warned that if we fail to take swift and serious action, the U.S. faces "the most predictable economic crisis in its history." They predict such an event could occur in 2 years or less.

It is time to move past empty rhetoric and get serious about confronting the debt crisis. Delaying difficult decisions and simply increasing the debt ceiling once again without making any changes to the way Washington spends taxpayer dollars should not be an option. We cannot afford business as usual.

The President's solution is to raise revenues to balance the budget. But does anyone really believe that increased taxes will be used to pay down the debt or will it just be used for even more spending? History shows that money raised in Washington, DC, results in more spending in Washington, DC.

When families struggle to pay the bills, they do not simply ask for a pay raise; they cut their spending. The revenue increases we need are not tax increases but increased revenues that come from a growing economy.

The last time we had a balanced budget was at the end of President Clinton's term. Yes, there was some spending restraint, and Republicans and Democrats could not get along well enough to agree to spend a bunch of money, but the real reason the budget was balanced was that people were working and paying their taxes. We need a growing economy once again to balance the budget.

Increasing taxes reduces the chances of economic growth and the ability to create more and better jobs. If we increase taxes, we reduce the chance of economic growth and we reduce the chance of more and better paying jobs.

In Kansas, for example, the President proposes we increase taxes on those who own a business plane. Airplanes are a pretty important component of our State's economy, and this proposal would have a devastating impact upon the Wichita economy, which has already suffered the loss of thousands of jobs under declining business in this country.

Now is not the time to penalize a U.S. industry that produces the best quality airplanes in the world. The U.S. and North America ship a signifi-

cant amount of business jets worldwide, more than any other region in the world. But because of the recession, nearly every aircraft manufacturer has had to cut jobs, some up to 50 percent of their workforce.

We see this in Kansas day in and day out, and yet the proposal is to make it more expensive to own an aircraft. This does not punish the owners of aircraft. It punishes the people who work every day to make an airplane.

To turn our economy around and put people back to work, Congress and the Obama administration should be implementing policies that encourage job creation, not diminish the chances; rein in burdensome government regulations; replace our convoluted Tax Code with one that is fair, simple, and certain; open foreign markets for American manufactured goods and agricultural products; and develop a comprehensive energy policy. Yet none of these are being done by this Senate.

Spending more has failed to stimulate our economy. Instead, we should cut government spending to reduce our deficit, cap spending so it does not continue to eat up more and more of our gross domestic product, and balance our budget so we do not get back in this mess once again.

First, it is time to cut government spending and change the way Washington, DC, spends taxpayer dollars. Mr. President, 40 cents of every dollar our Federal Government is spending is borrowed. One hundred percent of our tax revenue is spent on mandatory spending and interest payments on the debt. Everything else—defense, homeland security, energy, education—is borrowed. This year we will collect \$2.2 trillion and spend \$3.7 trillion—a \$1.5 trillion deficit.

CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, now projects that debt held by the public will exceed 100 percent of gross domestic product by 2021 under current policies. This is a 10-percent increase in debt relative to CBO's projections of only a year ago.

The debate over government spending is often seen as one that is philosophical or partisan bickering that always goes on in Washington, DC. And certainly I have heard, all of my adult life, the conversations that go on in Washington, DC, and on the talk shows, and in the newspapers, that talk about Republicans and Democrats arguing about balancing the budget and how much money we can spend, but the reality is this time it is different, and our failure to act will have dramatic consequences on the daily lives of Americans.

This is about whether Americans can find a job, can make their payments on their homes and automobiles, whether their kids have a bright future and can pursue the American dream. This is not a philosophical discussion for Washington, DC. This has real consequences for every American family.

We are not, unfortunately, immune from the laws of economics that face

every nation. The failure to get our financial house in order and borrowing under control will lead to increased inflation, higher interest rates, fewer jobs, and a lower standard of living for every American. Our creditors may one day decide we are no longer credit-worthy, and we will suffer the same consequences that other countries are now suffering that followed that path. We should learn from them.

Secondly, it is time to cap discretionary spending this year and next. We must demand enforceable statutory caps to return Federal spending to 18 percent of gross domestic product, where it has been for almost all of the past 60 years. Current Federal spending is now nearly 25 percent of gross domestic product and remains on track to be high over the course of the next 10 years.

Third, we must pass a balanced budget amendment. This amendment to the U.S. Constitution is the best way to discipline government officials. This amendment would require the President to submit and Congress to pass a balanced budget each and every year, cap Federal spending at no more than 18 percent of gross domestic product, and require a two-thirds vote of the House and the Senate to raise taxes.

Nothing here is unreasonable. Cut spending, cap the percentage of spending to GDP, and pass a balanced budget amendment. When did it become radical or even irresponsible to live within our means? We know what is going to happen if we do not act, and it would be immoral for us to look the other way or to kick the can down the road because the politics of these issues are too difficult to deal with.

Officials from the Obama administration warn that the failure of Congress to raise the legal debt limit would risk default. But the bigger economic threat that confronts our country are the consequences of allowing our country's pattern of spending and borrowing to continue without a serious plan to reduce that debt. Our out-of-control debt is slowing our economic growth and threatening the prosperity of future generations who will have to pay for our irresponsibility.

Our government is not on the verge of a financial meltdown because Republicans will not vote to raise the debt ceiling. We are at the point of financial collapse because Republicans and Democrats have spent money we do not have for way too long. We must use the leverage that raising the debt ceiling now presents to force elected officials to do something they otherwise would not do: curb spending, grow the economy, and balance the budget.

If we fail to respond, if we fail to act as we should, if we let this issue one more time pass for somebody else to solve because it is so difficult, we will reduce the opportunities the next generation of Americans have to pursue the American dream.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, we are here trying to figure out where America goes in the near future, but also where it goes in the long term because the decisions we make here are going to have a long lasting effect.

What we hear and the American people are witnessing over TV is the Republicans are playing with fire, and millions of Americans are in danger of getting scorched. It reminds us some of those who played the fiddle while Rome burned. The Republicans are willing to allow our country to go into default rather than ask the wealthiest among us to pay their fair share.

The Republican side of the Capitol is clear. They say: Don't ask our millionaire friends to contribute anything more to keep our ship of state afloat. Yes, the ride is going to be bumpier for everyone, but that is life. Why shouldn't the middle class pay something, they ask. After all, there are so many of them.

In fact, a Republican Senator was on the floor this afternoon saying the wealthy are overburdened. It is not easy, I guess, to pick out a new car every year, maybe make sure your reservations for your trip abroad are made, and renovations for the house are in order. Life gets complicated if you are rich. These decisions do not come easy.

The Senator who spoke this afternoon complained that the poor and the middle class—and I quote him here—“need to share some of the responsibility.”

So there it is. It is the poor and the middle class who need to sacrifice once again, but not the wealthy. The fat cats sit purring on the front deck while middle-class workers are breaking their backs.

Middle-class workers should not have to explain to their kids why they cannot afford to help them get a college education. Democrats know the way to keep our country strong is to educate every young person capable of learning.

Now, what is the real cost of millionaire protection? This risk is an economic calamity for middle-class families across the country if we make a mistake here as we deal with the raising of the debt ceiling, as we deal with the problems of the budget.

It is time to stop protecting millionaires when so much is needed from everyone who can help this country regain its footing. If the Republicans force default on our debt, it could mean tens of millions of Americans might not receive their Social Security checks. Retirees and disabled Americans on fixed incomes depend on Social Security for survival.

But Social Security is only the beginning. If the Republicans insist on

pushing the government into default, the men and women who wear our country's uniforms may not even get their paychecks. Right now there are 140,000 brave Americans risking death and injury in Afghanistan and Iraq. Do we reduce our responsibility to them because Republicans do not want to burden millionaires?

Additionally, payments to doctors under Medicare and Medicaid could be suspended. Where do the seniors and needy Americans turn then in the event of an urgent medical problem?

At a time when nearly 14 million Americans are out of work and struggling to keep food on the table, unemployment benefits could lapse. We are talking about the possibility of people without incomes, people unable to sustain their basic needs. In addition to destroying the safety net for ordinary Americans, a default crisis would likely threaten America's position as the economic giant of the world, as we see the possibility of widespread panic on Wall Street and the damage to the credit markets that could lead to the loss of millions of jobs across the country.

The question has to be answered: Why are the Republicans willing to walk on this economic tightrope to win favor among wealthy contributors? It is because they do not sufficiently value the human infrastructure that enabled the millionaires to make their millions. They are insisting on protecting tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires.

They want to keep subsidizing big oil companies to the tune of \$4 billion a year in tax breaks. I look at what our leader, the majority leader, has proposed. I am proud to be a cosponsor of a commonsense resolution introduced by Senator REID.

The resolution says: Americans who earn \$1 million or more a year should pick up the shovel and help their country dig its way out of the disaster instead of just playing politics.

The American people see through the Republican games of protecting the rich, while middle-class families lose jobs, homes, and the belief that their children have a chance of success that their forebears dreamt about. In poll after poll, survey after survey, they say we should ask the very wealthy to pay more to reduce the deficit. Yet the Republicans refuse to close outrageous tax loopholes for oil companies that are rolling in profits. We cannot ask them to sacrifice.

Look at what the CEOs of these companies are being paid. ExxonMobil, they made over \$11 billion in a quarter. The CEO made, in 2010, \$29 million. ConocoPhillips, their CEO made \$18 million in 2010. Chevron, the CEO was paid \$16 million in 2010.

The facts are clear and so are the Republican priorities. They do not want the giant corporations and the wealthy to lose their lucrative tax loopholes. The Republicans want to end Medicare as we know it, forcing seniors to pick

up an extra \$6,000 a year for their health care. The question has to be asked: Why are the Republicans trying to slow the economic recovery? Why run the risk of financial collapse just 3 years after the last one? Do they believe destroying the economy now will help them during next year's election? What a terrible thought that is. We heard the minority leader say his No. 1 priority is stopping this President from winning another term.

Our No. 1 priority ought not to be to destroy lives for political gain. It ought to be about restoring our economy, restoring jobs, making sure all Americans can share in what this great country has to offer.

The question lurks: What is it that propels this unyielding refusal to ask those who make \$1 million a year or more to participate some in restoring our economic viability? The bottom line is, avoiding a default crisis requires all to participate or we could witness the failure of a nation that has survived for more than 200 years—200 years as a beacon of freedom, liberty, and democracy—with great risk of substantial failure in the future if we do not raise the debt ceiling.

The Democrats feel the need to protect the basic values that have made this dream heard only in America, over centuries, a reality. Going forward into the future, we have to continue to protect the values we treasure in our society.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AUTHORITY TO MEET

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if the Finance Committee meets tomorrow at 9 a.m., it be authorized to meet during tomorrow's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SERGEANT WILLIAM J. WOITOWICZ, U.S.M.C.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, on June 7, 2011, Groton, the State of Massachusetts, and our country lost a brave young man who gave his life defending the Nation he loved. Sergeant William "Billy" Woitowicz died serving with the U.S. Marine Corps in Afghanistan, fighting as a part of Operation Enduring Freedom.

In the difficult days that followed this awful news, the entire Groton community came together to show their support for his family and to remember Billy's dedication and selflessness. Joe Moore, a family friend, described Bill movingly in a tribute that was itself an act of great devotion. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD so that all of us can reflect on the sacrifice of a courageous marine tragically lost much too soon in service to a grateful nation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EULOGY FOR SERGEANT WILLIAM J. WOITOWICZ  
(Delivered by Joseph F. Moore)

Before I begin, I would like to read the statement I prepared for the media on behalf of the Woitowicz family this past Tuesday. It did not make its way to the individuals and communities that poured love from their hearts for Billy and his family.

On behalf of the Woitowicz family, I would like to thank everyone for their heartfelt condolences, the kind words, the outpouring of emotion, gifts of food, offers of help, cards, and prayers. I can't tell you how much that has meant to my friends. They appreciate your kindness very much.

They would also like to thank the Marines for the tremendous support of their family and the respect they've shown Billy in the way they have treated him as they've brought him home. My father was a Marine during World War II and I've always had a tremendous respect for the Corps. The actions of these Marines, in the way they've treated my friends, especially Sergeant Owens, only enhances that admiration.

If I could pause for a moment—Would you please stand and join me in a round of applause for the United States Marine Corps, and the Marines joining us today to honor their fallen comrade, to show them how much we appreciate the sacrifices they make for us?

Billy was a wonderful person. You only need to see the flags lining the streets of Groton and Westford, the messages of love, the swollen eyes, to see how people cared about him. It is because he cared for them—that was Billy, always more interested and concerned for you than he was for himself.

Although we mourn for Billy and our hearts ache for the loss of him, we know there is a celebration in heaven for the return of one of God's favorite sons and soldiers.

I am pleased to announce the Groton Dunstable Youth Basketball League, which I have great pride in saying I served for 15 years, has named their 3-on-3-basketball tournament after Billy. Thanks so much to the Board members; this means a lot to the Woitowicz family and to me.

Our State Representative Sheila Harrington is spearheading a movement to cre-

ate the Sergeant William J. Woitowicz Memorial Trust. The trust will fund a scholarship named after Billy and other activities chosen by the family. Thank you, Sheila. We appreciate your efforts.

Billy's second mother, my wife Karen, said, "For a kid who didn't like attention, he sure drummed up a lot of it."

Billy, did you see us on the tarmac waiting for you to come home?

Did you see the respect of your fellow Marines as they gently held you?

Did you see the people standing in honor as we drove through Hanscom?

Did you see Mr. Clickner with tears in his eyes holding a basketball?

Did you see the gentleman, also a Marine, at the exit with the sign that read, "Thank you Corporal Woitowicz, I try to be worth dying for."

Did you see the cherry pickers with American flags flowing down from them at the rotary?

Did you see the fire trucks from Acton and Maynard, Boxboro and Littleton, parked on the overpass, with their ladders extended and connected in a salute of honor, and the firemen standing on top of their trucks?

Did you see people who simply stopped by the procession and got out of their cars with their hands over their hearts?

Did you see along the route you traveled, the rescue squads, state police, sheriffs, and the police and firemen from Lexington, Concord, Acton, Watertown, Melrose, Medford, Lowell, Maynard, Boxboro, Lancaster, Littleton, Harvard, Ayer, Dunstable, Groton, and Westford?

Did you see the older veterans, in their uniforms, standing at salute?

Did you see the people pouring out of their offices as your procession passed by?

Did you see the elderly gray-haired woman, standing by herself in Harvard, holding an American flag?

Did you see the lines of people in bordering towns with genuine looks of anguish?

Did you see the rows of people on Main Street in Groton? And did you notice they were patiently waiting when we returned from the high school to honor you twice?

Did you see the Groton-Dunstable High School administrators, teachers, and students in respectful alignment? The students were proud to attend the same high school as you.

Did you see that we stopped at Orr Road, to pay tribute to where you grew up?

Did you see the fire trucks from Groton and Westford, your two home towns, with their ladders outstretched over 225, forming a gateway for your return?

Did you see the people in Forge Village, waiting patiently for you?

Did you see the little kids of Norman E. Day Elementary School saluting and waving?

Did you see the people holding flags in front of St. Catherine's?

Did you know your friend Kelly was going to give up her vacation to drive back from California because she loves you so much?

Kevin and Rose, and my wife Karen and I have seven children. Their children are ours and ours, theirs. Just as I know Kevin and Rose love our kids, we love Chris, Bill, and Mandy as our own. Billy was like a son and, for reasons that I never completely understood he seemed to be attached to me. Rose and Karen would often say, "Billy really likes talking to you. He looks up to you, Joe. Talk to him." And when my dearest friend Rosemary asked me to do this eulogy, Karen said, when I hung up the phone, "He loved talking to you. You should to do it. Share how much we all love him, respect him, and how much we now miss him."

Please bear with me as I give honor, through this eulogy, to my friend and hero,

Sergeant William J. Woitowicz, USMC. It is a great privilege that you have bestowed on me, Kevin and Rose. Thank you.

At the same time that I was saying yes to Rose, I was wondering how I would ever get through this without breaking down. I knew I couldn't, but nothing could ever keep me from it, not even the fear of losing my composure in front of all of you, once my friends Kevin and Rose asked me to do this for them.

Do me a favor. In the minutes that it might take me to recover, please raise your eyes to heaven and look for Billy's smiling face. And while you focus on him, pray for his mom and dad, and his brother and sister. I would ask that you to pray for Bill but I know he is in a better place, happy to be home. Even if he did need our prayers, it would be the preference of our unselfish Bill that you turn your thoughts not to him but to his family.

And please get comfortable, as this might take longer than one of Father Peter's sermons. We sometimes pack a lunch for the 11:00 Mass when we know he is preaching.

Speaking of Father Peter, some of you may not know that prior to being a parish priest, he was at a monastery for which he had to take a vow of silence. He was only allowed to say two words every seven years. After the first seven years the elders called him in and asked for his two words. "Cold floors," he said. The elders nodded and sent him away. Seven more years passed. They brought him back in and asked for his two words. He cleared his throat. "Bad food," he said. They nodded and sent him away. Seven more years passed. They brought him in for his two words. "I quit," he said. "That's not surprising," the elders said. "You've done nothing but complain since you got here."

You might think it inappropriate to begin this eulogy with a joke, but it is exactly what Bill would have wanted. There is not a doubt in my mind that Billy is saying right now, "Way to go, Mr. Moore." That happens to be one of his favorite expressions. I will try to paint a picture of Billy to help you understand why this is so.

In 1996, Karen and I moved our family from Allentown, Pennsylvania, to Groton. We were building a new house and it was not completed before the start of the school year so we crammed into a suite at the Westford Regency Hotel for six weeks. Prior to trekking to Groton, we had signed our kids up for soccer, and on our first Saturday as New Englanders we drove our kids to a match held behind St. Anne's Church in Littleton. As fate would have it, Chris, Billy, and our son Mike were all on the same team.

We knew no one in the area and Karen was determined to find a doctor for our kids. She happened to approach Rosemary on the sideline—she liked how Rose was cheering so loudly for her kids—and, as Rosie would, she went out of her way to be helpful to Karen. As they spoke, they connected partly because our kids went to Catholic schools. Let me interject here that Karen and Rose have not stopped talking since that day—literally, just ask our kids. Also while they chatted our daughters Jenny and Mandy struck up a friendship and, although they don't burn through their cell phone minutes talking like their mothers do, they have remained best friends.

The mothers figured out during their discussion that we lived near each other and Rose told us that she knew a short cut. We were headed to see how our house was coming along so we followed them home and pulled up to thank Rose for her help. It was then that we saw our first glimpse of Billy's tremendous charisma. Before we pulled away, little eight-year-old Bill looked at us and said, "Do you want to come in for coffee? My mom made muffins." He then

glanced at his mother as if to say, "Come on, of course were going to invite them in—right, mom?"

The rest, as they say, is history. Our older boys also became best friends. Drew became the younger brother to all of the kids and they each had a hand in raising him. Kevin and myself and even our dogs, Freckles and Maya, became friends. They all grew up together as our families intertwined.

When Billy decided to become a Marine, his parents, of course, tried to talk him out of it. So did many others. No one could change his mind. Finally, Rosemary asked me to talk to Bill about his decision. She told me that he seemed so committed, and that it was so very important to him that I shouldn't try to talk him out of it. But, even though she wanted him to follow his dream, she was hoping I could convince him to change his mind. I tried but failed. He listened—looking off into a place I could not see—patiently and politely. We ended our conversation with Bill telling me, "Don't worry Mr. Moore, everything will be okay." Billy had made his decision and no one could change it.

On other occasions when I talked to Bill about things that might be troubling him, he would listen intently but I always sensed that he had figured out his own answer. He would masterfully turn our conversations and I would walk away feeling as though it was he who had lectured me. And, as if he sensed my thoughts, he would give me his standard but heartfelt response, "Don't worry Mr. Moore, everything's okay."

Part of the connection Bill had with me, I believe, was that my father was also a Marine. He was a proud member of the First Marines and fought in World War II. He was at Guadalcanal, the first victory for America in the Pacific after suffering so many horrific losses. He fought at Peleliu, which had the highest percentage casualty rate of any battle in the Pacific, called, by some, the bitterest battle of the war for the Marines.

Bill constantly asked me questions about my dad and wanted me to tell him the stories I knew about his war experiences. He listened, riveted, as I told him that of the 200-plus men in my father's unit on Peleliu, only 27 returned unharmed. His face wore a look of reverence as I told him my father watched his closest friend, Sandy, die in front of him.

He loved to look at dad's medals, dog tags, and his old green-covered book about the First Marines, The Old Guard. The two of us watched a black-and-white video together that my father had given me about the battle of Peleliu—Bill could not take his eyes off of the television screen. Then again, when the mini-series "The Pacific" was released, I sat with Bill in our basement watching as it amazingly replayed the exact stories that I had told Bill about my father, including a scene where the soldier on whose life it was based, on leave in Australia, slept—just as my dad had—with other wounded and fatigued soldiers in a soccer stadium where the bleachers had been removed and replaced by cots. It also chronicled many of the horrific battle scenes. Bill, who could never sit still, did not move a muscle.

On several occasions Billy said to me, "I hope I will make your dad proud, Mr. Moore." And, just prior to leaving for Afghanistan, he asked me, "Do you think your dad will be proud of me, Mr. Moore?" I told him, "Billy, my dad is already proud of you."

I would like to share an email that Bill sent me this past April from Afghanistan. It will give you a good sense of his character, his humor, and what was important to him.

mr moore,  
glad to hear from you . . . just headed off to bed, going to be a long day tomorrow—and

my pack is starting to get heavy—as the afghans say in their broken English noooooooo goooooooy hahah. its been warm and rainy the last two days. i wonder what your dad would think of this war. probably a cake walk compared to WWII; but all i can do is try and make him proud. i bet he's watching down on all marines up there in heaven with a big smile on his face every time we have success. cant wait to be back home and have a relaxing day by the moore pool after a good game of bball. hope works been great and everyone's been staying out of trouble—i know its probably hard for drew this day in age haha. anyways tell the whole family i said hi, and tell matt to catch up with me on email—i called and left a message on his phone the other day. my beards nice and thick and the hair is nice and long (im trying to give ole tom brady a run for his money haha) ill keep in touch but write soon and often. its funny, last year for my 22nd bday i was in the middle of losing 20lbs being chased by dogs in the woods, now im turning 23 and being chased by dogs in afghanistan haha . . . wouldn't want it any other way

love,

Bill

This is a list of the Marine Core Leadership Traits. Reading them, a vision of the man that Billy became appears:

Dependability  
Bearing  
Courage  
Decisiveness  
Endurance  
Enthusiasm  
Initiative  
Integrity  
Judgment  
Justice  
Knowledge  
Tact  
Unselfishness  
Loyalty

Certainly, these are all words that describe Bill.

To quote Albert Einstein, "Life is not worth living unless you live it for someone else." Joining the Marines was an unselfish act, and a decision Bill made with certainty. Bill was not just a Marine, but part of MARSOC, or United States Marine Corps Special Operations Command—think Navy Seals on steroids.

Its core objectives are to direct action, special reconnaissance, and foreign internal defense. MARSOC has also been directed to conduct counter-terrorism, information operations, and unconventional warfare. MARSOC comprises roughly 2,500 Marines. About 30% of those that attempt make it through. If the Marines are the best of the best, MARSOC is the best—of the best of the best. Kevin told me that when Bill said he had to re-enlist to complete MARSOC, he started to tell Bill all the reasons he might want to reconsider. Frustrated, Bill finally told his dad he didn't need a "Plan B" because he would not fail. He was right. Billy also was one of only 1% of all Marines with a perfect score on the required physical fitness test.

Some of you may not know that Bill volunteered to go to Afghanistan ahead of his own unit. As a matter of fact, they are still here in the United States. Due to an injury to a soldier that had to return, there was a position open and Bill volunteered to go early, ahead of his unit. That was Bill, anxious to get going and positive he would make an impact.

The following is a note sent to Mandy from one of Billy's fellow Marines.

I worked with your brother in Miramar and I was the Sergeant in charge of the division that he was assigned to. I like to think I taught him most of what he knew as a com-

puter repair tech at his first duty station. I was grief stricken to hear of his passing but please know that for a Marine as dedicated to the Corps as your brother, there is no more honorable way to leave us. I wish the best for you and your family and am truly sorry for this tragic loss.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Sypole

One Christmas Billy gave me a Marine flag as a present. If it hasn't yet come through clearly to you, Bill loved and dedicated himself completely to the Corp. Bill, like my dad, passed away from us taking his fierce pride in being a Marine with him.

I believe we live our earthly lives simultaneously on two planes, the physical and the spiritual. In the ongoing struggle to overcome the physical and live more in the spiritual, there are a few saints and mystics who succeed. Advanced souls like Saint Thomas Aquinas, Padre Pio, and Mother Teresa, to name a few, are on Earth to help others rather than live for themselves. Some fail miserably, succumbing to the earthly pull. Most of us live our lives somewhere in between. I believe Billy, like the saints and mystics, was one of the more advanced souls, one that influenced others even if they were not aware. When you looked into his eyes, it seemed like he understood things that the rest of us couldn't comprehend.

C. S. Lewis said, "You don't have a soul. You are a soul. You have a body." Not many of us fully grasp this concept while here on Earth, but I believe our Billy did. He knew that this was just a temporary parking place for his soul; his real home is in heaven. I think that is why he was so impatient, why he couldn't sit still. Just maybe he was anxious to get back where his vibrant, loving soul belonged. Why he was with us for so short a time.

On the physical plane, Billy certainly had faults, like the rest of us. But, as we know, even the Apostles Jesus selected weren't perfect. I think Billy was a lot like St. Peter—a bit impulsive, temperamental, impatient, and blindly loyal. Most of you never saw that side of him, but it was there. Far outweighing it, however, was his other side, loving and caring, unselfish and kind, and extremely loyal—he was one of the good ones. In his book *The Imitation of Christ*, Thomas a Kempis wrote, "The grace of the Holy Spirit always seeks a meek and humble heart." If so, the Holy Spirit was a permanent tenant in the heart of Billy Woitowicz.

We all loved and respected the Billy of the physical plane, but to really understand the depth of him you needed to look much deeper. I don't mean look so much as I mean feel. To know him, you had to feel Billy's spirit, the energy that exuded from him. Many of us don't slow ourselves down enough to feel the soul of another. We are too busy with our day-to-day. We waste our time idolizing athletes and movie stars. We pay too much attention to what we own, how we look, what we wear, and what others think of us. Bill cared nothing about these things—he cared about others.

Those who truly knew Bill took the time to know his spirit and they could not help but fall in love with his pure, unadulterated soul. Although I miss the Bill that I could see and hear and touch, it is the loss of his soul next to mine that has tilted my world askew. I've heard many stories from many people about Bill, including his family, my family, his friends, teachers, and others that loved him. I can't tell them all but would like to share a few that I hope you will enjoy.

Billy always seemed to be in a hurry. He didn't like staying in one place he was always talking and moving. More than once he came into our house and, as I was engrossed

in a television program or movie, he would start asking me questions. "So, Mr. Moore," (he loved to begin his sentences with the word "so"), "have you seen that show on sharks yet?" "Mr. Moore, have I told you the story about my buddy?" He referred to most everyone, it seemed, as his buddy. "Mr. Moore, what do you think of the change in the economy?" "Mr. Moore, I have a great business idea. What do you think—Grilled Cheese, a restaurant where that's all we serve. I'll let you in on it." And, invariably, he would ask, "So, Mr. Moore, how is work going for you?" Now, that isn't the type of question I typically get from a 20 year old. But Bill was anything but typical.

Karen summed up Bill when she said, "I guess what Billy always gave most was his time. He always had time for you." My son Mike said, "Bill always did what you wanted rather than what he wanted, and when you talked to him he asked about you. He rarely spoke about himself."

Mike went on to say, "There is a great debate about which I've studied in many of my philosophy and psychology classes, whether altruism in humans really exists. While to this day there is no definitive proof for or against, Billy's life, and the way he lived it, makes one hell of a case in support of its existence."

A close friend, Matt McElroy, echoed this theme in a beautiful letter he wrote to the Woitowicz family. I would like to read a part of it to you:

Bill was instantly likeable and I think I know why. I noticed it in a conversation I had with him around Christmas this year. He called me at school to see how I was doing and soon our conversation turned into him telling me how much he admired me for studying to become a lawyer and working hard towards a career. As Bill went on, I remember feeling immediately rejuvenated and energized—It is an incredible feeling to be admired like that! I tried to reciprocate the praise as much as I could because I was just as proud of him for working so hard to achieve excellence in his own profession. After thinking about our conversation that day, I reflected on past experiences with Bill and finally realized why Bill connected with so many people. I remembered Bill admiring the way I played basketball and asking for advice on how to get better; I remembered at the gym he would tell me how strong I was and saying he wanted to look like me. Even though I had seen Bill do these things before, I wasn't mature enough to realize his emotional genius, but now I know. Bill's secret was his ability to identify your best traits and tell you what they were. What an unbelievable gift! And he did it in such a genuine and honest way—never insincere. It is so rare to see that in anyone, let alone someone that young.

When Karen read Matt's letter she said immediately, That describes Rose, Joe, Rosie, it is from you that he received this wonderful trait.

Bill never wanted attention. Even though he could get a discount at some stores because he was military, he did not use it. This past December, I listened as he spoke on the phone to a store from which he had ordered three new suits. He ordered them in plenty of time for Christmas and New Years, the last time he could wear them before shipping out. But a clerk made an error and Bill was told the suits would not be there in time. He spoke patiently trying to find a way to make it happen. I said to Bill, "Tell them you are a Marine and headed to Afghanistan." He would not. I told him to give me the phone, I would talk to them. He would not. The suits did not make it; they have never been worn.

Bill did not care about money. When Chris and Matt discussed who would pick up a din-

ner check, the conversation turned to how some people never offer to pay. Bill replied, "People should not be so focused on money I like spending my money on friends." When a close high school friend expressed concern about how she was going to pay her college tuition, he told her not to worry, he had plenty of money.

Chris, Matt, Mike, Matt McElroy, and a group of their friends formed what they call the Power Group. They share inspirational sayings and their own thoughts with each other. Bill sent the following note to the group from Afghanistan.

hey chris, send this around to the power group if you think it makes the cut-its short and sweet.

(1) perception is reality, no matter what you think

(2) word travels fast, so fast that what you say about someone may travel faster than expected, and now your trying to backtrack on what was said.

(3) life is short, even to usama life was probably too short.

(4) if there's one thing i learned through this deployment so far is that what's said can be taken back, but if you don't take it back today, tomorrow may be too late.

(5) and finally, stressing over the small stuff only makes things look fuzzy around the edges and the goal is harder to accomplish.

anyways i thought i might contribute to the power group because every day i strive to be looked at as a professional, and more importantly be a professional.

eat your vegetables,  
woita

Riding a dirt bike was Billy's first love. As a kid, he was determined he was going to be a professional dirt bike rider. He and Mike would often bomb up and down our driveway popping wheelies. I would hear the whine of Bill's dirt bike in the woods behind our house, it was the signal that Bill was paying us a visit. Matt's laptop screen is a picture of Bill popping a wheelie on a dirt bike in Afghanistan. Billy's Sergeant, Danny Draher, told Kevin that they use dirt bikes in Afghanistan to travel to remote areas. Each time he put Bill out on point he'd just be gone, ahead of the pack, and Sergeant Draher had to keep reeling him back in. He asked Kevin where Bill learned to ride like that. Bill was a natural. And, just like Bill, he was having fun no matter where he was.

Bill loved to eat. Rose said that when he was an infant in his crib, you could hear him from the other room making sucking sounds, looking for food. She said he was that way the rest of his life. He was eating steak at 10-months-old. One of his favorite sayings was "Eat big, get big."

One of his greatest gifts was how he could build your self-esteem. One night during dinner at our house he turned to Drew and said, "So, Drewman, are you going to play in the NBA or the NFL?"

He was a people person. When Bill was home on leave you would often find him in the Village chatting with people of any age, asking them endless questions, never turning the conversation to himself.

Kevin told me Bill loved hypotheticals. He would propose, "Dad, if we drove by a dirt bike laying along the side of the road every day for three weeks and no one claimed it, couldn't you just take it? That wouldn't be stealing would it?" Another example. Matt and Bill were having lunch together and they struck up a conversation with the man at the next table. He turned out to be the co-founder of Safety Insurance and he told the boys that he had cashed out and now lived his life helping others. He said he was a deacon at his church. Bill, who could be skeptical of organized religion, posed a hypo-

thetical. "So, let's say that I steal something and die. I learned that it is a mortal sin and if I die without confessing the sin I go to hell. But, another guy commits murder. He confesses his sin before dying and he doesn't go to hell. Explain to me how that is right?" Kevin and Chris would sometimes tease Billy about his hypotheticals. "So, Bill, if that house was sitting empty for a year could we just move in?" Bill would see the humor and laugh along with them.

Bill was a prankster. As he grew physically strong through his training, he loved to wrestle Matt, Chris, Mike, or Drew. We would be sitting talking or watching TV and, unexpectedly, he would jump up, grab one of them, and try to wrestle him to the ground. All the while, laughing and taunting, "Let's see what you got."

My daughter Jenny had gym class with Bill when she was a freshman and he was a junior. They were playing dodge ball and one of the boys hit her in the head at close range with a ball, which made her teary eyed. Billy noticed, sought out the perpetrator, took aim, and hit him square in the face. Bill the White Knight had defended her honor.

When Billy was learning to read from a picture book, the kind with one sentence per page, his dad said that any time he made a mistake he would close the book, go back to the beginning, and start over. If he made ten mistakes, that's how many times he would start again. If anyone helped him pronounce a word, he did the same. Of course, Chris enjoyed tweaking his brother by helping him with a word even if he didn't need it. Bill would yell, "You're messing me up," slam the cover shut, and start again.

Bill's Grandfather Labelle said, "All I can say about him as a child was that wherever he went he was on the run. That kid never stopped moving."

Kevin recounts another story. One hot summer afternoon when Billy was around 13 years old, Kevin was taking the kids for a drive. Just past the Village, Bill pushed a ballpoint pen into the side of a hot can of Pepsi, and it sprayed everybody and everything and made Bill roar with laughter. Kevin, furious, pulled over and yelled at Billy to start walking. Bill was laughing when got out of the car, unfazed by his dad's punishment. But, after driving away, Amanda was crying so hard for her brother, Kevin had to grudgingly go back to pick him up. There stood Bill, with a big grin still on his face, deciding whether he would get back in the car or not. After he got in, they all laughed about Bill's antics and being sticky with soda. They headed home to wash up.

On another occasion, when Bill was eight or nine, he was shopping with his dad and as they were walking back to the car there was a group of rowdy teenagers pushing and shoving each other in the parking lot. As they got closer to the teenagers, Kevin saw that they were watching them and it was clear to him they were claiming the space between them and their car. Kevin stopped and tried to move Billy to the opposite side of him, away from the teens. As he tried, Billy stopped, pushed back, and looked up at his dad and said in a loud voice, "Dad, you don't need to be afraid!" While Kevin thought he was protecting his son, Billy was looking out for his dad. Kevin said he has never forgotten how fearless Bill was.

Bill's Uncle Larry told me, "If I had a dollar for every time I heard Kevin yell, 'Billy, don't!' I would be rich. But, the amazing change in him from his childhood to adulthood is beyond comprehension." His Uncle Al said that even the growth in him from the time he started boot camp to when he graduated from MARSOC was the difference between a boy and a man.

We spend every Christmas Eve with the Woitowicz family. We have shared our home

with them and our good friends the Roccas, Hutchinsons, MacDonalds, and Decoteaus for many years. My son Matt describes it as the best night of the year. Karen goes all out decorating our home, everyone brings food, and Mr. Rocco makes his phenomenal Christmas punch. We all have some wonderful Billy memories tied to this annual celebration of our Lord's birthday and the friendship shared by our families. On a few occasions, Billy partook a bit too much of the Christmas punch and entertained us.

Typically, these events happen at the end of the evening, in our kitchen, as everyone is preparing to leave. One year Billy was telling a story, gesturing with his hands as he tended to do, and accidentally knocked our sugar bowl off the counter. It shattered as it hit the floor. We all looked at him. The expression on his face was priceless, as was his response. "I really don't know how that happened!" As we all burst into laughter he bent down and started scraping the sugar into his hands in an attempt to clean it up. He apologized to "Mrs. Moore" for days after that.

One of the best Christmas Eve memories was the year he told his parents he couldn't make it home. Matt gathered all of us in the kitchen for the purpose of making a toast to Billy. As we raised our glasses, Billy burst through the kitchen door, shocking the rest of us—especially his parents. This time the priceless expression was pasted on the faces of his parents. They were frozen, not moving, not believing—as if he were a vision. Billy the magician had made himself appear.

This past Christmas, our kids gave Kevin, Rose, Karen, and me a gift of a cruise to Bermuda. It was Billy's idea, and he was determined to do it for us. He took charge and, in his larger-than-life way, gestured through telling us how we married folk could use the time away and should enjoy some rest and relaxation. Billy the marriage counselor was taking care of us.

As in past years, at the end of the evening, around 1:00 a.m., those remaining were in the kitchen saying good-bye. Kevin and I had spent a good bit of time herding the boys up from the basement toward the door. The kids had been joking through the night about the song "Teach Me How to Dougie," which they thought was funny. I was teasing Billy that I was going to show him how to Dougie but he kept pushing me back saying he would show me. He started dancing and we all laughed as he Dougied in his tipsy state. Finally, I was able to move Billy toward the door, but he stopped abruptly, turned away, and started toward the door. Just as abruptly, he turned around, walked quickly toward me and shouted as he pointed at my chest, "Good day, sir. I said good day!" He turned again and walked out the door. We couldn't stop laughing for a long time. We tell this story often.

We have all been struggling to make sense of the loss of Billy. On the day we received the news, as Rose hugged me, she asked, "Oh, Joe what are we going to do?" My good friend Kevin and I sat and tried to make sense of it and he said, "I have always been able to fix things but I can't fix this." Kevin's nickname at the fire station is MacGyver because he really can fix almost anything, but, although we wish so much he could, this is not fixable.

I can feel the pain of his brother and sister, Chris and Mandy, and my kids, his other brothers and sister, Matt, Mike, Jenny, and Drew. I see the hurt behind the eyes of my good friends Jay, Peter, Ralph, and Mark, and many others that were so close to Billy. I see the swollen eyes of his young friends. And I feel the unbelief and numbness as I read the letters, e-mail, and texts from those that loved him. Karen and I can't stop crying. But most of all, I can barely endure the grief I see in Kevin and Rose.

Casey Mahoney, the daughter of Brian and Kirsten Mahoney, and friends of Billy's family wrote a beautiful poem for Bill. God bless Billy for all of his love, God bless the loving father above, God bless Billy's family and friends, We all pray that war will end.

Oh, Bill Boy, where have you gone? Why did you leave us? What answer do I give your mother if she asks me again, "What are we going to do now?" And, Dear Lord our God, why did you take our Billy away?

Maybe there is no answer, or at least not one we can understand. Saint Thomas Aquinas wrote [paraphrased]. Above all God destines us an end beyond the grasp of reason; according to Isaiah, Our Eyes cannot see, O God, without your help, what you have prepared for those that love you. Many things are shown that are above the understanding of men.

As to your question, Rosie, I can only say that we will endure through the love that we have for Bill, and he for us. He is with you. He will be able to help you more now, where he is, than when he was here. He loves his parents, he told me that during one of our many conversations, and he wants you to be happy. He respects you, Kevin. He will be with you, Chris, when you move to Virginia. You know that he will try to wrestle you to the ground, even from heaven. He will guide your hand, Mandy, as you learn to become a nurse like your mother. He is standing next to all of you right now, right there, and he is looking at me saying, "Don't worry Mr. Moore, they will be okay. I will make sure of it."

To my last question, I received a reply in a dream the other night. God said, "Remember, Joe, he was my son too. And, although I did not call him home—that was his choice—my heart ached, as yours does now, when I released him to Earth at his request to be with and guide Rose and Kevin, Chris and Mandy, you and your family, and his many friends. That was his mission, and like everything he does, he chose it enthusiastically."

As to where Billy has gone, I am certain I know that answer. He is sitting next to God our Father. His arm is around Bill and He has a look of great pride on His face. Bill is bathed in the pure love and light of God the Holy Spirit. And, he is chatting up his friend Jesus, asking him a thousand questions. "Are those gates really made of pearl, or do they just say that?" "Can I ride my dirt bike here?" "Yo, Jesus, would you introduce me to Mr. Moore's dad?" "Do I get to eat here, and do you have grilled cheese?" "Dude, have I told you the story about my friend?" And, invariably, "How is your work going for you, Jesus?"

The Blessed Virgin Mother Mary is hugging him while smiling and saying, "Welcome back, Billy, I missed you. You have always been one of my favorites." He is teaching the Cherubim and Seraphim how to Dougie. He is receiving a salute from the greatest military heroes of all time—there are rows and rows of them, as far as you can see, and the Marines are out in front, just as in battle. Chesty Puller, the great Marine, is shaking Bill's hand and pinning the highest award given in heaven to soldiers who sacrifice their lives for others, the Wooden Cross of Jesus.

When Jesus introduces them, my dad says, "Yes, Billy, I am very proud of you."

And, he is wrestling St. Peter to the ground.

He is reading a poem that he wants me to share with you now.

Do not stand at my grave and weep,  
I am not there, I do not sleep.  
I am in a thousand winds that blow,  
I am the softly falling snow.

I am the gentle shower of rain,  
I am the field of ripening grain.  
I am the morning hush,  
I am the graceful rush,  
Of beautiful birds in circling flight,  
I am the star shine of the night.  
I am in the flowers that bloom,  
I am in a quiet room.  
I am in the birds that sing,  
I am in each lovely thing.  
Do not stand at my grave and cry,  
I am not there, I do not die.

He is whispering in my ear, "Don't worry Mr. Moore. Everything will be okay."

I know it will, Bill. Eventually. But, before you go, there is something you need to hear. And this time, please listen carefully.

Your mom wanted me to tell you, "I want you to know that as soon as I could pull myself together, I had our family say a prayer of gratitude to you because underneath my deep grief is the tremendous joy of loving you for 23 years."

I love you too, Billy, and I promise never to forget how much you've meant to me.

Semper Fi [salute my friend]

"Good day, sir. I said, good day."

#### CAPTAIN MATTHEW GUNNAR NIELSON

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a noble fallen warrior. CAPT Matthew Gunnar Nielson of Jefferson, IA, gave his life for his country on June 29, 2011, during an attack by insurgents in Badrah, Iraq. He was 27 years old. My prayers are with Captain Nielson's parents, Roger and Christine, and all his family and friends who are feeling his loss.

In a statement, his family said, "Since Matt was a small boy he loved anything military, so he died doing what he loved best. Serving others was of the utmost importance to him and how he wanted to spend his life. He always gave his all, whatever he was doing. Matthew was a beloved son, brother, friend and Soldier. He's already home, and we know we'll be together again someday. Apart, but forever in our hearts. Psalms 11." What can I say about such selfless service and sacrifice? We just celebrated 235 years of independence and liberty, which is an occasion to reflect on the incalculable debt we owe to Matt and his comrades in arms over the years who have secured that legacy for us and for posterity. So long as we continue to have brave patriots like Matthew Nielson who are willing to give their all for their fellow Americans, our heritage as a free people will be in safe hands.

#### TRIBUTE TO JOE BYKOWSKI

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today I want to take a few minutes to offer special congratulations to Joseph "Joe" Bykowski, an extraordinary young man who has served Massachusetts and the United States in remarkable ways.

After returning home from service in the Iraq war, Joe wanted to give something back to his fellow veterans. So since 2007 he has interned in my Boston office for 4 days a week, working with

my senior staff on behalf of active servicemembers, veterans and their families. He is also an active member of the American Legion and the Catholic War Veterans Organization, where he volunteers in assisting wounded veterans and their families. And as if that is not enough, all the while he has also been working toward an undergraduate degree at UMass Boston.

This spring, Joe completed his degree's requirements. During the university's commencement ceremony, UMass Boston Chancellor J. Keith Motley cited Joe as an inspiration to all his classmates. "Joseph Bykowski served our country for eight years, from Ground Zero, to Iraq, before he joined us to major in history and political science," Chancellor Motley said. "He is a leader in veterans' affairs on campus and at the State House, where he's testified before the legislature, interned for Senator JOHN KERRY, and helped found the nation's first program dedicated to our veterans' mental health. Joe has overcome tremendous personal obstacles to get where he is, and he lifts others up with him."

I couldn't agree more. I have known Joe for 5 years, and I have been impressed all along by his dedication to public service and his devotion to his fellow veterans. It was Joe's idea to organize a "Welcome Home Cruise" to honor wounded Massachusetts vets who had just returned home from Iraq and Afghanistan. Joe worked with my office and leveraged his ties to Massachusetts Vets organizations, working together to invite hundreds of vets and their families to join us for an evening on the water in Boston. I was honored to have the chance to present several of our wounded heroes with Purple Hearts on that boat—a memory I treasure, and one I don't think would have been possible without Joe's creativity and initiative.

Joe is still reaching out to veterans. Just this month, Joe helped us arrange an honorary GED for Vietnam veteran Ron Estrella, a longtime patient at the Brockton VA spinal care unit who was diagnosed with terminal cancer. To earn the GED, Ron worked with UMass-Boston's Upward Bound, a program that helps students finish high school—no surprise, it is just one more program where Joe himself is an active leader and member.

President Kennedy once said that "the highest appreciation is not to utter words, but to live by them." He would have recognized that quality in Joe Bykowski. Joe has lived—and continues to live—a life devoted to service to country, in many forms. Whether he's serving on the other side of the world on the frontlines in Iraq, or down the street at the New England Center for Homeless Veterans serving a spaghetti dinner, there's one constant: Joe lives for service.

I have no doubt that he will put his UMass-Boston degree to the same great use.

I congratulate Joe Bykowski on his graduation, thank him for his service

these last years in my office, and salute all that he's accomplished. We can't wait to see what he does next.

#### TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL E. LEITER

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Michael Leiter, the Director of the National Counterterrorism Center and a good friend of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. This is Mike's last week and I want to thank him for his service and wish him the very best in the next steps in his career.

Director Leiter has been at the National Counterterrorism Center, or NCTC, for most of its existence. He was the principal deputy director from February 2007 to November of that year when he became the acting director. President Bush nominated him to be the Director on March 31, 2008, and he was confirmed by the Senate on June 10, 2008.

Mike has served in both the Bush and Obama administrations which speaks to his bipartisan and professional approach to the Nation's security, and the support that he has earned from the Congress and within the executive branch.

His leadership at the NCTC has brought stability and continuity to our Nation's counterterrorism efforts, and he should take pride in the fact that under his tenure, there have been no successful attacks against the United States homeland by foreign terrorists. In this threat environment, that is an impressive accomplishment indeed.

As is often the nature of the intelligence business, much of the successes of the National Counterterrorism Center go unrecognized. Terrorists plotting and carrying out attacks are captured through good intelligence and law enforcement work, and through strong cooperation with allies and partners around the world. Often, terrorist plots fail to proceed because of the barriers to recruit, travel, raise funds, get training, or gain access to destructive materials that have been erected through the efforts of the United States and other nations.

Even in counterterrorism victories that become known, such as the cases of Najibullah Zazi in the United States or the identification of Usama bin Laden's compound in Abbottabad, the National Counterterrorism Center's important—sometimes absolutely critical role—is often not well known.

So I am pleased today to be able to recognize Mike Leiter for his work in keeping our Nation safe for the past 4½ years.

As a member, and now as chair of the Intelligence Committee, I have come to rely on Mike's analysis and judgment. He has been willing to admit that at times our counterterrorism policies or practices haven't been what they should be.

He has appeared regularly before the committee and has been very accessible for the committee's staff as well.

In addition to the regularly scheduled meetings we hold, I have received secure calls from Mike often, apprising me on new threats and the status of investigations. He is, without fail, available to provide updates and assessments, and I appreciate the importance he has placed on keeping the committee, and me personally, fully informed.

Director Leiter has also worked tirelessly to achieve the goals set out for the National Counterterrorism Center in the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004. The NCTC was established to bring together information and officers from across the intelligence community and from other parts of the government involved in the spectrum of counterterrorism, including counter-radicalization, detection, and prevention of attacks.

Even after the experiences of 9/11 and the findings of the 9/11 Commission, it was a difficult and enormously frustrating challenge to truly integrate the Nation's counterterrorism efforts. It speaks to Director Leiter's energy and dedication that he was, eventually, able to bring together analysts from the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the Department of Homeland Security, and military services to share the threat streams that each one collected and assessed.

The result has been the ability to better connect the intelligence information that points to suspicious activity, to develop the case when a terrorist or a terror plot is identified, and to take coordinated action to disrupt that plot.

The NCTC now produces, on a daily basis, its own counterterrorism analysis that provides Intelligence Community-wide assessments and warning. Analysts at the NCTC are among the finest we have, and Director Leiter has fostered a productive environment through analytical roundtables and weekly forums in which analysts share information, provide briefings, and develop improved analytic tradecraft.

In fact, I recently learned that as the CIA was developing its assessment that Usama bin Laden was in the Abbottabad compound, it turned to NCTC analysts to "red-team" the intelligence case and give their assessments. And Director Leiter was involved in the briefings and discussions with the President that led to the decision to carry out the operation.

Director Leiter has demonstrated leadership in hard times, as well. After the failed terrorist attack on a Detroit-bound airliner on December 25, 2009, investigations uncovered significant failures and shortcomings in our counterterrorism efforts. The Senate Intelligence Committee's review found 14 specific "points of failure" across the government that enabled Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab to come so close to carrying out a major attack.

While several of our conclusions and recommendations fell to other agencies, Director Leiter moved quickly to implement the changes that we and others suggested. Since early 2010, the NCTC has vastly improved its methods for screening counterterrorism data and watchlisting individuals who pose a threat to our Nation.

In response to the finding that no agency in the government was ensuring that all terrorist leads were pursued, Mike implemented "Pursuit Groups" at NCTC, teams of highly skilled analysts who sift through massive amounts of data to identify disparate pieces of intelligence and find linkages that identify terrorists, their plans, and their networks before they reach the point of plot execution.

In addition to his service at the National Counterterrorism Center, Mr. Leiter helped establish the Office of the Director of National Intelligence as its deputy chief of staff, having previously served as the deputy general counsel and assistant director of the very well-regarded WMD Commission led by Senator Chuck Robb and Judge Laurence Silberman.

From 2002 to 2005, he was an assistant U.S. attorney in the Eastern District of Virginia, one of the most active jurisdictions for national security cases. He clerked for Justice Stephen Breyer and for Chief Judge Michael Boudin of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

Most people do not know that Mike was also a naval aviator, flying EA-6B Prowlers with action in operations in the former Yugoslavia and in Iraq.

In short, he has served the Nation in a wide variety of capacities over the past 20 years.

I thank Mike for his exemplary service in keeping this Nation safe and for his very positive relationship with the Intelligence Committee as we have carried out our oversight duties.

I expect that this will not be Mike's last service to the Nation, and I wish him all the best.

#### REMEMBERING SECOND LIEUTENANT ROBERT EMERSON

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to honor 2LT Robert S. Emerson who is coming home to Maine more than 60 years after he served his country during World War II. Lieutenant Emerson perished when the B-24 aircraft he was flying in crashed in the Philippines on April 3, 1945.

His body was recovered in 1947, and he was buried in Leyte, Philippines. In 1949, his remains were moved from his resting place in the Philippines to Jefferson Barracks National Cemetery in St. Louis, MO. In 2008, his remains were exhumed and transferred to the jurisdiction of the Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command in Hawaii, bringing him one step and thousands of miles closer to his home State of Maine. Thanks to the persistent efforts of the relatives of Lieutenant Emerson's family and the

other airmen that served with him on his B-24, the Department of Defense was able to guarantee the return home of this fallen service member.

Lieutenant Emerson's long and remarkable journey home is finally coming to an end. On Saturday, July 9, 2011, he will finally be brought to home, to rest alongside his mother and father in Norway, ME. After more than 66 years since he first left home, it is a privilege to welcome home, and honor, a fallen warrior who gave his life in World War II in defense of our Nation.

While no words of mine can console the grief that Lieutenant Emerson's family has felt for too long, I know Mainers and the American people are profoundly grateful for his service. Like so many throughout our history, Lieutenant Emerson left the comfort and safety of home to answer the call of duty to our country. He is now among that valiant legion that has journeyed through the darkest valley to a place of quiet waters and now able to rest at home.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### CATOCTIN MOUNTAIN PARK

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, this year marks the 75th anniversary of Catoctin Mountain Park, one of Maryland's most spectacular national parks. Located in northern Frederick County in western Maryland, Catoctin, MD, is a popular wilderness refuge just a few hours away from the bustling urban centers of Baltimore and Washington, DC. People of all walks of life visit Catoctin Mountain, whether it is working Maryland and Pennsylvania families taking a weekend camping trip to Misty Mount or U.S. Presidents taking a weekend retreat to Camp David to work or relax without the distractions of Washington. I am proud to celebrate the diamond anniversary of this wonderful natural treasure in my home State.

Catoctin Mountain Park is 5,810 acres of wilderness in the foothills of Maryland's Blue Ridge Mountains. The name Catoctin is what the Algonquians, the predominant Native American tribe of the Mid-Atlantic region prior to European settlement, called the region where Catoctin Mountain Park is located. The Algonquians were known to use rhyolite rocks found throughout the rocky terrain for spearheads and European settlers and Algonquians alike would fish for trout in mountain streams that also supplied water for early agricultural settlements in the valleys around the mountain.

The growth of the settler population in Maryland during colonialism and postrevolutionary America, gave rise to agriculture and industry in western Maryland. The growing industrial age changed the ecological and social condition of the wilderness of the eastern United States and western Maryland

was no exception. Logging activities for ship and structural building, iron ore extraction and the arrival of the Western Maryland Railroad drastically changed the culture and natural state of Catoctin.

The Great Depression of the 1930s slowed economic progress and thwarted industrial growth across the country. The extractive industries of the Mid-Atlantic suffered greatly. The Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal ushered in sweeping public works programs to help get Americans back to work building America's infrastructure and renewing the stewardship of our Nation's great resources. Catoctin Mountain Park is a testament to the success of the New Deal's Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps.

In May of 1933 the Federal Emergency Relief Administration was appropriated \$300,000,000 to be spent on public works projects designed to provide work for struggling Americans. In 1934 a land planning committee established under the Federal Emergency Relief Act was examining how to put fallow land to better use. Conrad L. Wirth, Assistant Director to the Chief Branch of Planning of the National Park Service served on the land planning committee. Based on the findings in a 1928 report of the Joint Committee on Recreational Survey of Federal Lands, Wirth decided one of the answers to the report's "urgent need" to "provide quality outdoor recreation facilities at the lowest cost for the benefit of people of lower and middle incomes" on natural areas near urban areas was to establish a recreational area in western Maryland proximate to Baltimore and Washington.

By 1934, years of agricultural, logging and resource extraction activities had taken its toll on the economic value of the land comprising Catoctin. With \$25 million transferred to Public Works Administration the Department of the Interior was able to purchase the "sub-marginal" lands that now make up Catoctin Mountain Park. Catoctin was officially placed into the program in January of 1935 and within a year and a half, and hundreds of man hours of work, Catoctin Recreational Demonstration Area was officially opened on August 8, 1936.

In the years immediately following Catoctin's official placement under the National Park Service's jurisdiction, The Works Progress Administration and Civilian Conservation Corps provided work for hundreds of men looking to learn a trade, earn a wage and develop leadership skills. These programs are responsible for providing some of the base training these men needed before going off to fight in World War II. The programs themselves reforested the park and restored its natural beauty. The CCC planted thousands of Maples, Pine and Oak trees in the park. The CCC also helped restore mountain streams and create suitable habitat for native fish and wildlife to

return to the mountain. These hard-working men also built many park structures still in use today including the Blue Blazes Contact Station which is now the Catoctin Mountain Park Visitor Center, Camp Round Meadow and Camp Misty Mount.

The legacy of the hard work of these Depression-era CCC and PWA workers lives on today and will continue to be enjoyed for years to come.

President Roosevelt personally experienced the success of the CCC and WPA at Catoctin on many occasions. This is because one major component of the Works Progress Administration's at Catoctin was to build Hi-Catoctin camp for Federal Government agents, now known as Camp David.

FDR hosted Winston Churchill at Catoctin in May of 1943 and every President since FDR has made use of Camp David. Perhaps most famously is President Jimmy Carter who brought Egyptian President Anwar Sadat and Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin to Camp David where he brokered the Camp David Peace Accords in September of 1978. But many Presidents and their families go to Camp David, for the same reason everyone else does, to simply enjoy the spectacular outdoor recreational opportunities the park has to offer.

More than 80,000 visitors a year come to Catoctin Mountain Park to experience the park's extensive trail system, scenic vistas, and terrific camping opportunities. When hiking around Chimney Rock or the old Whiskey Still or Sawmill it is not uncommon for visitors to see white tail deer, wild turkey, coyotes, dozens of species of songbirds or even the occasional black bear.

With further dwindling resources for the National Park Service it has become increasingly challenging for the NPS to manage the park resources. Invasive species like the emerald ash borer threaten the health of the park's forest and the sustainability of park habitat for the wildlife that make the park so popular. It is essential that Congress and the Federal Government recognize the importance of preserving these natural resources. That is why I have been a staunch champion for robustly funding the National Park Service because I believe the treasures the NPS work to protect for the public's enjoyment and enrichment is invaluable and it is the responsibility of the Federal government to do this work.

Despite tough fiscal times, the leadership at Catoctin Mountain Park is doing an outstanding job providing fun and educational activities for park visitors and have put together a wide range of special programs and activities to celebrate the park's 75 anniversary.

I congratulate Catoctin Mountain Park and the National Park Service for 75 wonderful years and encourage my colleagues to take a trip to experience this wonderful located in the backyard of your home away from home just outside of Washington.●

#### CONGRATULATING SISTERS OF THE PRESENTATION

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, with great honor, I congratulate the Aberdeen congregation of the Sisters of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary who are in the process of celebrating their 125 years of service.

Founded on December 25, 1775 by Nano Nagle in Cork, Ireland, with the mission to educate poor children and minister to the sick, the Sisters of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary retain a strong dedication to their founding principle of providing for people's unmet needs. Arriving in the Dakota Territory from Dublin, Ireland, in 1880, the Sisters of the Presentation endured the hardship of isolation and harsh weather to teach the children of the early settlers of South Dakota.

Teaching and healing remain the foundation of the work performed by the Presentation Sisters. Today the sisters have expanded their work into less traditional forms. From teaching the young to counseling individuals in spiritual growth, the services provided by the Sisters have grown steadily outside the classroom to provide deeper healing. Assisting in such healing has also led the Sisters to become involved in a wide range of activities—from walking alongside those with HIV to facilitating healing and counsel to individuals after traumatic life events. In addition, the Sisters continue to sponsor Presentation College and Avera Health, along with having sisters actively engaged in those ministries.

While recognizing the need to adapt to the changing needs of those they serve, the common thread that binds all the work the Sisters perform is their steadfast adherence to their apostolic tradition of joyfully going where the calls of need ring out most loudly. They are guided in this mission by the words of Bishop Walsh who advocated for the need to go where they are needed, but not necessarily wanted, and stay until they are wanted but no longer needed.

I am proud to have this opportunity to honor the Aberdeen Congregation of the Sisters of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary for 125 years of exemplary service. It is an honor for me to share with my colleagues the strong commitment the Sisters of the Blessed Virgin of Mary have demonstrated over these many years. I strongly commend their years of hard work and dedication, and I am very pleased that their substantial efforts are being publicly honored and celebrated.●

#### STRANDBURG, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the community of Strandburg, SD, on reaching the 125th anniversary of its founding. Strandburg is a community that embodies the spirit of hospitality,

and an exceptional quality of life that is well known in South Dakota. The people of Strandburg celebrated this momentous occasion on the weekend of July 2-3.

The city of Strandburg was settled in 1886 and named after the town's first homesteader John Strandburg. John was the man that applied for a post office to be opened in Strandburg, and served as the first postmaster. With the help of the railroad, Strandburg soon prospered and grew like many South Dakota towns of the time.

Today, Strandburg has come a long way from its beginning days. The town is currently working on developing the old town gymnasium to a new community center as an effort to bring the community closer. The beautiful and historic Swedish Lutheran Church still stands today and is known as the Tabor Lutheran Church, and was, recognized on the National Register of Historic Places in 1978.

Residents of Strandburg plan to commemorate the anniversary with many community events including a craft show, wagon train, and parade. On Sunday the community will come together in the historic Tabor Lutheran Church for a service to conclude the celebration.

South Dakota's small communities are the bedrock of our economy and vital to the future of our state. Towns like Strandburg and its citizens truly know what it means to be South Dakotan, and I am proud to honor Strandburg on this historic milestone.●

#### REMEMBERING CHARLOTTE BLOOMBERG

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, most New Yorkers knew Charlotte Bloomberg as Mayor Michael Bloomberg's spirited, independent mother whose example shined through in her son.

But for us in Massachusetts, Mrs. Bloomberg was a presence and a fixture in a city where neighborhood ties run deep—Medford. There she was known and loved as a schoolteacher, a community icon, and a beloved and caring friend.

Mrs. Bloomberg passed away at her home in Medford, in the same house that she turned into a home with her husband and children. In his farewell, Mayor Bloomberg remembered his mother for her "constant love." In Medford, Mrs. Bloomberg's generosity in sharing caring and compassion was well known. Charlotte Bloomberg showered attention on her neighbors and friends, and her modesty, her grace, and unflagging energy was infectious. She was a fixture at the Temple Shalom, which the Bloombergs founded and where she served as copresident well into her eighties. Neighbors remember that they could always count on Mrs. Bloomberg to be one of the first people to arrive for Friday services because she wanted the chance to say hello to everyone, especially the children.

She was an energetic campaign volunteer—even in her midnineties, she was frequently out on the campaign trail, telling anyone who would listen why her son was the best choice for mayor. And when she couldn't be there physically, she was still present because she was tightly weaved into her son's life and as a result his political speeches. Her values were instilled in her children—hard work, intellectual curiosity, and ambition. These were values Charlotte Bloomberg lived day-in and day-out. She graduated high school at 16 and went to New York University. She raised two great children—Michael and Marjorie Tiven. And when her husband died while Michael was in college, Charlotte forged forward and became the family breadwinner. Mayor Bloomberg later wrote, above all his mother was a woman who lived according to the belief that “we've got to take care of each other.” That is a lesson we should all hold close.

Mr. President, if there is an example we can all learn from the life of Charlotte Bloomberg, it is that we can always do more for our community, our State, and our country. So today we join the Bloomberg family in mourning the passing of Charlotte Bloomberg, but we also join to rejoice in the blessings she shared with everyone who knew her and the indomitable spirit her friends won't ever forget—a spirit that is the very best of Medford, MA.●

#### TRIBUTE TO JACLYN LICHT

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, student activism has always been at the forefront of every step forward we have taken as a country and as a society. It was true for my generation in the civil rights movement, the women's movement, and the effort to end the Vietnam war. In recent years it was students—young people—who put issues like AIDS in Africa and global poverty front and center on the Nation's agenda when few others showed much interest in the fight.

Today I would like to recognize the special efforts of a student activist in my State—Jaclyn Licht, a young woman carving out time from her studies to raise awareness about the brutal tactics of the Lord's Resistance Army, LRA, in east and central Africa. Right now Jaclyn is lobbying to maintain the integrity and funding for the landmark LRA disarmament bill that passed in the 111th Congress. And she recently penned an insightful article about the important role that all citizens play in promoting democracy and peace throughout the world. Jaclyn's article appeared in “The Vanguard,” the student newspaper of Buckingham Browne & Nichols Upper School in Cambridge, MA. She writes convincingly about the right of Americans to petition their government and urges her fellow Americans not to waste that right, especially given the uncertain fate of the LRA disarmament bill. Jaclyn reminds us that “students . . . have the great-

est ability to take advantage of this right” and urges activism on the part of her classmates.

Along with representatives from the group Resolve, Jaclyn recently met with staff in my Boston office to discuss how important this legislation is for the people of east and central Africa. She also shared her views about America's role in protecting the people most vulnerable to the brutalities of the LRA.

For Jaclyn, of course, activism is in her DNA—an inheritance from two parents who have always made the cause of justice their concern. But Jaclyn is already writing her own chapter in that family history of urging change.

Mr. President, I am submitting the text of Jaclyn's article to the RECORD as an example to all of us.

The information follows.

[From The Vanguard, June 9, 2011]

#### STUDENT ACTIVISTS LOBBY TO PROTECT LRA DISARMAMENT BILL

(By Jaclyn Licht)

In the First Amendment of the United States Constitution, citizens are guaranteed the right to free speech, including the right to “petition the government for a redress of grievances.” Though many students may easily overlook the meaning of these words, it is students, in fact, who have the greatest ability to take advantage of this right.

In early April, I received an email from Resolve, an organization dedicated to raising awareness about the terror of the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) in Central and East Africa. The email outlined a nationwide lobbying campaign taking place throughout the month and offered an opportunity for Massachusetts residents to attend a meeting with a staff member at the office of Senator John Kerry. Last year, President Obama signed into law the LRA Disarmament and Northern Uganda Recovery Act, a bill unanimously passed by Congress that ensures the United States will aid in dismantling the rebel group and protect affected civilians. Though this bill only requires less than .002 percent of our national budget, economic challenges have brought about risks of foreign aid budget cuts and the possibility of losing the bill's budget completely. Therefore, Americans throughout the country attended lobby meetings with their local government representatives in order to guarantee that the LRA Disarmament Act budget will remain intact.

The meeting was led by a student from Worcester Polytechnic Institute, and the group of ten comprised Resolve supporters who were mainly high school or college students. We were greeted warmly by Senator Kerry's representative at his Boston office. After taking our seats around a large table in a spacious conference room, we commenced our discussion. The discussion lasted for almost 30 minutes, longer than we had anticipated. Each of the group members outlined the current issues posed by the LRA and proceeded to explain the need for our government representatives to support these efforts as well. As Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Kerry could hold much influence in this area of concern. The staff member nodded his head vigorously throughout our discussion, frequently asking questions about the situation in central Africa and about Resolve. He explained that Senator Kerry and his staff were already familiar with the deadly situation in countries such as Uganda, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and South

Sudan. He assured us that the Senator was very concerned about the situation in the region, as well, and even outlined useful tips to help us carry out additional meetings with other government officials. After outlining the key information we hoped would be passed on to Senator Kerry, we prepared to depart and began to thank him for his time. However, the senator's representative interrupted us and asked us each how we became involved in Resolve's efforts. Our reasons for becoming involved varied, but each one shared a similar message: that we could not allow such violence by this African rebel group go unnoticed.

The dedicated interest of the government officials in our concern for this issue reflects not only the overwhelming number of opportunities available in this democratic country, but also the true power of student activism in particular. Throughout this country, students frequently raise awareness for issues of local or global concern often only in their own communities. While it is absolutely crucial to rally whole communities around the cause, the opportunity to lobby government officials or their staff directly is widely overlooked. While citizens of several countries around the world are prohibited from such petitioning, this country and its officials welcome the opinions of those they are representing. Moreover, American students must not hesitate to contact their government leaders to express concern for any issue. Throughout the United States' history, young adults have instilled many lasting changes in the country through many modes of activism. Therefore, government officials take much interest in meeting with student lobbyists, for it grants them the ability to learn and hear firsthand from an influential segment of the population. Moreover, students have the ability to take action immediately through direct contact with government officials to advocate for changes that will shape the history of our country and our world.●

#### TRIBUTE TO ALAN MACDONALD

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, we are lucky in Massachusetts to have men and women who—at the community level—give of themselves to make lasting contributions to our quality of life, our neighborhoods, and our economic footing. I have always thought it was no coincidence that when DeTocqueville came to America to study the country's “character,” he spent much of his time in Massachusetts and reflected there that “America is great because Americans are good.” DeTocqueville would find much of that character still abides in Alan Macdonald, executive director of the Massachusetts Business Roundtable, whose life has been defined by good old fashioned civic leadership—for 23 years a driving force making Massachusetts a better place to live, to work and to raise a family.

Today, as Alan prepares for a much-deserved retirement, I thank him for everything he has done for our State.

Throughout 23 years at the helm of the Massachusetts Business Roundtable, Alan brought together the policymakers, industries and educators who make Massachusetts the center of economic growth, educational excellence and health care innovation it is today. The Massachusetts Business Roundtable set a laser focus on



strengthening our State's long-term economic health. Alan himself oversaw the creation of task forces on health care, on education and workforce development, on transportation and infrastructure and corporate social responsibility.

The results are clear for all to see. Massachusetts is creating jobs faster than almost every other State, our economy is expanding at twice the national growth rate, and our students are outperforming their peers around the country. Now, there are a lot of people to thank for that, and many who have played a part in the success of our State—but one of them is very definitely Alan Macdonald. Thanks in part to the strategic thinking under Alan's leadership, Massachusetts became the model for health care reforms that expand coverage and lower costs. It is one of the reasons that a well-educated work force is our State's calling card in the global economy. And it is one of the reasons our State has a competitive edge in building a 21st century infrastructure and developing clean energy. Thank you, Alan.

Alan's retirement gives him more time to spend with his wife Jane, more time with his two sons, Alan and Daniel and their families, and more time with his four grandchildren. And I think we can all agree that he has earned the extra time for his other great passions—baseball and golf.

But fortunately, the Massachusetts Business Roundtable has made Alan its president emeritus. So as the roundtable navigates the coming challenges, it is comforting to know that Alan Macdonald won't be far away.●

#### RECOGNIZING MORNING GLORY NATURAL FOODS

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, our economy relies on small businesses, particularly small, family-owned firms that have been in operation for generation after generation. One such small business, Morning Glory Natural Foods in Brunswick, will be celebrating its "30 Years on Maine Street" on July 15, complete with festivities for the whole community. Today I wish to commend Morning Glory Natural Foods for its remarkable achievement.

Morning Glory Natural Foods opened its doors in May of 1981, proudly serving the mid-coast community of Brunswick with fresh, local, and organic products—from delicious local produce to organic cotton clothing, and everything in between. Since then, the firm has grown to incorporate dozens of other Maine-made products in its catalogue of goods that truly exemplify the virtues of a local economic leader.

Like so many small Maine businesses, Morning Glory is rooted in family tradition. The Tarpinian family has continually operated the store since its opening 30 years ago. It is particularly pleasing to acknowledge the successes of small, family-owned businesses, because these companies help maintain

the strong, community-oriented character of Main Street America. And certainly Brunswick's Maine Street is a shining example of this uniquely American proposition.

The long-term success and longevity of Morning Glory Natural Foods and the Tarpinian family is a byproduct of the strong work ethic, customer service, and decision to sell quality, local products at affordable prices. Indeed, this business serves the local community on two levels: by providing fresh, environmentally responsible products to Maine citizens, while also supporting other local businesses by electing to sell their products. Morning Glory Natural Foods and the Tarpinians are a true testament to the rewards of hard work and perseverance.

On Friday, July 15, Morning Glory Natural Foods will be holding a celebration of "30 Years on Maine Street," a storewide celebration being held at their location in the middle of Brunswick. Events include free food and drink, raffles, and sampling throughout the day, a way to say thanks to the community and the store's loyal customers. Morning Glory also plans to have an abundance of local food vendors and farmers lining the street, another wonderful way to promote and encourage growth in the local economy.

Small businesses like Morning Glory Natural Foods are the heart and soul of our Nation's communities. Main Streets across America are chock full of restaurants, grocery stores, and shopping boutiques which provide citizens with the goods and wares they need in a friendly and convenient location and deserve our recognition. Indeed, Morning Glory Natural Foods is a prime example of a small business that has persevered through a turbulent economy time and again, and has come out on top each time. I congratulate everyone at Morning Glory for this incredible milestone and wish them many more years of success.●

#### REMEMBERING ROGER WILLIAMS

● Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, today I wish to reflect on a recent article on one of the most influential heroes from the earliest days of our Nation's history: Roger Williams of Rhode Island.

Roger Williams' legacy is well known in my home State of Rhode Island—the State he helped found after being banished from Massachusetts for his beliefs about religious tolerance.

Roger Williams argued that religious beliefs should be kept separate from government policies and that government should not impose a specific set of religious beliefs on its citizens. The separation of church and state is widely embraced today, both in the United States and in many countries around the world. But in the 1600s, this was a scandalous idea. The Puritans who colonized the Massachusetts Bay Colony fled England because of religious

persecution, but they had no intention of allowing religious freedom in the new colonies. Rather, they established the Massachusetts Bay colony as a theocracy that enforced adherence to their particular religious beliefs with the gallows and the lash.

Roger Williams rejected this framework, and was forced to flee Massachusetts. Upon arriving at the northwestern shore of Narragansett Bay in 1636, he negotiated an agreement with the Narragansett Indians to establish a new colony on that land. As Williams wrote, "...having made covenant of peaceable neighborhood with all the sachems and natives round about us, and having, in a sense of God's merciful providence unto me in my distress, called the place Providence, I desired it might be for a shelter for persons distressed for conscience." Later on these views would be enshrined in Rhode Island's founding charter, providing "full liberty in religious concernsments."

Williams' principles of tolerance are the foundation on which our state, and afterwards our nation, were built. To this point, I request to have printed in the RECORD a recent op-ed from the Providence Journal by Rhode Island College Professor J. Stanley Lemons entitled "Assessing the global importance of Roger Williams," which does an excellent job of capturing this piece of American history.

The information follows.

[From the Providence Journal, Friday, June 24, 2011]

#### ASSESSING THE GLOBAL IMPORTANCE OF ROGER WILLIAMS

(By J. Stanley Lemons)

The greatest contribution that the U.S. has made to world religion is the concept and practice of separation of church and state, and that was started in Providence with Roger Williams in 1636.

Even if nothing in the rest of the history of the state was remarkable, Providence would still have that one world-class contribution to its credit. It was the first place in modern history where citizenship and religion were separated, where freedom of conscience was the rule.

While his ideas were reviled and attacked in the 17th Century, they became embodied in the U.S. Constitution in 1789 and the Bill of Rights, appended to it in 1791.

Have you wondered why there is a Roger Williams Lodge of B'nai B'rith? Why the oldest synagogue (Touro Synagogue, in Newport) in America is in Rhode Island? Have you ever wondered why Rhode Island never had a witch trial? Or blasphemy trials? Nor hanged, whipped or jailed people because of religion? All the other colonies executed witches, but not Rhode Island. Most had blasphemy trials, but not Rhode Island.

Nearly everywhere else in colonial America, people of faith were persecuted, but not in Rhode Island. Massachusetts hanged four Quakers, and Virginia imprisoned dozens of Baptists. Maryland, which was created as a haven for Roman Catholics, came to outlaw Catholic priests and prohibited Roman Catholics from inheriting property. These things did not happen here because Roger Williams founded Providence to be a "shelter for those distressed of conscience." Rhode Island's freedom of religion prevented such religious laws and abuses.

It is well to recall how this came about. Roger Williams got into serious trouble in

Massachusetts when he challenged both the political and religious establishments by asserting that the government had no role in religion. Moreover, he challenged the legitimacy of the colony itself by charging that it had stolen its land from the Indians. So he was tried and convicted of sedition, heresy and the refusal to take an oath of allegiance to the colony that required him to swear in God's name. In October 1635 he was ordered banished to England, whence he had fled in 1630 because of religious persecution.

Before the banishment could be carried out, however, he fled from Salem into the snow in January 1636 and trekked to the Narragansett Bay. In June he left the shelter of the Wampanoags and crossed the Seekonk River into the domain of the Narragansetts. From Miantonomi and Canonicus he acquired Providence. His relations with the Narragansetts were so cordial that Providence and the Narragansetts remained allies for the next 40 years against the efforts of Massachusetts, Connecticut and Plymouth colonies to destroy them both.

When the householders first gathered in Providence to form their town government, they agreed that they could make rules and laws in "civil matters only." In 1644 when Williams secured his charter for the "Province of Providence Plantations in Narragansett Bay in New England," that charter was for a "civil government." It did not mention religion because Williams did not believe that government had any role to play in religion. "Soul liberty" was God's gift to all humanity; it was not something granted by any government.

Soul liberty was the freedom of every person to follow the dictates of conscience. A government could only acknowledge this freedom and stand aside to allow full freedom of religion. This meant that one had to have complete separation of church and state. For Roger Williams, separation of church and state was for the protection of the church from the corrupting effects of government. Williams wrote repeatedly that true religion needs no support of the government and that government support invariably corrupts religion.

All of the neighboring colonies regarded Providence Plantations with undisguised horror and worked for the first hundred years to dismember and destroy this "hive of heretics." But they failed, and the principle that Roger Williams planted in Providence in 1636 came to be the law of all of Rhode Island and then a basic principle of the United States. And, Roger Williams, whose ideas were roundly rejected by everybody in his lifetime, would be seen by the 20th Century as the quintessential American of the 17th Century. What was the founding principle of Providence—freedom of religion (which demands separation of church and state)—now holds out a hope for the whole world where religious intolerance is the basis of so much strife.

Williams believed that it was God's command that everyone (including people that he regarded as heretics, pagans, atheists, and infidels) had a right to freedom of conscience. He believed that anyone had a right to be wrong, and that only civil debate could be used to change a heart or mind. The only tools of religion were those of the spirit, never the sword. For him, the state had no role to play in religion. He believed that whenever and wherever the government tried to meddle with religion by trying to define it or control it or enforce it, or even to support it, religion was corrupted by such efforts.

Williams and his good friend John Clarke, of Newport, shared the view that the key to a peaceful society was complete separation of church and state. Nearly everyone else believed just the opposite: They believed that

peace was possible only when everyone was united in a single church in a single state. Williams's core religious principle held that each person had freedom of conscience and freedom to practice their faith. Nearly everyone else thought that the state had to punish and coerce those who had divergent religious beliefs, wrong practices, or wayward ideas.

His position on freedom of religion was wildly radical in his day and, nearly four centuries later, this basic principle is still wildly radical in great swathes of today's world. Religious freedom does not exist in most nations on the planet.

What would Roger Williams think of the idea that our nation was founded as a Christian nation? Certainly Providence and Rhode Island were not founded as a Christian government. It is deeply troubling to know that a pastor of one of the largest churches in Texas declared on national TV that "separation of church and state is the product of some infidel's mind."

To call Roger Williams an infidel reveals profound ignorance of our nation's history. Roger Williams utterly rejected any such concept and regarded the idea of a "Christian nation" as "blasphemy." So, he established a government that was confined to "civil matters only," and this has become a model for the world.●

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1326. A bill to implement the President's request to increase the statutory limit on the public debt.

#### 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-2370. A communication from the Chief of Planning and Regulatory Affairs, Food and Nutrition Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Child and Adult Care Food Program: Improving Management and Program Integrity" (RIN0584-AC24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2371. A communication from the Chief of Planning and Regulatory Affairs, Food and Nutrition Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National School Lunch Program: School Food Service Account Revenue Amendments Related to the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010" (RIN0584-AE11) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2372. A communication from the Chief of Planning and Regulatory Affairs, Food and Nutrition Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC): Exclusion of Combat Pay from WIC Income Eligibility Determinations" (RIN0584-AE04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2373. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer

authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2374. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prompt Corrective Action; Amended Definition of Low-Risk Assets, 76 FR 16234 (March 23, 2011)" (RIN3133-AD81) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2375. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prompt Corrective Action; Amended Definition of Low-Risk Assets, 75 FR 66298 (October 28, 2010)" (RIN3133-AD81) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2376. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67)(Docket No. FEMA-2011-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 1, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2377. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Certification, Compliance, and Enforcement for Consumer Products and Commercial and Industrial Equipment" (RIN1904-AC23) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 1, 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2378. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision of Fee Schedules; Fee Recovery for Fiscal Year 2011" (RIN3150-AI93) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2379. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulation to Mitigate the Misfueling of Vehicles and Engines with Gasoline Containing Greater Than Ten Volume Percent Ethanol and Modifications to the Reformulated and Conventional Gasoline Programs" (FRL No. 9428-2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2380. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Prolongation of Implementation Plans; State of Oregon; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan and Interstate Transport Plan" (FRL No. 9425-3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2381. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 9427-9) received in the Office

of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2382. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Louisiana" (FRL No. 9323-7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2383. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District, Kern County Air Pollution Control District, and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District" (FRL No. 9425-4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2384. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District, Kern County Air Pollution Control District, and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District" (FRL No. 9429-1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2385. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference" (FRL No. 9314-6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2386. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Louisiana; Determination of Termination of Section 185 Fees" (FRL No. 9430-2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2387. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District" (FRL No. 9428-7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2388. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to Regulations Regarding Major Life-Changing Events Affecting Income-Related Monthly Adjustment Amounts to Medicare Part B Premiums" (RIN0960-AH06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2389. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, status reports relative to Iraq for the period of February 21, 2011

through April 20, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2390. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Devices; Ear, Nose, and Throat Devices; Classification of the Wireless Air-Conduction Hearing Aid" (FDA-2011-N-0361) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2391. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Group Health Plans and Health Insurance Issuers: Rules Relating to Internal Claims and Appeals and External Review Processes" (RIN0938-AQ66) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 1, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2392. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Administrative Simplification: Adoption of Operating Rules for Eligibility for a Health Plan and Health Care Claim Status Transactions" (RIN0938-AQ12) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 1, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2393. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Disease Control, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "World Trade Center Health Program Requirements for Enrollment, Appeals, Certification of Health Conditions, and Reimbursement" (RIN0920-AA44) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 1, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2394. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 1, 2011; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC-2395. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-53; Introduction" (FAC 2005-53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 5, 2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2396. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the operations of the National Defense Stockpile (NDS); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2397. A communication from the Secretary, Division of Corporation Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Exemptions for Security-Based Swaps" (RIN3235-AL17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2398. A communication from the Senior Vice President and Chief Accounting Officer,

Federal Home Loan Bank of Dallas, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's management report for fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2399. A communication from the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Chicago, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's 2010 management reports; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2400. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "In the Matter of Lifeline and Link Up Reform and Modernization, WC Docket No. 11-42; Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, CC Docket No. 96-45; Lifeline and Link Up, WC Docket No. 03-109" ((RIN3060-AF85) (FCC 11-97)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 1, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2401. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Personnel Monitoring Device—Direct-Reading Pocket Dosimeters" (Regulatory Guide 8.4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 1, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2402. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Qualification for Cement Grouting for Prestressing Tendons in Containment Structures" (Regulatory Guide 1.107, Revision 2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 1, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2403. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the extension and amendment of the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Colombia Concerning the Imposition of Import Restrictions on Categories of Archaeological Material from the Pre-Columbian Cultures and Certain Ecclesiastical Ethnological Material from the Colonial Period of Colombia; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2404. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services to support Proton Rocket Launch Vehicle integration and launch of the Astra 2F commercial communications satellite for the United Kingdom in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2405. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services to Japan for the manufacture, assembly, inspection, installation, test, and sale of auxiliary power units for use in CH-47, SH-60K, UH-60J, SH-60, and UH-60 helicopters and landing craft air cushions in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2406. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's response to the GAO report entitled "Afghanistan Development: Enhancements to Performance Management and Evaluation Efforts Could Improve USAID's Agricultural Programs"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2407. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to an audit of the Garden for the period from January 1, 2010, through December 31, 2010; 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. REED (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1328. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding school libraries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 1329. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to establish a pilot program to facilitate the provision of education and training programs in the field of advanced manufacturing; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1330. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a temporary payroll increase tax credit for certain employers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WEBB (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1331. A bill to provide for the inclusion of Lease Sale 220 in the outer Continental Shelf leasing program for fiscal years 2012-2017, to revise the map for the Mid-Atlantic planning area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 1332. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Hudson River Valley, New York; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1333. A bill to provide for the treatment and temporary financing of short-time compensation programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

S. 1334. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to ensure that certain Federal contracts are set aside for small businesses, to enhance services to small businesses that are disadvantaged, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PRYOR, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. AL-EXANDER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BURR, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr.

JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COBURN, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 1335. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide rights for pilots, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 57

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 57, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the application of the tonnage tax on certain vessels.

S. 169

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 169, a bill to prohibit appropriated funds from being used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.

S. 294

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 294, a bill to enhance early care and education.

S. 312

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 312, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits.

S. 383

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 383, a bill to promote the domestic production of critical minerals and materials, and for other purposes.

S. 398

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 398, a bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to improve energy efficiency of certain appliances and equipment, and for other purposes.

S. 426

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 426, 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.

S. 434

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 434, a bill to improve and expand geographic literacy among kindergarten through grade 12 students in the United States by improving profes-

sional development programs for kindergarten through grade 12 teachers offered through institutions of higher education.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to amend the Public Health Services Act and the Social Security Act to extend health information technology assistance eligibility to behavioral health, mental health, and substance abuse professionals and facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 542

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 542, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize space-available travel on military aircraft for members of the reserve components, a member or former member of a reserve component who is eligible for retired pay but for age, widows and widowers of retired members, and dependents.

S. 556

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 556, a bill to amend the securities laws to establish certain thresholds for shareholder registration, and for other purposes.

S. 609

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) 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. 769

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 769, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prevent the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from prohibiting the use of service dogs on Department of Veterans Affairs property.

S. 778

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 778, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 1025

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 1025, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the national defense through empowerment of the National Guard, enhancement of the functions of the

National Guard Bureau, and improvement of Federal-State military coordination in domestic emergency response, and for other purposes.

S. 1145

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1145, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify and expand Federal criminal jurisdiction over Federal contractors and employees outside the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1176

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1176, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes.

S. 1189

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1189, a bill to amend the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) to provide for regulatory impact analyses for certain rules, consideration of the least burdensome regulatory alternative, and for other purposes.

S. 1279

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1279, a bill to prepare disconnected youth for a competitive future.

S. 1297

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1297, a bill to preserve State and institutional authority relating to State authorization and the definition of credit hour.

S.J. RES. 17

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 17, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 17, supra.

S.J. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution pro-

posing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1328. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding school libraries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I introduce with my colleagues Senators COCHRAN, MURRAY, ROCKEFELLER, and WHITEHOUSE, the Strengthening Kids' Interest in Learning and Libraries Act bill.

Our bipartisan legislation will reauthorize and strengthen the school library program of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The key improvements to the program include ensuring that elementary, middle, and high school students are served; expanding professional development to include digital literacy instruction and reading and writing instruction across all grade levels; focusing on coordination and shared planning time between teachers and librarians; awarding grants for a period of three years; and ensuring that books and materials are appropriate for and gain the interest of students with special learning needs, including English learners.

The SKILLS Act will also strengthen Title I by asking state and school district plans to address the development of effective school library programs to help students develop digital literacy skills, master the knowledge and skills in the challenging academic content standards adopted by the state, and graduate from high school ready for college and careers. Additionally, the legislation will broaden the focus of training, professional development, and recruitment activities under Title II to include school librarians.

Since 1965, more than 60 education and library studies have produced clear evidence that school libraries staffed by qualified librarians have a positive impact on student academic achievement. Knowing how to find and use information are essential skills for college and careers. A good school library, staffed by a trained school librarian, is where students develop and hone these skills.

The SKILLS Act will build on the success of the Improving Literacy through School Libraries programs that was part of the No Child Left Behind Act and is the only Federal initiative solely dedicated to supporting and enhancing our Nation's school libraries. The Department of Education's January 2009 evaluation of the program found that it had been successful in improving the quality of those school li-

braries receiving the grants. Unfortunately, even in the face of all the evidence of the role school libraries play in boosting student achievement and the efficacy of the program itself, the Administration opted not to use its authority to provide funding for the school library program under the fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution.

This was a very short-sighted decision. Since its enactment in 2002, the Improving Literacy through School Libraries program has been making a difference for students across the country.

In Rhode Island, for instance, this program supported the Get READY, Get Ready, Empowered And Determined Youth, project of the Woonsocket school district, which encompassed a comprehensive strategy to improve the reading skills and academic achievement of 6,296 students, in grades K-12, by addressing critical elements of an effective school library program. Grant funds allowed the district to replace outdated library materials, add one to two books per student at each library, extend library hours, and add new computers to connect students to information at other libraries. The funds also increased resources for professional development in technology training for teachers and librarians.

Absent the Federal program, the libraries in many of our high poverty schools will languish with outdated materials and technology. This is a true equity issue, which is why I will continue to fight to sustain our Federal investment in this area and why renewing and strengthening the school library program is of critical importance.

I urge my colleagues to join in cosponsoring the Strengthening Kids' Interest in Learning and Libraries Act.

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. 1328

*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 "Strengthening Kids' Interest in Learning and Libraries Act" or the "SKILLS Act".

#### SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.).

#### TITLE I—IMPROVING EDUCATION THROUGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES

##### SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 1002(b)(4) (20 U.S.C. 6302(b)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) IMPROVING LITERACY THROUGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES.—For the purpose of carrying out subpart 4 of part B, there are authorized to

be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2012 and for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years.”

**SEC. 102. STATE PLANS.**

Section 1111(b)(8) (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(8)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “or include” after “describe”;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(3) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F); and

(4) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E) an assurance that the State educational agency will assist local educational agencies in developing effective school library programs to provide students an opportunity to develop digital literacy skills and the knowledge and skills described in the challenging academic content standards adopted by the State; and”.

**SEC. 103. LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PLANS.**

Section 1112(c)(1) (20 U.S.C. 6312(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (N), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (O), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(P) assist each school served by the agency and assisted under this part in developing effective school library programs consistent with section 1111(b)(8)(E).”.

**SEC. 104. SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAMS.**

Section 1114(b)(1)(D) (20 U.S.C. 6314(b)(1)(D)) is amended by inserting “school librarians,” after “teachers.”.

**SEC. 105. TARGETED ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.**

Section 1115(c)(1)(F) (20 U.S.C. 6315(c)(1)(F)) is amended by inserting “school librarians,” after “teachers.”.

**SEC. 106. IMPROVING LITERACY AND COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS THROUGH EFFECTIVE SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAMS.**

Subpart 4 of part B of title I (20 U.S.C. 6383) is amended to read as follows:

**“Subpart 4—Improving Literacy and College and Career Readiness Through Effective School Library Programs**

**“SEC. 1251. IMPROVING LITERACY AND COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS THROUGH EFFECTIVE SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAMS.**

“(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this subpart is to improve students’ literacy skills and readiness for higher education and careers, by providing students with effective school library programs.

“(b) **DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—In this section, the term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(1) a local educational agency in which 20 percent of the students served by the local educational agency are from families with incomes below the poverty line; or

“(2) a consortia of such local educational agencies.

“(c) **RESERVATION.**—From the funds appropriated under section 1002(b)(4) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve—

“(1) one-half of 1 percent to award assistance under this section to the Bureau of Indian Education to carry out activities consistent with the purpose of this subpart; and

“(2) one-half of 1 percent to award assistance under this section to the outlying areas according to their respective needs for assistance under this subpart.

“(d) **GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—From amounts appropriated under section 1002(b)(4) and not reserved under subsection (c), the Secretary shall award grants, on a competitive basis,

to eligible entities to enable such entities to carry out the authorized activities described in subsection (e).

“(2) **SUFFICIENT SIZE AND SCOPE.**—The Secretary shall award grants under this section of sufficient size and scope to allow the eligible entities to carry out effective school library programs for which the grant funds are provided.

“(3) **DISTRIBUTION.**—The Secretary shall ensure that grants under this section are equitably distributed among the different geographic regions of the United States, and among eligible entities serving urban and rural areas.

“(4) **DURATION.**—The Secretary shall award grants under this section for a period of 3 years.

“(5) **LOCAL APPLICATIONS.**—An eligible entity desiring to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. Such application shall include, for each school that the eligible entity identifies as participating in a grant program under this section, the following information:

“(A) a needs assessment relating to the need for literacy improvement at all grade levels and the need for effective school library programs, based on the age and condition of school library resources, including—

“(i) book collections;

“(ii) access to advanced technology;

“(iii) the availability of well-trained, State certified or licensed school librarians; and

“(iv) the current level of coordination and shared planning time among school librarians and classroom teachers;

“(B) a description of which grade spans will be served, and an assurance that funding will be distributed to serve students in elementary, middle, and high schools;

“(C) how the eligible entity will extensively involve school librarians, teachers, administrators, and parents in the activities assisted under this section, and the manner in which the eligible entity will carry out the activities described in subsection (e) using programs and materials that are grounded in scientifically valid research;

“(D) the manner in which the eligible entity will effectively coordinate the funds and activities provided under this section with Federal, State, and local funds and activities under this subpart and other literacy, library, technology, and professional development funds and activities, including those funded through the Institute of Museum and Library Services; and

“(E) the manner in which the eligible entity will collect and analyze data on the quality and impact of activities carried out under this section by schools served by the eligible entity.

“(e) **LOCAL ACTIVITIES.**—Funds under this section may be used to develop and enhance effective school library programs, which may include activities to—

“(1) acquire up-to-date school library resources, including books and reading materials that—

“(A) are appropriate for students in all grade levels to be served and for students with special learning needs, including students who are limited English proficient; and

“(B) engage the interest of readers at all reading levels;

“(2) acquire and use advanced technology, incorporated into the curricula of the school, to develop and enhance the digital literacy skills of students;

“(3) facilitate Internet links and other resource-sharing networks among schools and school libraries, and public and academic libraries, where possible;

“(4) provide—

“(A) professional development in the acquisition of digital literacy skills and literacy instruction that is appropriate for all grades, including the assessment of student literacy needs, the coordination of reading and writing instruction across content areas, and training in literacy strategies in all content areas for school librarians; and

“(B) activities that foster increased collaboration among school librarians, teachers, and administrators; and

“(5) provide students with access to school libraries during nonschool hours, including the hours before and after school, during weekends, and during summer vacation periods.

“(f) **SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.**—Funds made available under this section shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, other Federal, State, and local funds expended to carry out activities relating to library, technology, or professional development activities.

“(g) **ACCOUNTABILITY AND REPORTING.**—Each eligible entity that receives funds under this section for a fiscal year shall prepare and submit a report to the Secretary regarding how the funding was used and the extent to which the availability of, the access to, and the use of, up-to-date school library resources in the elementary schools and secondary schools served by the eligible entity was increased.”.

**TITLE II—PREPARING, TRAINING, AND RECRUITING HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS, SCHOOL LIBRARIANS, AND PRINCIPALS**

**SEC. 201. TEACHER, SCHOOL LIBRARIAN, AND PRINCIPAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING FUND.**

Title II (20 U.S.C. 6601 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the title heading, by striking “**HIGH QUALITY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS**” and inserting “**HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS, SCHOOL LIBRARIANS, AND PRINCIPALS**”; and

(2) in the part heading, by striking “**TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL**” and inserting “**TEACHER, SCHOOL LIBRARIAN, AND PRINCIPAL**”.

**SEC. 202. PURPOSE.**

Section 2101(1) (20 U.S.C. 6601(1)) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) increase student achievement through strategies such as—

“(A) improving teacher, school librarian, and principal quality; and

“(B) increasing the number of highly effective teachers in the classroom, highly effective school librarians in the library, and highly effective principals and assistant principals in the school; and”.

**SEC. 203. STATE APPLICATIONS.**

Section 2112(b)(4) (20 U.S.C. 6612(b)(4)) is amended by inserting “, school librarians,” before “and principals”.

**SEC. 204. STATE USE OF FUNDS.**

Section 2113(c) (20 U.S.C. 6613(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “principals,” and inserting “highly effective school librarians, and highly qualified principals and”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “, principals,” and inserting “, highly effective school librarians, and highly qualified principals”; and

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking “teachers and principals” each place the term appears and inserting “teachers, school librarians, and principals”.

**SEC. 205. LOCAL USE OF FUNDS.**

Section 2123(a) (20 U.S.C. 6623(a)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

“(9)(A) Developing and implementing strategies to assist in recruiting and retaining highly effective school librarians; and

“(B) providing appropriate professional development for school librarians, particularly related to skills necessary to assist students to improve the students’ academic achievement, including digital literacy skills and preparation for higher education and careers.”.

### TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

#### SEC. 301. DEFINITIONS.

Section 9101 (20 U.S.C. 7801) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (16), (17), and (18) through (43) as paragraphs (17), (18), and (20) through (45), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (15) the following:

“(15) DIGITAL LITERACY SKILLS.—The term ‘digital literacy skills’ has the meaning given the term in section 202 of the Museum and Library Services Act.”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (18) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) the following:

“(19) EFFECTIVE SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAM.—The term ‘effective school library program’ means a school library program that—

“(A) is staffed by a State certified or licensed school librarian;

“(B) has up-to-date books, materials, equipment, and technology (including broadband);

“(C) includes regular collaboration between classroom teachers and school librarians to assist with development and implementation of the curriculum and other school reform efforts; and

“(D) supports the development of digital literacy skills.”.

#### SEC. 302. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 2 of the Act is amended—

(1) by striking the items relating to subpart 4 of part B of title I and inserting the following:

“SUBPART 4—IMPROVING LITERACY AND COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS THROUGH EFFECTIVE SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAMS

“Sec. 1251. Improving literacy and college and career readiness through effective school library programs.”;

(2) by striking the item relating to title II and inserting the following:

“TITLE II—PREPARING, TRAINING, AND RECRUITING HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS, SCHOOL LIBRARIANS, AND PRINCIPALS”;

and

(3) by striking the item relating to part A of title II and inserting the following:

“PART A—TEACHER, SCHOOL LIBRARIAN, AND PRINCIPAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING FUND.”.

Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1333. A bill to provide for the treatment and temporary financing of short-time compensation programs; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Layoff Prevention Act, legislation to strengthen and expand work sharing programs to keep Americans on the job and provide employers with a practical alternative to layoffs that is good for business.

While the U.S. has experienced 15 consecutive months of private-sector

job creation, too many Americans, nearly 14 million, remain out of work. Like everyone in my State, I am fully focused on finding ways to create jobs. As we work to stabilize employment, our efforts should also be aimed at preventing the loss of jobs in the first place.

This is where work sharing programs make a real difference. If you are a business owner faced with the prospect of having to let go some percentage of your highly-skilled workforce because of a rough patch, work sharing allows you to keep your workers on the job with reduced hours until you can bring them back on full time when business rebounds. In this way, a business does not lose out on the considerable expense and time it has put in to hire and train these workers. This initiative helps workers by lessening the impact of those reduced hours on workers and their families because workers receive a proportionate share of unemployment benefits.

Work sharing has proven to be effective not only in my State of Rhode Island, but in the more than 20 States and the District of Columbia that have adopted it across the Nation. At the height of the recession in 2009, there was a significant jump in employer participation, demonstrating the program’s value to small, medium, and large businesses. Indeed, according to the Department of Labor, work sharing programs saved approximately 165,000 jobs in 2009, nearly triple the number the year prior. As the overall economy improved in 2010, the system continued to be a valuable tool, saving 100,000 jobs. But these numbers could be much larger if more States adopted work sharing.

Although work sharing has played an increased role in preventing layoffs, it remains underutilized. Some States are not actively promoting its use; while in many other States it is simply not available.

Despite these limitations, the current economic circumstances have shined a bright light on the value of job sharing and these initiatives have been front and center as States are increasingly turning to them to prevent job losses. A growing number of States with Republican and Democratic Governors have taken action. In just the past few weeks, Maine and Pennsylvania have enacted laws to create work sharing systems, following Colorado, Oklahoma, and New Hampshire last year. The President has also recognized the potential of work sharing to stave off further job losses by including in his fiscal year 2012 budget proposal that expanded on legislation I introduced last Congress.

The bill I am introducing today along with Senators HARKIN, MURRAY, SCHUMER, SHERROD BROWN, WHITEHOUSE, LEAHY, CASEY, and BLUMENTHAL builds on this momentum and encourages States with existing lay off prevention systems to utilize them more frequently and incentivizes States with-

out work sharing to create them. It strengthens the legislation that I authored last Congress by including changes suggested by the business community, States, economists, and other stakeholders. As in past versions, it provides States that have approved programs with temporary Federal financing for 100 percent of work sharing benefits paid to workers, limited to 26 weeks worth of benefits spread out over the course of a year. This financing is available for three years.

While the bill is designed to incentivize States to enact permanent laws to create work sharing, the bill also includes provisions to allow States to get work sharing up and running more quickly. Specifically, a State can reach an agreement with the Department of Labor to create a temporary program under which they would receive 50 percent Federal financing. This financing incentive would be available for 2 years, and such States would be eligible for a third year of 100 percent federal funding if they pass a permanent law.

In addition, the bill provides flexible grants to State labor agencies at a time when they are doing more with less. States that enact work sharing programs are eligible for grants to improve implementation and administration, and there are also grants for promotion and enrollment. These resources will play a critical role in ensuring that States are efficiently able to inform employers of its benefits, and encourage greater use of work sharing to stave off layoffs. Moreover, as work sharing programs take hold, States will see their unemployment insurance systems less burdened as fewer individuals will need to avail themselves of full unemployment benefits.

Simply put, this legislation will help more workers, businesses, and communities stay afloat, while the country works its way through these tough economic times. Moreover, the bill lays a needed foundation to protect businesses and workers from any future recession. It is a win-win for all.

First, work sharing helps speed economic recovery. Economist Mark Zandi estimates that temporary financing of work share offers a very high “bang for the buck” of \$1.69. That is, every \$1 devoted to finance State work share programs results in \$1.69 in real GDP.

Second, work sharing allows businesses to retain skilled workers, temporarily cut costs, and maintain employee morale.

Third, it keeps people working while receiving a share of unemployment benefits to make up for lost wages and retaining health insurance and retirement benefits. This means workers can continue to pay their mortgages and bills, provide for their families, and support businesses in their local communities.

Keeping workers attached to the workforce is a key element of ensuring economic growth.

This legislation does not reinvent the wheel, it is not a mandate on employers or States, and it is not telling anyone what they must do.

Instead, it takes a proven jobs-saving initiative, that is increasingly being used by States, and strengthens and expands it. It gives more employers in more States the opportunity to take advantage of its benefits.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this important legislation. It is my hope that we can proceed in a bipartisan manner as has been accomplished in the more than 20 States where work sharing has been adopted and take swift action to pass this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1333

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Layoff Prevention Act of 2011”.

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Treatment of short-time compensation programs.
- Sec. 3. Temporary financing of short-time compensation payments in States with programs in law.
- Sec. 4. Temporary financing of short-time compensation agreements.
- Sec. 5. Grants for short-time compensation programs.
- Sec. 6. Assistance and guidance in implementing programs.
- Sec. 7. Reports.

**SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF SHORT-TIME COMPENSATION PROGRAMS.**

(a) **DEFINITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 3306 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 3306) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(v) **SHORT-TIME COMPENSATION PROGRAM.**—For purposes of this chapter, the term ‘short-time compensation program’ means a program under which—

“(1) the participation of an employer is voluntary;

“(2) an employer reduces the number of hours worked by employees in lieu of layoffs;

“(3) such employees whose workweeks have been reduced by at least 10 percent, and by not more than the percentage, if any, that is determined by the State to be appropriate (but in no case more than 60 percent), are eligible for unemployment compensation;

“(4) the amount of unemployment compensation payable to any such employee is a pro rata portion of the unemployment compensation which would otherwise be payable to the employee if such employee were totally unemployed;

“(5) such employees are not expected to meet the availability for work or work search test requirements while collecting short-time compensation benefits, but are required to be available for their normal workweek;

“(6) eligible employees may participate, as appropriate, in training (including employer-sponsored training or worker training funded under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998) to enhance job skills if such program has been approved by the State agency;

“(7) the State agency shall require employers to certify that the employer will continue to provide health benefits and retirement benefits under a defined benefit plan (as defined in section 414(j)) and contributions under a defined contribution plan (as defined in section 414(i)) to any employee whose workweek is reduced under the program under the same terms and conditions as though the workweek of such employee had not been reduced;

“(8) the State agency shall require an employer to submit a written plan describing the manner in which the requirements of this subsection will be implemented (including a plan for giving advance notice, where feasible, to an employee whose workweek is to be reduced) together with an estimate of the number of layoffs that would have occurred absent the ability to participate in short-time compensation and such other information as the Secretary of Labor determines is appropriate;

“(9) in the case of employees represented by a union, the appropriate official of the union has agreed to the terms of the employer’s written plan and implementation is consistent with employer obligations under the applicable Federal laws; and

“(10) upon request by the State and approval by the Secretary of Labor, only such other provisions are included in the State law that are determined to be appropriate for purposes of a short-time compensation program.”

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Subject to paragraph (3), the amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) **TRANSITION PERIOD FOR EXISTING PROGRAMS.**—In the case of a State that is administering a short-time compensation program as of the date of the enactment of this Act and the State law cannot be administered consistent with the amendment made by paragraph (1), such amendment shall take effect on the earlier of—

(A) the date the State changes its State law in order to be consistent with such amendment; or

(B) the date that is 2 years and 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.**—

(A) Subparagraph (E) of section 3304(a)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(E) amounts may be withdrawn for the payment of short-time compensation under a short-time compensation program (as defined under section 3306(v));”

(B) Subsection (f) of section 3306 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(i) by striking paragraph (5) (relating to short-time compensation) and inserting the following new paragraph:

“(5) amounts may be withdrawn for the payment of short-time compensation under a short-time compensation program (as defined in subsection (v)); and”;

(ii) by redesignating paragraph (5) (relating to self-employment assistance program) as paragraph (6).

(2) **SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.**—Section 303(a)(5) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking “the payment of short-time compensation under a plan approved by the Secretary of Labor” and inserting “the payment of short-time compensation under a short-time compensation program (as defined in section 3306(v) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986)”.

(3) **UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS OF 1992.**—Subsections (b) through (d) of section 401 of the Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1992 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) are repealed.

**SEC. 3. TEMPORARY FINANCING OF SHORT-TIME COMPENSATION PAYMENTS IN STATES WITH PROGRAMS IN LAW.**

(a) **PAYMENTS TO STATES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (3), there shall be paid to a State an amount equal to 100 percent of the amount of short-time compensation paid under a short-time compensation program (as defined in section 3306(v) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section 2(a)) under the provisions of the State law.

(2) **TERMS OF PAYMENTS.**—Payments made to a State under paragraph (1) shall be payable by way of reimbursement in such amounts as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this section for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any amount by which the Secretary finds that the Secretary’s estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made on the basis of such statistical, sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency of the State involved.

(3) **LIMITATIONS ON PAYMENTS.**—

(A) **GENERAL PAYMENT LIMITATIONS.**—No payments shall be made to a State under this section for short-time compensation paid to an individual by the State during a benefit year in excess of 26 times the amount of regular compensation (including dependents’ allowances) under the State law payable to such individual for a week of total unemployment.

(B) **EMPLOYER LIMITATIONS.**—No payments shall be made to a State under this section for benefits paid to an individual by the State under a short-time compensation program if such individual is employed by an employer on a seasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis.

(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Payments to a State under subsection (a) shall be available for weeks of unemployment—

(A) beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) ending on or before the date that is 3 years and 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **THREE-YEAR FUNDING LIMITATION FOR COMBINED PAYMENTS UNDER THIS SECTION AND SECTION 4.**—States may receive payments under this section and section 4 with respect to a total of not more than 156 weeks.

(c) **TWO-YEAR TRANSITION PERIOD FOR EXISTING PROGRAMS.**—During any period that the transition provision under section 2(a)(3) is applicable to a State with respect to a short-time compensation program, such State shall be eligible for payments under this section. Subject to paragraphs (1)(B) and (2) of subsection (b), if at any point after the date of the enactment of this Act the State enacts a State law providing for the payment of short-time compensation under a short-time compensation program that meets the definition of such a program under section 3306(v) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section 2(a), the State shall be eligible for payments under this section after the effective date of such enactment.

(d) **FUNDING AND CERTIFICATIONS.**—

(1) **FUNDING.**—There are appropriated, out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for purposes of carrying out this section.

(2) **CERTIFICATIONS.**—The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to such State under this section.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Labor.



(2) STATE; STATE AGENCY; STATE LAW.—The terms “State”, “State agency”, and “State law” have the meanings given those terms in section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note).

**SEC. 4. TEMPORARY FINANCING OF SHORT-TIME COMPENSATION AGREEMENTS.**

(a) FEDERAL-STATE AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any State which desires to do so may enter into, and participate in, an agreement under this section with the Secretary provided that such State’s law does not provide for the payment of short-time compensation under a short-time compensation program (as defined in section 3306(v) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section 2(a)).

(2) ABILITY TO TERMINATE.—Any State which is a party to an agreement under this section may, upon providing 30 days’ written notice to the Secretary, terminate such agreement.

(b) PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL-STATE AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any agreement under this section shall provide that the State agency of the State will make payments of short-time compensation under a plan approved by the State. Such plan shall provide that payments are made in accordance with the requirements under section 3306(v) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section 2(a).

(2) LIMITATIONS ON PLANS.—

(A) GENERAL PAYMENT LIMITATIONS.—A short-time compensation plan approved by a State shall not permit the payment of short-time compensation to an individual by the State during a benefit year in excess of 26 times the amount of regular compensation (including dependents’ allowances) under the State law payable to such individual for a week of total unemployment.

(B) EMPLOYER LIMITATIONS.—A short-time compensation plan approved by a State shall not provide payments to an individual if such individual is employed by an employer on a seasonal, temporary, or intermittent basis.

(3) EMPLOYER PAYMENT OF COSTS.—Any short-time compensation plan entered into by an employer must provide that the employer will pay the State an amount equal to one-half of the amount of short-time compensation paid under such plan. Such amount shall be deposited in the State’s unemployment fund and shall not be used for purposes of calculating an employer’s contribution rate under section 3303(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) PAYMENTS TO STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be paid to each State with an agreement under this section an amount equal to—

(A) one-half of the amount of short-time compensation paid to individuals by the State pursuant to such agreement; and

(B) any additional administrative expenses incurred by the State by reason of such agreement (as determined by the Secretary).

(2) TERMS OF PAYMENTS.—Payments made to a State under paragraph (1) shall be payable by way of reimbursement in such amounts as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this section for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any amount by which the Secretary finds that the Secretary’s estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made on the basis of such statistical, sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency of the State involved.

(3) FUNDING.—There are appropriated, out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for purposes of carrying out this section.

(4) CERTIFICATIONS.—The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to such State under this section.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An agreement entered into under this section shall apply to weeks of unemployment—

(A) beginning on or after the date on which such agreement is entered into; and

(B) ending on or before the date that is 2 years and 13 weeks after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) TWO-YEAR FUNDING LIMITATION.—States may receive payments under this section with respect to a total of not more than 104 weeks.

(e) SPECIAL RULE.—If a State has entered into an agreement under this section and subsequently enacts a State law providing for the payment of short-time compensation under a short-time compensation program that meets the definition of such a program under section 3306(v) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section 2(a), the State—

(1) shall not be eligible for payments under this section for weeks of unemployment beginning after the effective date of such State law; and

(2) subject to paragraphs (1)(B) and (2) of section 3(b), shall be eligible to receive payments under section 3 after the effective date of such State law.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Labor.

(2) STATE; STATE AGENCY; STATE LAW.—The terms “State”, “State agency”, and “State law” have the meanings given those terms in section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note).

**SEC. 5. GRANTS FOR SHORT-TIME COMPENSATION PROGRAMS.**

(a) GRANTS.—

(1) FOR IMPLEMENTATION OR IMPROVED ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall award grants to States that enact short-time compensation programs (as defined in subsection (i)(2)) for the purpose of implementation or improved administration of such programs.

(2) FOR PROMOTION AND ENROLLMENT.—The Secretary shall award grants to States that are eligible and submit plans for a grant under paragraph (1) for such States to promote and enroll employers in short-time compensation programs (as so defined).

(3) ELIGIBILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall determine eligibility criteria for the grants under paragraph (1) and (2).

(B) CLARIFICATION.—A State administering a short-time compensation program, including a program being administered by a State that is participating in the transition under the provisions of sections 2(a)(3) and 3(c), that does not meet the definition of a short-time compensation program under section 3306(v) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by 2(a)), and a State with an agreement under section 4, shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this section until such time as the State law of the State provides for payments under a short-time compensation program that meets such definition and such law.

(b) AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The maximum amount available for making grants to a State under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be equal to the amount obtained by multiplying \$700,000,000 (less the amount used by the Secretary

under subsection (e)) by the same ratio as would apply under subsection (a)(2)(B) of section 903 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1103) for purposes of determining such State’s share of any excess amount (as described in subsection (a)(1) of such section) that would have been subject to transfer to State accounts, as of October 1, 2010, under the provisions of subsection (a) of such section.

(2) AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR DIFFERENT GRANTS.—Of the maximum incentive payment determined under paragraph (1) with respect to a State—

(A) one-third shall be available for a grant under subsection (a)(1); and

(B) two-thirds shall be available for a grant under subsection (a)(2).

(c) GRANT APPLICATION AND DISBURSAL.—

(1) APPLICATION.—Any State seeking a grant under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and complete with such information as the Secretary may require. In no case may the Secretary award a grant under this section with respect to an application that is submitted after December 31, 2014.

(2) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall, within 30 days after receiving a complete application, notify the State agency of the State of the Secretary’s findings with respect to the requirements for a grant under paragraph (1) or (2) (or both) of subsection (a).

(3) CERTIFICATION.—If the Secretary finds that the State law provisions meet the requirements for a grant under subsection (a), the Secretary shall thereupon make a certification to that effect to the Secretary of the Treasury, together with a certification as to the amount of the grant payment to be transferred to the State account in the Unemployment Trust Fund (as established in section 904(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1104(a))) pursuant to that finding. The Secretary of the Treasury shall make the appropriate transfer to the State account within 7 days after receiving such certification.

(4) REQUIREMENT.—No certification of compliance with the requirements for a grant under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) may be made with respect to any State whose—

(A) State law is not otherwise eligible for certification under section 303 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 503) or approvable under section 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or

(B) short-time compensation program is subject to discontinuation or is not scheduled to take effect within 12 months of the certification.

(d) USE OF FUNDS.—The amount of any grant awarded under this section shall be used for the implementation of short-time compensation programs and the overall administration of such programs and the promotion and enrollment efforts associated with such programs, such as through—

(1) the creation or support of rapid response teams to advise employers about alternatives to layoffs;

(2) the provision of education or assistance to employers to enable them to assess the feasibility of participating in short-time compensation programs; and

(3) the development or enhancement of systems to automate—

(A) the submission and approval of plans; and

(B) the filing and approval of new and ongoing short-time compensation claims.

(e) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary is authorized to use 0.25 percent of the funds available under subsection (g) to provide for outreach and to share best practices with respect to this section and short-time compensation programs.

(f) RECOUPMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a process under which the Secretary shall recoup the amount of any grant awarded under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) if the Secretary determines that, during the 5-year period beginning on the first date that any such grant is awarded to the State, the State—

(1) terminated the State's short-time compensation program; or

(2) failed to meet appropriate requirements with respect to such program (as established by the Secretary).

(g) FUNDING.—There are appropriated, out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Secretary, \$700,000,000 to carry out this section, to remain available without fiscal year limitation.

(h) REPORTING.—The Secretary may establish reporting requirements for States receiving a grant under this section in order to provide oversight of grant funds.

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor.

(2) SHORT-TIME COMPENSATION PROGRAM.—The term "short-time compensation program" has the meaning given such term in section 3306(v) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section 2(a).

(3) STATE; STATE AGENCY; STATE LAW.—The terms "State", "State agency" and "State law" have the meanings given those terms in section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note).

#### SEC. 6. ASSISTANCE AND GUIDANCE IN IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to assist States in establishing, qualifying, and implementing short-time compensation programs (as defined in section 3306(v) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section 2(a)), the Secretary of Labor (in this section referred to as the "Secretary") shall—

(1) develop model legislative language which may be used by States in developing and enacting such programs and periodically review and revise such model legislative language;

(2) provide technical assistance and guidance in developing, enacting, and implementing such programs;

(3) establish reporting requirements for States, including reporting on—

(A) the number of estimated averted layoffs;

(B) the number of participating employers and workers; and

(C) such other items as the Secretary of Labor determines are appropriate.

(b) MODEL LANGUAGE AND GUIDANCE.—The model language and guidance developed under subsection (a) shall allow sufficient flexibility by States and participating employers while ensuring accountability and program integrity.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In developing the model legislative language and guidance under subsection (a), and in order to meet the requirements of subsection (b), the Secretary shall consult with employers, labor organizations, State workforce agencies, and other program experts."

#### SEC. 7. REPORTS.

(a) INITIAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall submit to Congress and to the President a report or reports on the implementation of the provisions of this Act.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Any report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of best practices by States and employers in the administration, promotion, and use of short-time compensa-

tion programs (as defined in section 3306(v) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section 2(a)).

(B) An analysis of the significant challenges to State enactment and implementation of short-time compensation programs.

(C) A survey of employers in States that have not enacted a short-time compensation program or entered into an agreement with the Secretary on a short-time compensation plan to determine the level of interest among such employers in participating in short-time compensation programs.

(D) Other matters related to the implementation of the provisions of this Act as the Secretary of Labor determines appropriate.

(b) SUBSEQUENT REPORTS.—After the submission of the report under subsection (a), the Secretary of Labor may submit such additional reports on the implementation of short-time compensation programs as the Secretary deems appropriate.

(c) FUNDING.—There are appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Secretary of Labor, \$1,500,000 to carry out this section, to remain available without fiscal year limitation.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PRYOR, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BURR, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COBURN, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 1335. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide rights for pilots, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, just a few minutes ago I did introduce and we have a bill number that is S. 1335. It is the Pilot's Bill of Rights. It is very significant that we get this done today, and I will explain why.

First of all, when Senator John Glenn from Ohio retired, that left me as the last active commercial pilot in the Senate. Consequently, I probably get more complaints than anybody else does about problems and abuses with the FAA.

I have to say this: I was very complimentary yesterday to so many of the people. The vast majority of the inspectors, the controllers, and others at the FAA are so talented. In fact, the first thing I do when I go up to Oshkosh every year, the largest air show in the world, is I go up to where they are all gathered together and I compliment them on the fact that they are taking on the toughest job for a 6-day period in Oshkosh as a volunteer. So I love their virtues. However, we have to keep in mind that any bureaucracy can become abusive.

So I have introduced the Pilot's Bill of Rights. The reason I am speaking right now is because we have 25 cosponsors at this time, which means 25 percent of the Senate has signed on as cosponsors.

The way the rules work around here, any of the Members who might be lis-

tening right now—and I know the occupier of the Chair is very concerned about this and he is very active with me on this legislation—any staffers who are watching, they should advise their Members that they have until close of business today, probably 1 more hour, to put their names down as original cosponsors.

Now, the bill simply does four things. First of all, it requires the FAA, for any enforcement action, to make sure the pilot is fully aware of what he is being accused of before any ultimatums are put forth. Consequently, that pilot is able to defend himself.

The second thing is it clarifies what they call statutory deference. Right now, statutory deference relates to the National Transportation Safety Board. The NTSB is the only area of appeal, so that if a pilot is accused of something and he looks at it and thinks it is unfair, he would have to go to the NTSB. Yet because of deference, they merely rubberstamp in almost all cases what the FAA does. As an example, of the emergency determinations that were made last year, only one was actually granted and the rest of them were denied. This bill will allow, in terms of fairness, that if something is going on and they refuse to consider a case, there will be an appellate process where the pilot can go to the Federal District Court and be heard there.

The third thing it does is it has to do with notice. That is notice to airmen. That is very significant. Those of us who are pilots know that when we go into a field, we check and see what the NOTAMs are, so that if there is any work on the runway, any problem there, any taxiways that are closed, they will give the pilot that information. However, the problem is it is the pilot's responsibility to do this and the FAA many times doesn't even post these NOTAMs. So what we are saying with our FARs, or our laws, is we are saying to a pilot, You have to be responsible to know what is going on at the airport, where you are going to be landing. Yet there is no place you can find out. So this requires that they revamp this system so that there is a central location. We specify that in the legislation, so that can be found.

Then the fourth and final thing, there is another problem in terms of medical certification. Those of us who are pilots have to have medicals and we have to have a certification process. This has been a problem for a long period of time. I have had countless people call me and talk about the problems they are having with their medical certification. In fact, of all the requests for assistance to the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association—they represent hundreds of thousands of pilots—of all the requests for assistance they receive each year, 28 percent are related to the FAA's medical certification process. So I would say this of this very simple legislation. Two sections actually change the statutes so that it offers protection to pilots, but

the other two are working together to come up with a system where we can have a central location for NOTAMs as well as having a fair process for medical evaluations.

I think it is very obvious that there are a lot of bureaucracies where one or two people can be bad. When I was in Tulsa, I can remember all it took was one or two bad cops and that gave a black eye to everybody else. I remember actually, when I was running—it is the whole reason I ran for office in the first place. When I was out in the private sector, I was doing things that I thought I was supposed to be doing, and I had one old building called the Wrightsman Oil Estate. I was going to take this old eyesore and make it into a building and preserve it as it was originally. Old, in my city of Tulsa, OK, in this case was maybe 1910 or 1912. We weren't even a State until 1907. This is something everybody wanted.

I went to the city engineer and I said, I want to take this eyesore of a fire escape on the second floor and move it from the south to the north end. It is the same thing; it will service the same number of people, but it is an eyesore and this gets it out of the way. No one is against it. He said, You can't do that until this committee meets. So let's see. You have to have notice. That would be 3 more weeks before you can get notice. A month after that, you can get on the agenda. I said, Look, everyone is for it. He said, That is your problem, not mine. I said, I will run for mayor and fire you, and I did, and I fired him. This can happen in any bureaucracy.

So the reason there is a sense of urgency is because we have already told all of the groups—the Experimental Aircraft Association, ALPA, all of these groups that represent these different organizations—that we are going to be getting this bill ready with all of our original cosponsors and then cosponsors so that when we arrive and when I arrive at the end of July, at Oshkosh, WI, I am going to do the same thing I did in 1994 that caused us to be able to pass the first product liability bill on aviation and aviation products that had the effect of changing us from a major importer of aviation products and of airplanes to a major exporter, just by changing that. It was an 18-year repose bill. I did that at Oshkosh with an audience of 200,000 people. These are single issue people. I can assure my colleagues that they will be just as interested in this bill.

So I will be presenting this, and I am going to encourage Members of the Senate who want to get their name in today, they can be cosponsors, original cosponsors, as is the occupier of the chair at the present time, and myself, and 23 other Members of the Senate.

One last reminder. This is S. 1335. This is the last chance. Colleagues have 1 more hour to be an original cosponsor. I hope my colleagues will join me in sponsoring this legislation.

---

#### ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 7, 2011

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it

adjourn until 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, July 7; that following the prayer and the 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 resume the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 93, S. 1323, a bill to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit, with the time until 10 a.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each; that at 10 a.m., the Senate conduct a rollcall vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 1323.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

#### PROGRAM

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, there will be a vote tomorrow morning at approximately 10 a.m.

---

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. LAUTENBERG. 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 7:24 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 7, 2011, at 9:30 a.m.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### ANTIGUA'S BREACH OF BILATERAL AND INTERNATIONAL TREATIES

**HON. MIKE COFFMAN**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I would like to renew a discussion of an ongoing situation which requires our attention.

The expropriation of the Half Moon Bay Resort in Antigua, owned and developed by a group of American citizens since 1971, was entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD almost three years ago by my predecessor, the Hon. Thomas Tancredo (September 24, 2008—E1891).

I would remind this House that the expropriation of this internationally recognized Resort has been the subject of ongoing legal proceedings from 2000 to June 2007, when the Privy Council in London allowed the Government of Antigua to “forcibly acquire” the property under its sovereign right of eminent domain, provided the owners’ rights to payment of compensation were equally upheld.

Since that date, four years ago, the dispossessed owners have had to initiate a number of legal actions against the Government of Antigua to move the process of arriving at compensation as prescribed by Antigua’s own laws and Constitution.

At this point, three issues still remain before the Courts: two in the Eastern Caribbean High Court and one before the Eastern Caribbean Court of Appeal. The subject matter of the cases have to do with the value of the property as established by a Government appointed Assessment Board, and with the owners’ Constitutional Right to “fair compensation within a reasonable time.”

By request of the Attorney General, representing the Government in each of these cases, the hearings scheduled for dates in the first half of this year have been adjourned without a return date being set.

The hearing before the Court of Appeal may occur during that court’s next sitting in Antigua in September, but the Attorney General has already ignored a filing deadline ordered by that body, which may cause further postponement of that hearing.

Meanwhile, Antigua’s Ministers have announced various agreements that are being signed with developers for the Half Moon Bay property. Even more outrageous is a statement released to the Antiguan press by the Attorney General (who is also Antigua’s Minister of Justice and Minister of Legal Affairs) that such re-development can legally commence prior to any compensation being paid to the dispossessed American owners.

It is an established fact that expropriation of American-owned property and business is a breach of the Caribbean Economic Basin Recovery Act (CBERA) and by ignoring the rights of the owners to prompt and fair compensation, the Government of Antigua has also

breached the WTO International Trade and Investment Rules.

I urge the President, as mandated by the terms of the CBERA, to suspend Antigua’s benefits and rights accorded to preferred trading partners.

While the financial effect of such alienation may be negligible, the political aspect of recognizing the breach is essential to maintain respect for the treaty and its signatories. Our citizens deserve no less.

### RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF GARY LABELLA

**HON. JOE DONNELLY**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to an outstanding American citizen who has made significant contributions to northern Indiana’s economy through his work on behalf of the recreational vehicle industry, Gary LaBella.

For more than three decades, Mr. LaBella was instrumental in enhancing the recreational vehicle (RV) industry’s image, contributing to the RVIA and the industry’s success. The efforts he led in the marketing of RVs has helped unify this industry and transformed the way consumers think about RVs in this country, now and for the future.

Known for his creativity, Mr. LaBella launched an aggressive industry-wide marketing program that earned high acclaim throughout the travel and recreation communities. Under his direction, RVIA and industry partners launched the Go RVing national advertising program in the mid 1990s, which is often referred to as one of the most successful programs in the industry’s history.

In 2010, Mr. LaBella organized a celebration for the RV industry’s Centennial, culminating with a widely attended June party on the grounds of the RV/Manufactured Housing Hall of Fame and Museum in Elkhart, Indiana. Elkhart is often referred to as the heart of the RV manufacturing community and the RV Centennial Celebration focused on saluting the workers who made the industry great.

RV Business, an industry trade journal, saluted Mr. LaBella in 2010 as one of the industry’s 100 most influential executives of all time. Mr. LaBella received a similar honor in 2005, the year he was inducted into the RV Hall of Fame. At a celebration of his career on December 1, 2010, many of the speakers echoed the sentiment that Mr. LaBella perhaps is one of the most influential individuals in the industry’s history. Mr. LaBella, a graduate of Utica College of Syracuse University who joined the Reston, VA-based RVIA in 1978, has received an “Outstanding Achievement Award” from RVIA, and in 2010, he received both the Chairman’s Award from the Recreation Vehicle Dealers Association and the prestigious Spirit Award from the RV/MH Hall of Fame. In

his farewell to the industry before an appreciative audience of 1,200 at the Louisville, Kentucky trade show, Mr. LaBella said he was leaving the stage with “two overriding emotions—pride in what we all accomplished together to elevate this industry’s image, and happiness that I leave RVIA with only friends.” Today I rise on behalf of the citizens of Indiana’s Second District, to salute his character, his personal achievements and his contributions to the RV industry.

### JULY 4, 2011 NATURALIZATION CEREMONY IN HAMMOND

**HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and sincerity that I take this time to congratulate the individuals who took their oath of citizenship on July 4, 2011. In true patriotic fashion, on the day of our great Nation’s celebration of independence, a naturalization ceremony took place, welcoming new citizens of the United States of America. This memorable occasion, coordinated by the Hammond Public Library and presided over by Magistrate Judge Andrew Rodovich, was held at The Pavilion at Wolf Lake in Hammond, Indiana.

America is a country founded by immigrants. From its beginning, settlers have come from countries around the globe to the United States in search of better lives for their families. The upcoming oath ceremony was a shining example of what is so great about the United States of America—that people from all over the world can come together and unite as members of a free, democratic nation. These individuals realize that nowhere else in the world offers a better opportunity for success than here in America.

On July 4, 2011, the following people, representing many nations throughout the world, took their oath of citizenship in Hammond, Indiana: Karen Seballos Dela Cruz, Shimei Yan, Suryaprasad Veeravenka Padala, Juan Pablo Diaz Avila, Luis Eduardo Rivera Ramirez, Blagoja Jofceski, Kulvinder Singh, Horacio Garcia Leon, Samip Rabindra Fozdar, Radhika Ragamanjar Chillarige, Annaji Rao Venkata Chillarige, Tin-Chun Lin, Magdaleno Nevarez Sanchez, Ciprian Daniel Bargo, Leonel Alonso Cancino Ortiz, Mouna Youssef Mikhael, Maroun Elias Elias, Jasmina Salkovski, Pedro Flores Rodriguez, Agnes Joh Smith, Francisco Javier Jimenez, Xiao Yan Wang, Mui Hiong Nykaza, Michael Franco Calonia, Alira Mae Navarro Calonia, Zbigniew Jasek, Claudia Jeanette Darak, James Tan Geulen, Gay Karen Geulen, Dung Thi Lux, Naumka Prentoska, Carlos Bayron Martinez Valencia, Chaudhry Ahtsham Sarwar, Mohammed Yahya Moha Atef, Gabriel Eduardo Orta Gonzalez, Varalakshmi Vaddi, Emmanuelle Renee Fran Davallet Fortney, Daisy Ngina

• 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.

Bakary, Juan Carlos Nielo Uy, Stojanco Krstevski, Sandy Yuliana Meza De La Torre, Joan John Dordea, Rocio Galvan, Jose De Jesus Hernandez, Javier Julian, Mahnoush Nikki Malekan, Olama Ziyad Mohammed, Oliberio Ortiz, Jorge Ortiz, and Bernardino Perea.

Though each individual has sought to become a citizen of the United States for his or her own reasons, be it for education, occupation, or to offer their loved ones better lives, each is inspired by the fact that the United States of America is, as Abraham Lincoln described it, a country “. . . of the people, by the people, and for the people.” They realize that the United States is truly a free nation. By seeking American citizenship, they have made the decision to live in a place where, as guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights, they can practice religion as they choose, speak their minds without fear of punishment, and assemble in peaceful protest should they choose to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating these individuals who became citizens of the United States of America on July 4, 2011, the day of our Nation's independence. They, too, are American citizens, and they, too, are guaranteed the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We, as a free and democratic nation, congratulate and welcome them.

THE BLACK AND GOLD IN THE  
ATL

HON. HENRY C. “HANK” JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following proclamation.

Whereas, since its founding, the Black and Gold in the ATL has been and continues to be a worthy instrument for reuniting people who have migrated from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, to Atlanta, Georgia; and

Whereas, over the past 20 years, the Black and Gold weekend celebration has been held to support the Pittsburgh Steelers and to fellowship with family and friends from Pittsburgh; and

Whereas, the Black and Gold in the ATL weekend has always promoted the concept of One Community—One Goal by working with and for individuals of all walks of life to make Atlanta a place where Pittsburgh natives are seen as well as heard; and

Whereas, its members give of themselves tirelessly and unconditionally to serve our community by being productive citizens; and.

Whereas, the lives of many in our district are touched by the members of the Black and Gold in the ATL, our district is a better place due to their commitment to excellence in all of their endeavors; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize their outstanding service to our District;

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. “HANK” JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby proclaim June 25, 2011, as The Black & Gold in the ATL Day in the Fourth Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 25th day of June, 2011.

CONGRATULATING THE ROCK  
BRIDGE BRUINS MEN'S TENNIS  
TEAM

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Rock Bridge Bruins Men's Tennis team for winning the Class 2 A Missouri State Championship on May 26.

These young men and their coaches should be commended for all their hard work throughout the regular season and bringing home the 2 A Tennis Championship to their school and community.

I ask that you join me in recognizing the Rock Bridge Bruins for a job well done.

RECOGNIZING CAPTAIN JOHN T.  
HARDIN OF THE UNITED STATES  
COAST GUARD

HON. G.K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of the distinguished 27-year career of Captain John T. Hardin in the United States Coast Guard. Captain Hardin has served in the United States Coast Guard with distinction throughout his career, in particular as the commanding officer of Coast Guard Air Station Elizabeth City, which is located in the First Congressional District.

Captain Hardin graduated from the United States Coast Guard Academy in New London, Connecticut on May 23, 1984 with a Bachelor of Science Degree in civil engineering. His first duty station was aboard the USCG Sherman where he served as Engineer of the Watch, Auxiliary Officer, Electrical Officer, and Fueling Officer. Captain Hardin went on to attend Naval Flight Training and received his wings in May of 1987.

Captain Hardin's diverse career took him to multiple locations including Miami, San Diego, and San Francisco. During these assignments Captain Hardin served as Morale Officer, Public Works Officer, Aviation Material Officer, Rotary Wing Assistant Engineer, Aircraft Salvage Officer, HH-65A Instructor Pilot, Engineer Officer, and even President of the Flight Examining Board. Captain Hardin became dual-qualified in the HH-65A helicopter, the first qualified copilot in the HU-25C Air Interceptor, and earned a Master's of Business Administration in Technologies Management.

Captain Hardin's connection to Elizabeth City, North Carolina began in 1999 with his first assignment as the HU-25 Product Line Manager at the Aircraft Repair and Supply Center. Later, in 2002, Captain Hardin transferred to the Engineering Industrial Supply Center as the Aircraft Repair and Supply Center Chief Engineer. In 2003, Captain Hardin became the commanding officer of the C-130J Aircraft Project Office, and his career culminated in July of 2008 when he assumed command of Coast Guard Air Station Elizabeth City.

Captain Hardin has dutifully served our country for the past 27 years, and eastern

North Carolina for over 10 years while stationed at Coast Guard Air Station Elizabeth City. It brings me great joy to honor the dedication, sacrifice, and commitment to duty demonstrated by Captain Hardin.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Captain John T. Hardin on his retirement from the United States Coast Guard and offer my sincere appreciation for his many years of service to the United States of America.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF AN OPEN  
DOOR CHURCH

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I stand before you today to congratulate An Open Door Church on its 25th anniversary. In honor of this momentous milestone, a celebratory reception will be held on Wednesday, July 6, 2011 at An Open Door Church in Hammond, Indiana. For 25 years, An Open Door Church has been committed to the spiritual and social conditions of residents living in the Hammond area as well as in the greater Northwest Indiana community.

Founded on July 6, 1986 in South Holland, Illinois, by Doctors and Pastors Meredith and Marilyn Shackelford, An Open Door Church began as a small congregation in the basement of the pastors' home. Quickly outgrowing this small space, the church began to rent space, and, after eight years, it was able to purchase its first building in Hammond. The church's congregation continued to grow and the church moved to its current location on Hohman Avenue in Hammond, Indiana six years ago. Currently, the church has an impressive membership of more than 350 congregants.

The church and its parishioners follow a visionary motto, “reaching people to reach the world,” which is carried out through the church's various ministries and programs that work to support change in the lives of others. An Open Door Church places a strong emphasis on the family unit, and has built its organization around the belief that strong families build strong communities. The church's dedication to the welfare of residents in Northwest Indiana is demonstrated through its many outreach projects which include: a summer concert series at Harrison Park where school supplies are distributed to children in need; Wee Care, a child development ministry; a food pantry ministry that feeds over 75 families per month; Give God a Chance, a marriage ministry; a prison outreach ministry; various children and teen ministries; and the Christian Academy, which provides education for grades kindergarten through grade eight. In addition, the church has partnered with numerous community organizations in order to improve the quality of life for countless individuals. These organizations include Calumet Project, Interfaith Worker Justice, and Northwest Indiana Reinvestment Alliance. An Open Door Church, its founders, and its ministry directors show uncompromising loyalty to the community of Northwest Indiana and they are worthy of the highest praise.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in

honoring An Open Door Church for its exceptional community service ministry and to congratulate the organization on its 25th anniversary. The founders and congregation of this truly admirable organization continue to touch the lives of numerous people, and for this selfless, lifelong service they are to be commended.

HONORING MAJOR CAMILLE MACK

**HON. LARRY KISSELL**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. KISSELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to Major Camille Mack, United States Army, on the occasion of her departure from the Army House Liaison Office to pursue a Master's Degree in Strategic Intelligence from the National Defense Institute at Bolling Air Force Base. I, and many other members of this chamber, have had the pleasure of working with her over the past three years as she served as a part of the U.S. Army Office of Legislative Affairs and as a Liaison Officer in the Army Liaison Office in the U.S. House of Representatives. Major Mack served in my personal office and was an essential part of my staff during that time.

In 1999, after completing Officer Candidate School at Ft. Benning Georgia, Major Mack was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Signal Corps Branch.

Major Mack's initial assignment was to Fort Bragg, North Carolina, where she served as a Psychological Operations Platoon Leader and Company Executive Officer in 4th Psychological Operations Group. She deployed on two consecutive tours in Iraq in support of 1st Marine Expeditionary Force and 3rd Psychological Operations Battalion.

For 22 months, Major Mack commanded the 45th Sustainment Brigade stationed in Schofield Barracks, Hawaii. While in command, her unit was dispersed to three locations throughout Iraq. Upon her return to the United States, Major Mack served on division staff as the network operations Officer in Charge (OIC) and then later was selected as a Congressional Fellow and served a year in my personal office. During her time as a Fellow in my office, Major Mack showed great leadership and dedication; the very qualities that have helped her make this chamber, our U.S. Army and our nation a better place. She embodies the very core values of our armed services. I was honored to have her become such an integral and important part of our team.

Following her fellowship in the House of Representatives, Major Mack was assigned to the Army House Liaison Office. I have come to know Major Mack well during her assignment to the House of Representatives through her time working as a fellow in my Washington D.C. Office and as a regional liaison in the Army House Liaison Office. She has never failed to impress me with her energy and dedication to Soldiers, their families, and the United States Army. She is a superb representative of Army values.

Camille's personal contribution to our nation on behalf of not only the United States Army but also all of our armed services represents the finest of our military professionals.

Camille's service is a remarkable example of patriotic and selfless service.

It is my great honor to congratulate Major Camille Mack on her service to the Army and our Nation and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the outstanding accomplishments of this Soldier, citizen, and friend.

IN HONOR OF THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF WESTLAKE

**HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the City of Westlake, Ohio, in recognition of its bicentennial celebration. Since 1811, Westlake has been a shining community within Northeast Ohio.

In 1811, 16-year-old Leverett Johnson became Westlake's first resident when he began clearing land for a log cabin. This cabin served as lifelong home for him, his wife Abigail, and their nine children. Johnson went on to have a distinguished career in government, serving as a justice of the peace, township treasurer, Cuyahoga County Commissioner, and Ohio State Legislator.

Now, 200 years later, Westlake is a successful, vibrant community known for its unique appeal to both businesses and families. The City of Westlake is continuing to make improvements to the community; St. John Medical Center is being renovated, Cuyahoga Community College's new Westshore campus is near completion, and plans are underway for the construction of a new high school.

The residents of Westlake have planned a series of events to celebrate their city's rich history and vibrant future. Several events, such as a fence dedication, historic cemetery tour, marker dedication and time capsule burial will take place at the historic Evergreen Cemetery. The Evergreen Cemetery was founded around 1820 by Leverett Johnson and several other early settlers. Today it serves as their final resting ground and one of Westlake's most historic locations. Other planned festivities include an art show, concert, Mayor's Ball, a 4th of July parade and fireworks and a Bicentennial Ball Drop on New Year's Eve.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor of the City of Westlake, Ohio as its residents celebrate the city's bicentennial. I extend my sincere congratulations to all members of the Westlake community.

IN RECOGNITION OF FATHER ANTON KCIRA'S RETIREMENT AFTER MORE THAN 40 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

**HON. GARY C. PETERS**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Father Anton Kcira, a leader in Michigan's Albanian American community for

the past 22 years and a fierce advocate for the rights of Kosova Albanians around the world, on the occasion of his retirement after 40 years of ministry in the Catholic Church.

As the son of a town mayor in Kosova, Father Anton learned at a young age the value of service to his community and the importance of standing up for one's own beliefs. Early in his life, Father Anton heard the call to serve his community as a priest in the Catholic Church and went on to serve several parishes for over two decades following his ordination. As a servant of the Church during the years of communist rule in Yugoslavia, Father Anton took great personal risk to provide spiritual guidance and leadership to the Kosova Albanian Catholic community during a time of great uncertainty.

As a community leader, it is clear that Father Anton believes strongly in the power of dialogue to bring his community together. During his time in Kosova he took it upon himself to step out into the community to resolve issues between brothers, sisters, friends and neighbors. He even took it upon himself to step in between the warring sides of blood feuds and brought peace between families who had been fighting for generations. Father Anton even reached out to Albania's Muslim community and through his skillful dialogue built an understanding and mutual respect between Albanian Muslims and Catholics.

After his many years of service to the Albanian community in Kosova, Father Anton was forced to flee his homeland to avoid persecution by Yugoslavia's communist government. Father Anton arrived in Michigan in 1989 and was appointed administrator of St. Paul's Albanian Catholic Church by the Archdiocese of Detroit. He brought with him the same sense of community that had served his parishioners so well in Kosova and under his administration St. Paul expanded its congregation from 50 families to over 1,100 members. Under his leadership, St. Paul's also found its new home in Rochester Hills and built an extraordinary place of worship, which has allowed its members to better practice their spiritual fellowship.

Much as he did in Kosova, Father Anton has continued to play a central role within the community he serves. Father Anton rallied the Albanian community to support the many Albanian refugees who arrived, first fleeing from communism and then from genocide in the Balkans. In an even greater show of leadership, Father Anton called upon his parish to meet the challenges its brothers and sisters were facing in the Balkans and the St. Paul's parishioners responded by raising over one million dollars to help the wounded in Kosova. In addition, Father Anton has been an unwavering international voice for the needs of Kosova, advising Members of Congress, U.S. Presidents and world political and religious leaders on the need to support Kosova's ethnic Albanian minority. In 1999, he even sat as a member of the Rambuje Delegation which developed the peace that has allowed Kosova to become the independent nation that it is today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in celebrating a true leader, statesman and humanitarian as Father Anton Kcira celebrates his retirement after more than 40 years in the service to the Catholic Church. Father Anton has truly been a father to a community that has faced so much adversity and contributed immensely to improve the lives of millions

around the world. I wish him happiness in his retirement and trust that he will continue to be a strong advocate for his community and for fairness and social justice around the world.

HONORING JAMES D. BOYD'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF PUBLIC SERVICE TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**HON. JIM COSTA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, Mr. GARAMENDI and I rise today to congratulate Mr. James D. Boyd on an exemplary 50 years of public service to the State of California. For five decades, Mr. Boyd has been a pioneer in the fields of renewable fuels, air quality, new vehicle technologies, bio-energy and climate change. He deserves great praise for his involvement and expertise, which has resulted in California becoming a leading example for the rest of the nation.

Jim graduated from the University of California, Berkeley in 1961 with a Bachelor's Degree in Business Administration, and a minor in Mechanical Engineering. He immediately went to work for the California Department of Water Resources, where he served as principal budget reviewer for the administration of major state public health and health care programs, as well as appeared before committees of the state legislature as principal advocate for these programs' budget needs.

From 1970 to 1976, Mr. Boyd worked at the California Health and Welfare Agency as the Deputy Director, and then as the Assistant Secretary of Operations. In the latter role, he directed operational, administrative and fiscal policy for eight agencies with more than 30,000 employees and a budget exceeding \$3 billion. These departments operated the state's programs for Health (Public Health, Medicaid, Mental Health), Employment, Rehabilitation, Social Welfare, Corrections, and Youth Authority.

Following his tenure at the California Health and Welfare Agency, Jim was appointed chief executive officer of the California Air Resources Board (CARB). From 1981 to 1996, he directed the nation's largest state air pollution-control program, which included the adoption of regulations that required the use of cleaner burning gasoline and diesel fuel, lowering emissions of cars and trucks, and the implementation of electric vehicles on California roads. Due in large part to these efforts, the state now has the highest number of hybrid electric vehicles in the world. During his time as CARB's CEO, he successfully served under five chairmen and three governors with contrasting political views, which is a significant testament to his professionalism and problem-solving skills.

For the past decade, Mr. Boyd has served on the California Energy Commission, where he oversees transportation programs, and an annual \$100 million investment in alternative and renewable fuel and vehicle technologies. Because of his expertise, Jim was appointed by U.S. Energy Secretary Steven Chu to the National Petroleum Council to comprehend and explain the circumstances and fixtures surrounding transportation fuels of the future.

Jim has accomplished many feats in his careers including organizing California's first Bio-energy Interagency Working Group, as well as California's first Joint Agency Climate Change Team, which predated any current mandates pertaining to the issue. He has been honored for contributions to the field of air pollution control and serves on several nonprofit and public-private boards. For instance, his participation with the Baja Board of Governors and the Swedish government on renewable energy resulted in two Memorandums of Understanding between the State of California and Baja, and California and Sweden.

Additionally, Mr. Boyd was appointed California's liaison to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in 2002 and became knowledgeable about issues facing nuclear power plants, particularly seismic vulnerability. Because of this experience, Jim was able to testify before Congress in the wake of Japan's Fukushima nuclear disaster in April 2011.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. GARAMENDI and I ask our colleagues to rise and thank Mr. Jim Boyd for his tireless dedication to the health and well-being of the great people of California, his decades of strong leadership, and for continuing to seek creative and cost-effective solutions to some of the state's most pressing issues.

IN RECOGNITION OF WOODVALE CEMETERY

**HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Woodvale Cemetery on the occasion of its dedication as an Ohio Historical Marker.

The Woodvale Cemetery was established in the early 1800s after Mr. Fred G. Klink donated a half acre of land to be utilized as a burial ground. It was not until 1876 that the cemetery was named by Frank M. Stearns who proposed the unnamed cemetery be identified for the scenic wooded vale it abuts. In 1931, the Woodvale Cemetery covered 35 acres and was designated as a non-profit cemetery. Today the Woodvale Cemetery is owned by the cities of Middleburg Heights and Berea and spans nearly 50 acres.

The Woodvale Cemetery hosts some of Ohio's most historic and important graves. The oldest marked grave, dated 1858, is that of Fred G. Klink, the patron of the cemetery. Other notable sets of graves include those of John Baldwin and James Wallace's, the founders of Baldwin Wallace College.

There are also hundreds of veterans from every U.S. war buried in Woodvale Cemetery. There are entire areas dedicated to the graves of soldiers of the U.S. Civil War. Additionally, the first Ohioan to be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, World War I veteran Albert E. Baesel, is buried in the cemetery.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in recognition of the Woodvale Cemetery on the occasion of its dedication as an Ohio Historical Marker.

COMMEMORATING THE CITY OF CENTER LINE, MICHIGAN ON ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

**HON. SANDER M. LEVIN**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the city of Center Line, Michigan, as it celebrates its 75th anniversary of being incorporated as a city this weekend.

The city of Center Line is located north of Detroit in Macomb County and was incorporated in 1936. The city has a rich heritage, and is known as a warm, family-oriented and tight-knit community. Residents have always prided themselves on maintaining the community's distinct identity and small-town feel. After 75 years of growth and change, that local spirit remains embodied in the city.

The area incorporated as a village in 1925 and transitioned to cityhood in 1936. The Center Line name derives from the center of three Native American trails named by the French that led north from Detroit to other trading posts. The middle trail, known as the "Centre Line," became the main road used by early settlers travelling between the cities of Detroit and Utica. It became known as Center Line Road, and today is Sherwood Avenue.

The "center" of town became Van Dyke Avenue after construction of St. Clement Catholic Church in 1854. St. Clement has been one of the defining landmarks of the city. In addition to the many Catholic families that settled in Center Line, a large number of the residents that migrated from Detroit to settle in Center Line are of French, German, Belgium and Irish descent. These close-knit families have lived in the city their whole lives, many now going on the three generations.

The city of Center Line embodies the American dream: Hard-working, middle class families, many of whom worked their way up the economic ladder through employment in the domestic auto industry and also serving honorably in our country's armed services.

As the city of Center Line commemorates this milestone, I ask all my colleagues to join me in congratulating its residents, elected officials, and businesses as they celebrate their history, preserve their rich local heritage, and look forward to growth and prosperity in the future.

IN HONOR OF MARY E. HARTMAN

**HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mary E. Hartman on the occasion of her retirement from the Western Campus of Cuyahoga Community College.

Ms. Hartman was raised in southeast Cleveland and is the youngest of five children. She graduated in 1970 from Marymount High School and proceeded to study at the Eastern Campus of Cuyahoga Community College, where she completed her associate of applied business degree in 1975.

While studying, Ms. Hartman was hired as the executive secretary to the college executive vice president at the district administrative

offices. She then moved to the Western Campus in 1981 as a staff assistant to the Dean. In 1986 she began her current role as administrative assistant to Western Campus President Patricia Campbell Rowell, which includes managing the \$42 million budget of the Western Campus.

Ms. Hartman is also extremely active in her community and serves on the Parma Area Chamber of Commerce board of directors, a position she has held since June 2004. In addition, she is a member of the Parma City School District business education/executive assistant advisory committee.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Mary E. Hartman, a woman whose tireless work ethic, collaborative spirit, and unending passion for her work enabled her to make invaluable contributions to Cuyahoga Community College and the community around her.

HONORING TOM W. WILLIAMS, JR.

**HON. BARBARA LEE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Tom W. Williams, Jr., founding partner and CEO of Williams, Adley & Company, LLP (Williams Adley), and a dedicated community leader, husband, father and mentor. With Mr. Williams' passing on June 22, 2011, we are reminded of his life's journey and the joyful legacy he inspired.

Known for his business acumen, integrity and generosity, Mr. Williams was a giant in the Bay Area business community and accounting profession. A California licensed Certified Public Accountant with a bachelor's degree from Berkeley's Armstrong College, Mr. Williams entered a career in public accounting with KPMG, LLP in 1972.

After leaving KPMG in 1980, Mr. Williams co-founded Williams Adley in September of 1982. Bolstered by the partners' guidance and hard work, the firm grew from a small 8(a) entity, into one of the nation's leading minority-owned small business firms. With current California locations in Oakland and San Francisco, as well as offices in Huntsville, Alabama and Washington, D.C., Williams Adley has built a successful clientele, serving Federal agencies, State and local government, non-profit entities, small businesses and individuals. The firm has provided crucial audit, accounting, tax and management consulting services for nearly 3 decades.

Under Mr. Williams' leadership, Williams Adley has received numerous accolades from various government agencies and the surrounding business community. In fact, just this month, Assemblymember Sandré Swanson and the California State Legislature recognized Mr. Williams as the Assemblymember's Small Business Leader of the Year during its California Small Business Day reception.

Mr. Williams' passion for his company and staff was only surpassed by his incredible devotion to his family and community. He supported numerous civic organizations, professional associations and charities, acting as a founding director and past president of the San Francisco Chapter of the National Association of Black Accountants (NABA) and serv-

ing the Committee on Government Auditing of the California Society of Certified Public Accountants.

Mr. Williams was also an enthusiastic mentor to young professionals, encouraging them to pursue their goals through self-awareness, higher education and volunteerism. Williams Adley Oakland staff have volunteered countless hours of expertise and financial support to organizations such as the Alameda County Family Justice Center, United Way, American Cancer Society, National Association of Black Accountants, Girl Scouts, and the Alameda County Community Food Bank. Mr. Williams also shared his astute business talents on Capitol Hill. He spent countless hours educating Members of Congress about small and minority business issues. He was focused, persistent and patient, and my staff and I relied on his wisdom and "marching orders."

Tom was so much a part of my life on so many fronts. We were friends as well as colleagues. I will always remember the two conversations we had a few days prior to his death. He was cheerful, and as always, encouraging. Tom supported my campaigns, as he did many candidates, and his generosity helped me in so many ways. We will miss his smile, his voice, his phone calls, his meetings and his awesome presence in our lives.

Today, California's 9th Congressional District salutes and honors a great individual and a stalwart community leader, Mr. Tom W. Williams, Jr. Mr. Williams spent his entire career seeking to improve and expand business opportunities for small businesses and minority firms. The contributions he made to others throughout his life are countless and enduring. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, his son and his extended group of loved ones and friends. He will be deeply missed. May his soul rest in peace.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF MRS.  
DONNA SMALLWOOD

**HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in remembrance of Mrs. Donna J. Smallwood, a beloved wife, mother, and friend. Mrs. Smallwood was an active member in the Parma community and a tireless civic activist.

Born and raised in Parma, Ohio, Donna began working towards her legacy, the Donna Smallwood Activity Center and Office on Aging, at an early age. In 1964, Donna and the Parma Jaycees Wives recognized the underserved senior community in Parma and approached the city to start a program. When told that the city did not have funds for such a venture, the group took it upon themselves to hold fundraisers for the cause. They found a location, Parma Memorial Hall, and ran the center as volunteers. As the center grew, seniors began to request increased services and programs. Instead of giving up, the Parma Jaycee Wives petitioned Mayor John Petruska to apply for state and federal funding, and as a result, the Parma Sixty Plus Club was able to expand. Furthermore, Mayor Petruska was so impressed by Donna's work in convincing City Council to accept these funds, that he hired her as his first Senior Director, making

her the first female department head in the City of Parma.

Between 1968 and 1987, the senior center flourished under Donna's management, as she acquired grants to kick-start programs that continue to exist today. During this time that transportation and meal services came to fruition, as did the Parma Commission on Aging, the governing body and fundraising arm of the Senior Center. Between 1988 and 1996, when Donna was not the Director, grants were lost and programs were discontinued. When Gerald M. Boldt took over as mayor, he quickly brought Donna back to revive the Senior Center, and she continued as Director from 1996 through 2003.

In addition to all of her work with the Senior Center, Donna still found time to be involved in many other aspects of the Parma community. She was President of Proud of Parma Inc., directed the Miss Parma Pageant, served on the Parma Area Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors and was on the Ridgewood Family YMCA Board of Directors. She also volunteered at Historic Stearns Farm and Homestead and was an active member and volunteer at Good Shepherd United Methodist Church.

In addition to all that she did for her community, Donna managed to be a devoted mother to her five children and wife to her husband of 41 years, Richard, with whom she owned and operated a local business, The Treasure Aisle gift shop from 1987 to 1996.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring the life of Donna J. Smallwood, she will forever be a part of Parma, Ohio.

HONORING THOMAS A. HARGETT

**HON. TODD ROKITA**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and salute an exceptional Hoosier, Thomas A. Hargett. Sadly, we lost Tom on June 27. I wish to express my condolences, thoughts and prayers to his family. We stood side by side fighting the "bad guys". He was my friend.

As a man of faith, I believe we were put on this earth to love one another and to make the best of the gifts our Lord has provided. We are all blessed to live in a country that allows us to experience freedom and the opportunity to succeed. Tom worked hard to represent his clients and help them recover money lost to unscrupulous stockbrokers, fraud and negligence.

Tom was also dedicated to community service and should be commended for all he did. He served on the Board of Directors, most recently as the Vice President, since 2003 of the Indiana Children's Wish Fund, granting wishes to children diagnosed with life-threatening illnesses. He was the President of the Sigma Nu Housing Corporation and in 2010 was awarded the Herman B. Wells Alumni Leadership Award and inducted into the Sigma Nu Beta Eta Chapter's Hall of Honor. Tom also served on the Board of Directors of the White Star Endowment, a wonderful organization that grants scholarships for academic excellence and financial need to Indiana University students.



For all he did for the community, his most favorite activity was spending time with his wife, Denise, and their beautiful children Isaac and Erin. I would like to thank his family for sharing Tom with us. For all the great things he did, he will be truly missed.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF HELEN  
AGNES POWELL

**HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Mrs. Helen Agnes Powell on the occasion of her passing.

Mrs. Powell was born on September 24, 1926 and was one of four siblings. She graduated from Garfield Heights High School in 1944 and upon graduation assisted in the war effort by working at a factory located at Harvard and Broadway Avenues that produced military equipment.

Her two brothers, John and Lawrence, both served in the military. John was mortally wounded fighting in Burma and passed away on June 11, 1944, which deeply affected Helen. Her brother Lawrence served in the 8th Army Air Corp and fought in the Battle of the Bulge.

Mrs. Powell met her husband Bob Powell in 1941, but he soon left to join the Navy. They married on September 24, 1947 and had four children: Robert Jr., Deborah, Grace and Marie.

Helen was a full-time mother and after her husband was severely injured in a construction accident, she took care of him. Aside from her family, Helen and her mother were extremely active in the VFW Post 3445 in Garfield Heights. Both Helen and Bob also helped to establish a VFW post in Aurora.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in remembrance of Mrs. Helen Agnes Powell, a woman whose biggest joy was bringing her family together and was completely dedicated to her husband, children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren.

RECOGNIZING MAJOR KEVIN D.  
BRADLEY

**HON. TODD RUSSELL PLATTS**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize and pay tribute to Major Kevin D. Bradley, United States Army, on the occasion of his departure from the Army House Liaison Office to join 4th Stryker Brigade, 2nd Infantry Division in Fort Lewis, Washington. I, and many other members of this chamber, have had the pleasure of working with Major Bradley over the past year that he has served as a Liaison Officer and Congressional Delegation Escort Officer in the Army Liaison Office in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Major Bradley has had a remarkably varied and successful career. After growing up in Stratford, New Jersey and graduating from Sterling High School in 1995, Major Bradley attended the United States Military Academy.

He graduated in 1999 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Civil Engineering and was commissioned a Second Lieutenant in the Armor Branch. Major Bradley attended the Basic Officer Course at Fort Knox, Kentucky before leaving for Germany.

Major Bradley's initial assignment was in Vilseck, Germany where he served as a Tank Platoon Leader, Tank Company Executive Officer, and later the Support Platoon Leader in the 1st Battalion, 63d Armor Regiment, 3d Brigade, 1st Infantry Division. As a Platoon Leader in Germany, he deployed to Kosovo to conduct peace enforcement operations. Major Bradley's platoon secured the Serbian towns of Partes and Donje Budriga as part of KFOR 1B shortly after the start of the NATO mission. Major Bradley also deployed his M1A1 Abrams tank as part of Operation Lariat Response to Hungary to conduct a live fire exercise with a Hungarian Airborne battalion.

After 3 years stationed in Europe, Major Bradley attended the Infantry Captains Career Course and Ranger School in Fort Benning, Georgia. Upon completion of these courses, Major Bradley joined 3d Brigade, 1st Cavalry Division in Fort Hood, Texas as they prepared to deploy to Iraq as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom II.

In March 2004, Major Bradley deployed to Baghdad, Iraq where he led a team of forty U.S. soldiers in recruiting, training, mentoring, and conducting combat operations with the 302nd Iraqi Army Battalion. After returning to Fort Hood, Major Bradley assumed command of Charlie Company, 6th Squadron, 9th Cavalry Regiment of the 1st Cavalry Division in April 2006. In October 2006, he deployed with his heavy scout company to the city of Muqdadiyah in the Diyala Province of Iraq for 14 months. Major Bradley led his troops during numerous combat operations while executing a clear, hold, build strategy against al-Qaeda in Iraq.

Following his command, Major Bradley was selected for the Joint Staff/Army Staff Intern Program in Washington D.C. As part of this program, he completed a Masters Degree from Georgetown University in Public Policy Management before joining the staff of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for a year. In June 2009, Major Bradley joined the Army House Legislative Division in the Rayburn Building. I have come to know Major Bradley well during his assignment in the House of Representatives through his work with Congressional Delegations and outreach to Members of Congress. Major Bradley has never failed to impress me with his energy and dedication to soldiers, their families, and the U.S. Army. Major Bradley is a superb representative of Army values and the American Soldier.

I am honored to express heartfelt thanks to Major Kevin Bradley for his dedicated service to the U.S. Army and our Nation. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the outstanding accomplishments of this Soldier, citizen, and friend.

IN HONOR OF AGNES KASPER

**HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and remembrance of Agnes Kasper,

whose strong dedication and commitment to improving her community led her to create one of Cleveland's most well-known hunger centers.

A native Clevelander, Ms. Kasper attended high school and graduated from St. Joseph Academy. She went on to become a secretary at Berea's Ohio Nut and Bolt, where she met and married John. The Kaspers are survived today by their ten children, twenty six grandchildren and three great-grandchildren.

Aside from running her church's daily meal program, Ms. Kasper also taught religious education for decades. Her work with her church's meal program eventually led her to found the renowned hunger center at St. Augustine Catholic Church in Cleveland, Ohio. In her spare time, she also actively helped run emergency shelters while simultaneously hosting homeless people in her own home.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in remembrance of Ms. Agnes Kasper. Her hard work for her community has improved the lives of countless individuals. I offer my sympathies to her family.

REMEMBERING AND HONORING  
THE LIFE OF ARTHUR HENRI  
JERBERT

**HON. JOE COURTNEY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and mourn the loss of Arthur Henri Jerbert of North Stonington, Connecticut. As we approach the one year anniversary of his passing, and in such close proximity to Independence Day, it is important for this House to remember Art's remarkable service to our nation and his contributions to his community.

Art was a member of the "Greatest Generation" and entered the U.S. Navy during World War II serving in the submarine force for 20 distinguished years. His career in the Navy included time aboard one of the submarines that adapted the highly-coordinated, "wolf pack" attack strategy in the Sea of Japan. That strategy was instrumental in reasserting allied naval supremacy in the Pacific—an essential ingredient to final victory. During that conflict, he earned the Bronze Star for valor in combat and after the war rose to the rank of Commander, retiring in 1962.

After leaving the Navy, Art applied his talent and energy to solving problems in his community and improving the quality of life in southeastern Connecticut. He coached Little League baseball, served on the North Stonington Board of Education, and became Ledyard's first mayor in 1971. He educated and empowered young people as a popular math teacher at schools across eastern Connecticut including Norwich Free Academy and Griswold High School.

Arthur is deeply missed by his loving wife Marilyn, his children, grandchildren, and great grandchild. His example of human excellence and service is an inspiration for us all today and for generations to come.

HONORING COLONEL RONALD LIGHT AND THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS MIDDLE EAST DISTRICT IN WINCHESTER, VIRGINIA

**HON. FRANK R. WOLF**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Colonel Ronald Light and the men and women of the Army Corps of Engineers Middle East District, MED, located in Winchester, Virginia, for the support they have provided for troops deployed overseas.

Colonel Light, commander of the MED, has had a distinguished military career since his graduation from The Pennsylvania State University in 1981. As an officer, he has completed the Engineer Officer's Basic and Advanced courses, the Combined Arms Services Staff School, the Command and General Staff Officer Course, and the U.S. Army Airborne School, while earning a Master's Degree in National Security and Strategic Studies at the U.S. Naval War College.

For his service, Colonel Light has been awarded the Legion of Merit, a Bronze Star, five awards for Meritorious Service, two Army Commendation medals, the Army Medal of Achievement, the Iraq Campaign Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, among others.

As the senior engineer commander responsible for reconstructions in Al Anbar and Baghdad provinces in Iraq, he managed the award of 194 projects valued at \$1.32 billion and completed contracts worth an additional \$782.4 million.

Since Colonel Light assumed command at the MED in 2009, employment has approximately doubled from 250 to 500 personnel. The MED employs 427 civilians comprising 23 nationalities, 53 advanced degrees and 24 different languages all dedicated toward the goal of preparing combat theaters for members of the military. The MED employs local accountants, architects, attorneys, paralegals, engineers, property managers, security specialists, and many others.

The MED has proved extremely beneficial not only to the U.S. Military, but also to Winchester and the Shenandoah Valley. The MED partners with local civic organizations, churches and school groups to help carry out many critical engineering projects abroad. The integration of the military and the surrounding communities will create a precedent for more companies to locate in Winchester and the Shenandoah Valley, recognizing the presence of a trained workforce and relative proximity to our nation's capital.

Colonel Light and the MED's dedication to the armed forces has advanced the mission of all military units in forward theaters of combat. We express our appreciation to the dedicated individuals staffing the MED for their service and honor them as the best our military officers and civilians have to offer.

CONGRATULATING JAMES HUNTER AND JOE LAROSE OF THE ROCK BRIDGE BRUINS MEN'S TENNIS TEAM

**HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating James Hunter and Joe LaRose of the Rock Bridge Bruins Men's Tennis Team for winning the Class 2 A Missouri State Doubles Championship on May 28.

These young men should be commended for all their hard work throughout the regular season and bringing home the 2 A Doubles Tennis Championship to their school and community.

I ask that you join me in recognizing James Hunter and Joe LaRose for a job well done!

HONORING JEFFREY GRALNICK

**HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Jeffrey Gralnick, who passed away this past May at the age of 72. A legendary news executive and producer, Jeff's 52-year career began with the black-and-white news segments of the 1950s and grew into leadership positions at nearly all the major broadcast networks including ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN, and MSNBC.

One of the first producers of "60 Minutes," Jeff worked with Walter Cronkite, Don Hewitt, Dan Rather, Peter Jennings, Barbara Walters, Brian Williams, Katie Couric, and Tom Brokaw. As an executive producer and network executive, Jeff oversaw the broadcasts of space launches, presidential elections, and was in charge of the CBS news desk on the day President Kennedy was assassinated.

Jeff's enduring legacy is memorialized in the people he mentored over the years who are employed throughout the news industry. A tough and demanding teacher, Jeff was always eager to share his knowledge and experiences with younger coworkers. His intense character, professionalism, and integrity have left a lasting impression throughout the news industry.

A fierce competitor with a tireless work ethic, Jeff was always welcome to new challenges. After beating his first bout with cancer in his early sixties, Jeff found inspiration in the saying "as soon as you feel too old to do something do it," and decided to climb to the peak of Mt. Kilimanjaro, nearly making it to the top.

I offer my condolences to Jeff's wife of 41 years, Beth, their son Robert, their daughter Kate and her husband Tim, their grandson Adam, and Jeff's brother Bill. Even though Jeff passed away this past May, his work will live on through the broadcasts he has produced, the networks he helped shape, and the anchors and producers he mentored throughout his career.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. VLADIMIR SWIRYNSKY

**HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mr. Vladimir Swirynsky, one of Cleveland's most prominent poets.

Born in Germany on May 20, 1948, Vladimir Swirynsky immigrated to the United States in 1952. After completing his education, Vladimir served with the U.S. Army during the Vietnam War. He was stationed in Long Bien and worked as a morning report clerk. Following his service, Vladimir returned to Cleveland, married, and began a career at Republic Steel.

In 1994, after a divorce, Vladimir left Cleveland in search of healing and found solace in the arts. He travelled to New Orleans, celebrated Mardi Gras, joined a band and began reading poetry. He was enthralled by poetry and realized his own talents. He spent years travelling around the country and perfecting his newfound creative outlet.

Today, Mr. Swirynsky has published thirteen books of poetry and is celebrated as one of Cleveland's finest poets.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in recognition of Mr. Vladimir Swirynsky. His story and poetry will continue to inspire all of those who hear his prose.

HONORING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MINNESOTA AIR NATIONAL GUARD—AMERICA'S FIRST IN THE NATION AIR GUARD UNIT

**HON. BETTY McCOLLUM**

OF MINNEAPOLIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the capable and courageous men and women of the Minnesota Air National Guard on the 90th anniversary of its founding. The Minnesota Air National Guard holds the distinction of being the first in our nation Air Unit of the National Guard recognized by the United States government.

The Minnesota Air National Guard took flight with humble, but honorable beginnings. On September 26, 1920 Captain Ray S. Miller and two other Minnesotans rented a Curtiss Oriole biplane to launch an 8-day flight to Washington, DC. Their mission was to be the first federally recognized National Guard flying squadron. Subsequently the 109th Observation Squadron, the predecessor to today's Minnesota Air National Guard, passed muster inspection on January 17th, 1921.

The creation of the 109th Minnesota Observation Squadron created the flight path for Minnesotans to continue making history while serving our state and our nation. The 133rd Airlift Wing (133rd AW) of the Minnesota Air National Guard Wing is headquartered at the Minneapolis-Saint Paul International Airport, and provides the U.S. Air Force with tactical airlift of troops, cargo, and medical patients anywhere in the world utilizing the C-130 Hercules. The 148th Fighter Wing (148th FW),

headquartered in Duluth, provides the United States Air Force with combat Air Sovereignty and Air Defense. Additionally, both Wings are continually prepared to support the State of Minnesota with assistance in the event of disaster declaration.

During WWII the 109th Observation Squadron was deployed to Europe, initially flying the Supermarine Spitfire Mk V and later reconnaissance missions with the North American F-6 Mustang. During the Korean War, Minnesota's Air Guard was again activated, contributing pilots to active wings throughout the Korean theater.

Throughout the Cold War of the 1950s and early 1960s, both units of the 179th Fighter Interceptor Squadron in Duluth and 109th Fighter Interceptor Squadron in St. Paul provided active air defense commitments with 24-hour alert status. Threats by the Soviet Union to oust Western troops from West Berlin in 1961 prompted the Berlin Crisis and a call-up of selected National Guard forces throughout the United States. Included in this mobilization were members of the 133rd Air Transport Wing, who served in federal active service for eleven months while operating out of their home station at the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Airport. While the Minnesota Air Guard was never officially mobilized during the Vietnam War, the organization flew hundreds of supply and transport missions to Southeast Asia.

Today, the Minnesota Air National Guard continues to serve with valor and with honor. We all recall the critical moments following the attack on our nation on September 11th, 2001. Immediately, F-16s from the 148th Fighter Wing were called into action for combat air patrols over critical areas. Since then, the Air Guard has provided support for our nation's efforts in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation New Dawn as well as other operations worldwide. Brave men and women today from 133rd Airlift Wing and the 148th Fighter Wing continue to serve our nation with distinction in overseas operations today.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in rising to honor the commitment and dedication of the 2,000 airmen and women serving in the Minnesota Air National Guard as we commemorate the 90th Anniversary of this pioneering unit.

IN HONOR OF GUERINO AND CAROLYN RИPEPI'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY

**HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Guerino and Carolyn Ripepi to acknowledge their 60th anniversary.

Guerino and Carolyn were married on May 5, 1951 at St. Paul's Croatian Church in Cleveland, Ohio. Over the course of their lives together Guerino and Carolyn raised four children in Parma and later North Royalton, Ohio. The couple takes great pride in the accomplishments of their seven grandchildren.

The Ripepi's were active members of the Northeast Ohio community. Guerino was a member of the Brooklyn-Parma Knights of Columbus and Parma Elks Lodge. Carolyn was

involved with her children's lives as a Cub Scout Pack leader and was awarded a Marian Award by the Girl Scouts. Carolyn also belonged to the Ridgewood Lanes women's league.

After a career with Erie Lackawanna Railroad and Parma City Schools, respectively, Guerino and Carolyn retired to the Timber Pines Retirement Community in Spring Hill, Florida. They continue to be active, participating in such activities as golf, bocce and billiards.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the long and happy life that Guerino and Carolyn continue to enjoy together.

THE LIFE OF ELIZABETH WATKINS SAUL

**HON. CORRINE BROWN**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the constituents of the Third Congressional District of Florida, I rise to offer heartfelt condolences and pay tribute to the life of Elizabeth Watkins Saul, a humanitarian, social service advocate and life activist.

I am moved and encouraged when recalling the life achievements of the gentle and loving spirit of an accomplished woman who lived such a brief and beautiful life of service. She strived for excellence in every endeavor and she exuded boundless energy and love that was shared in the field of community and social activism. As a wife, community leader and social service advocate, we embrace her husband, family and the community that embraced her service and humanitarian efforts. A woman for whom education was important, Elizabeth Watkins Saul received her B.S. Degree from the historic Texas Tech University with a degree in political science and public policy.

On this special occasion and celebration of the life of a phenomenal woman, I join with the immediate family, and loved ones in saying farewell and praising God for the life of a woman of God who was selfless and lived a productive life of purpose. Elizabeth enjoyed fishing, painting, traveling, decorating, BINGO, reading and spending quality time with her friends and family. Elizabeth was dearly cherished by her loved ones, colleagues and her community in Fort Worth, Texas; Las Cruces, New Mexico; Alexandria, Virginia; Orlando, Florida; and Tucson, Arizona. Elizabeth's employment spans from Clinique Cosmetics, Capitol Hill, The Metropolitan Orlando Urban League, Raytheon and Tuskegee University Resolution Team. She most recently worked as a successful and well respected Senior Manager of Human Resources at Raytheon Missile Systems, where she played an integral role in the recruitment of Tuskegee graduates for careers in engineering and management. Elizabeth was a Tuskegee University presidential transition team member. In addition to being an essential part of President Gilbert Rochon's Transition Team; Ms. Saul was a member of two Transition Team committees: Improve the Management and Performance of the Kellogg Center and Improve Staff Quality and Productivity. Tuskegee will establish the

Elizabeth Watkins Saul Scholarship at the University beginning in the fall of 2011. As a woman of integrity and character, Elizabeth was both gifted and inspiring, always leaning on the everlasting tasks of making a difference in her community. Where she saw pain, she sought to relieve it with personal interaction; where she saw potential in others, she gave them impetus and encouragement; where she saw despair, she brought direction and promise; and where she saw the need for love and caring, she unselfishly gave of herself.

The life of Elizabeth Watkins Saul was one of accomplishment and service. In her passing, we pay tribute to an accomplished woman and her life of service to each of us. She will be remembered for the love of her family, friends, Sorority Sisters of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc., and colleagues. This attribute set her above and beyond all selfless giving. She has a special anointed gift of discernment and those that had an opportunity to be in her presence were blessed to experience her tireless energy for service and were beneficiaries of her boundless generosity. It is my prayer that by her example that each of us become the bearers of her humanitarian legacy. We come now to join in prayer for her parents, and a host of loving relatives, friends, whose lives have been forever changed by this exemplary woman of excellence and peace. I thank our Heavenly Father for allowing us to be blessed with the time spent with Elizabeth, our friend. Elizabeth was a devoted wife and leaves memories and love to her husband H. Rock Saul of 17 years; father and mother George, Sr., and Carolyn Watkins; Siblings Gerald Cook, George Watkins, Jr., Darnetta Kay Watkins-Owens (Michael); Mother-in-law Arleen Haydel; Sister-in-law Nicole Saul, six nieces and nephews, one godchild (Evans); Grandmother Dear Watson and a host of family members and special friends.

HONORING CONGRESSWOMAN WOOLSEY'S SERVICE

**HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, as Dean of the California Congressional delegation, I rise to highlight the career of Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY, who has announced that she will retire after the 112th Congress. Congresswoman WOOLSEY broke barriers when she began her career as the first former welfare recipient to serve in Congress. As a young single mother with three children, she needed public assistance to make ends meet—even though she was employed. This sensitivity to working families has shone through her Congressional career.

Rep. WOOLSEY serves as a senior member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, and as a member of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education.

On this committee, she helped to pass the Family and Medical Leave Act, which protects Americans who need temporary employment leave due to a serious illness or to care for a sick family member. Recently, Congresswoman WOOLSEY proposed "the Balancing

Act," which will help families by promoting public universal pre-school, investments in child care, universal school breakfast, benefits for part-time workers, and telecommuting incentives.

She has served as co-chair of the Progressive Caucus where she led our efforts to present the progressive voice in Congress and use our strength as a large voting block to influence legislation. She continues to be an active progressive leader.

Congresswoman WOOLSEY vocally opposed the Iraq war from day one. The San Jose Mercury News hailed her as "the unofficial matriarch of the [anti-war] movement in Congress." She has led the way for peace by introducing the first resolution to demand that we bring our troops home.

Congresswoman WOOLSEY fought to pass landmark health care reform last Congress by supporting the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. She led our efforts to include a public health insurance option in the law in order to inject real competition against the private health insurance industry. Though we lost that battle as part of the health reform law, she has taken the lead in authoring legislation to amend the law to institute a public option. That legislation would save the Federal Government \$68 billion and deserves to be part of the solution as Congress focuses on efforts to reduce the deficit.

Congresswoman WOOLSEY has always worked to protect the environment and reduce our dependence on foreign oil during her tenure as a senior member of the Committee on Science, Space and Technology and as a member of the Subcommittee on Energy and the Environment. She is working to safeguard her district's shores from oil spills by introducing a bill that would designate the Sonoma coastline as a National Marine Sanctuary.

Congresswoman WOOLSEY simply personifies public service. She has been one of the most sought out and responsive representatives. Each week her Washington office receives and responds to over 3,000 constituent letters, phone calls, and emails.

It has been an honor to serve with LYNN over the past 20 years. Thanks to Congresswoman WOOLSEY's service, America is a better place for working families. I know we haven't heard the last from LYNN WOOLSEY. I look forward to continuing to work together in the 112th Congress and in her next venture, which I am sure will continue to advance the progressive causes she believes in so strongly.

CONGRATULATING THE EAU CLAIRE  
SOUTH MIDDLE SCHOOL ODYSSEY  
OF THE MIND TEAM

### HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Eau Claire South Middle School Odyssey of the Mind Team that took fifth place at the 2011 World Finals held at the University of Maryland. Odyssey of the Mind is an educational program that challenges students to creative problem-solving challenges. The competition takes place first at the local level and moves onto a state and world competition for

groups that succeed. The Eau Claire team was the only group from Wisconsin to make it to the worldwide competition where they placed fifth overall. They were one of only two teams to place in the entire Midwest division.

The team competed in a challenge entitled "Full Circle," which required the team to create a humorous skit while completing numerous challenges. The first challenge was having something change form three times during the presentation before returning to its original form. The skit also had to include a funny character, a serious character, a song and dance, and a surprising ending. All of this had to be worked together into one presentation.

Not only did the team have to prepare a challenge in advance, but they had to compete in a spontaneous challenge that they were presented with immediately before their performance. After competing in both the main challenge entitled "Full Circle," and the spontaneous challenge, they came in fifth place among schools from all over the world. I am proud of the Eau Claire South Middle School team and their accomplishment. Hopefully, it will be the first of many successes in these young students' lives.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 30TH AN-  
NIVERSARY OF THE MUSTARD  
SEED MARKET

### HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in honor of the 30th anniversary of the Mustard Seed Market, the largest locally-owned retailer of natural and organic products in Ohio.

In 1978, husband and wife team, Margaret and Philip Nabors, started a small, home-based, natural foods catering business in Northeast Ohio and discovered a large market for their healthy cooking. The couple supplied nutritious and delicious food to a multitude of weddings and events. In 1981, they expanded their enterprise with the opening of a small health foods store in Akron's Merriman Valley. Mustard Seed Market continues to offer a wide variety of natural foods, supplements, teas, books and health and beauty items.

In 1989, Mustard Seed Market relocated to a much larger space, which included a 60 seat restaurant and an even larger selection of natural foods. Responding to customers' requests, the Nabors added a new fresh seafood case, an antibiotic-and-cage-free poultry case, and a small meat department. In 1992, they began offering a Monday night educational program, which consisted of cooking classes and lectures related to natural health.

As a result of Mustard Seed Market's great and continued success, the Nabors decided to expand the business further in 1996. They moved to what is now their current location, a 31,500 square foot shopping and dining area, which includes a 14,000 square foot retail space, 120-seat restaurant, 20-seat bar and a banquet facility. In 1999, a second store was opened in Solon, Ohio.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in recognizing Margaret and Philip Nabors, whose inspiring thirty year mission has helped many people enjoy healthier lives through healthier eating habits.

BRUCE WARD TRIBUTE

### HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Bruce Ward for his promotion of outdoor recreation, and his devotion to the Colorado public lands. Throughout Mr. Ward's life, he has contributed greatly to the outdoors, establishing various programs to help people live active lifestyles and learn about the environment.

Mr. Ward started his career as a tour guide for TrekInternational, acquainting hundreds of young adults to America's National Parks and public lands. His time with TrekInternational cemented his passion for the outdoors, and it opened the opportunity for him to serve as an outreach coordinator for REI, where he organized volunteers and spearheaded programs to build outdoor outreach programs throughout the U.S.

In 1994, Mr. Ward and his wife, Paula, worked in conjunction with the Fausel Foundation to create the Continental Divide Trail Alliance, establishing the Continental Divide Trail as the "King of Trails." Currently, Mr. Ward is developing national initiatives designed to get youth outdoors. On July 6, 2011, Mr. Ward was recognized by President Obama as a "White House Champion of Change for Rural America."

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Bruce Ward today. He has spent his life working for people and the outdoors, and his efforts have richly served the great state of Colorado.

IN RECOGNITION FOR THE OUT-  
STANDING CONTRIBUTION OF  
STEVE MARTYN

### HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Mr. Steve Martyn, Field Representative and Case Worker for the 5th district of Colorado, and would like to express my gratitude for his service and congratulate him on his well-earned admission to the University of Colorado School of Law.

Mr. Martyn's career has demonstrated a remarkable commitment to public service as he has been involved in numerous service activities at the state and federal level. He has been a tremendous researcher, team leader, event planner, writer, and more specifically, an invaluable member of my staff. He has represented me and my office with excellence and has given his best efforts to serve the wonderful citizens of Colorado Springs.

For the past two years, Mr. Martyn has proven himself to be an exceptional case worker, field representative, and respected team member among his colleagues. Thousands of constituents have been directly aided and positively influenced by the expertise, customer service, and distinguished work ethic of Mr. Martyn.

As he transitions into life as a full-time law student, I am greatly honored to acknowledge

and thank him publically for his service. The benefits that my wife and I, our staff, and the many citizens of the 5th district of Colorado have received due to his hard work are beyond measure. Mr. Martyn has set an impressive precedent for service, proof of his path to a highly successful career. I would like to join in celebration with his colleagues, family, and friends as we congratulate him on his achievements as he continues to further his commitment to public service through the practice of law.

A TRIBUTE TO THE 2011 ELLIS ISLAND MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

**HON. DAN BURTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 2011 recipients of the coveted Ellis Island Medal of Honor. Presented annually by the National Ethnic Coalition, NECO, the Ellis Island Medal of Honor pays tribute to our Nation's immigrant heritage, as well as individual achievement. This year, the Ellis Island Medal of Honor takes on a special significance as 2011 marks the 25th anniversary of these distinguished awards, a milestone which was celebrated this past May with a patriotic ceremony on Ellis Island. The medals are awarded to U.S. citizens from various ethnic backgrounds who exemplify outstanding qualities in both their personal and professional lives, while continuing to preserve the richness of their particular heritage. Since the medal's founding in 1986, more than 2,000 American citizens have received Ellis Island Medals of Honor, including six American Presidents, several United States Senators, Congressmen, Nobel Laureates, outstanding athletes, artists, clergy, and military leaders.

As we all know, citizens of the United States can trace their ancestry to many nations. The richness and diversity of American life makes us unique among the nations of the world and is in many ways the key to why America is the most innovative country in the world. The Ellis Island Medals of Honor not only celebrate select individuals but also the pluralism and democracy that enabled our ancestors to celebrate their cultural identities while still embracing the American way of life. This medal is not about money, but about people who seized the opportunities this great country has to offer and who used those opportunities to not only better their own lives but make a difference in the lives of those around them. By honoring these outstanding individuals, we honor all who share their origins and we acknowledge the contributions they and other groups have made to America. I commend NECO and its Board of Directors headed by my good friend, Nasser J. Kazeminy, for honoring these truly outstanding individuals for their tireless efforts to foster dialogue and build bridges between different ethnic groups, as well as promotes unity and a sense of common purpose in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing the good works of NECO over these last 25 years and in congratulating all of the 2011 recipients of the Ellis Island Medals of Honor.

2011 ELLIS ISLAND MEDALS OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

Gina Addeo, Setrak O. Agonian, Margaret Ajemian Ahnert, Carlos E. Alvarez, Hamid Ansari, Michael Aram, Tom Arnold, Kevoork B. Bardakjian, PhD, Stanley M. Bergman, Tejinder SinghBindra, Col. Matthew Bogdanos, Esq., USMC (Ret.), John A. Brennan, MD, Paul A. Brinkley, Jerry Cahill, Hon. Salvatore J. Cassano, Anthony D. Chimino, Steve S. Chon, Jim Clifton, Darryle D. Clott, James F. Comley, Giancarlo Crupi, MD, James Jian Cui, MD, PhD, Supt. Joseph A. D'Amico, Marty D. Davidson, Joseph F. Dean, ADM Bruce DeMars, USN (Ret.), Nitin V. Doshi, DDS, Pierre Dulaine, CAPT Linda L. Fagan, USCG, David Fitzpatrick, PhD, Bill V. Gallo, Cyril E. Geacintov, PhD, John Giuffre, SSgt. Salvatore A. Giunta, USA, Joseph R. Haiek, Dorothy J. Harber, Lacy J. Harber, Stuart C. Harvey, Jr., Salah M. Hassanein, Robert S. Hekemian, Hon. Patrick Henry, Scott H. Herman, Fernando J. Hernandez, John M. Iacono, O. Wayne Isom, MD, Joel P. Jahraus, MD, MG Nathaniel James, AUS, Hon. James A. Kaddo, Chief Charles S. Kammerdener, Dr. Munn Kazmir, Ken Kendrick, Kamran Khavarani, PhD, Hon. Peter J. Koutoujian, Sr., Cecilia M. La Pietra, OP, Wai Lap Leung, MD, Jeffrey E. Levine, Jerry Lewis, Weining Liang, MD, Joanie M. Madden, Babu Rao Mandava, Joseph A. Martorana, Anthony J. Melita, Joseph S. Micallef, JD, Radmila Milentijevic, PhD, LTG John F. Mulholland, Jr., USA, Francis Najafi, Vali R. Nasr, PhD, Younes Nazarian, Denis O'Brien, James G. O'Connor, John O'Hurley, Gail Talanian O'Reilly, Harvey E. Oyer, III, Esq., Mustafa Oz, MD, FACS, BG Frederick M. Padilla, USMC, Fa Y. Park, Patrick M. Park, William L. Perocchi, Vladimir Prodanovich, Philip Pumerantz, PhD, Fahim Rahim, MD, Naeem Rahim, MD, Ali C. Razi, Frank L. Regnante, Doris Roberts, Michele M. Rollins, Esq., Thomas Roma, Bruno L. Sammartino, Samin K. Sharma, MD, Kevin Chang Yao Shih, Donald F. Shula, CMSgt Darren A. Silsbee, USAF, Susan Sommer-Luarca, Joel Szabat, George Veras, Manu K. Vora, PhD, MBA, Joseph M. Walsh, Shirley Wang, Richard P. Wei, Roger L. Williams, MD, Walter W. Wise, Jr., Chris Jia Shu Xu, Madlena Zepter, Philip Zepter, Kenny Weiqun Zhang.

HONORING THE HEROIC SERVICE OF CORPORAL NORMAN N. CHAPMAN, JR., UNITED STATES ARMY, 1964-1968

**HON. JEFF MILLER**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the heroic service of Army Corporal Norman N. Chapman, Jr.

Born in Pascagoula, Mississippi, Corporal Chapman enlisted in the Army in June of 1964 and attended basic training at Fort Devens. Trained in security, he volunteered for service in Vietnam with the 3rd Radio Research Unit, stationed at Davis Station at Tan Son Nhut Air Base, near the city of Saigon. On April 13, 1966, Corporal Chapman was wounded in a mortar attack. After his recovery, he was transferred to Homestead Air Force Base. In February 1967, Corporal Chapman moved to the National Security Agency at Fort Meade, where he served until his discharge from the Army in 1968.

Corporal Chapman's service to our country did not end there. He served as a police offi-

cer with the Pensacola Police Department for nearly 25 years in a number of capacities within the Department, from uniform patrol to tactile patrol. He also served in the Detective Bureau, Investigations, and Personnel and Training. In one of the most notable chapters in American criminal history, Mr. Chapman was instrumental in the apprehension and prosecution of serial killer Ted Bundy in 1978. From 1994 to 1998, he served admirably and honorably as Chief of the Pensacola Police Department.

The Purple Heart presented to Corporal Chapman is a testament to his life of selfless service to his country, his community, and his family. The medal is given to those who have been wounded or killed while serving in the U.S. Armed Forces, and is one of the oldest decorations bestowed upon service members by the United States. In reviewing his military medical records, the Army has seen fit to award the Purple Heart Medal to Corporal Chapman for wounds sustained as a result of enemy actions in Vietnam.

Norm Chapman spent his life protecting our lives and our freedoms as both an Army soldier and Pensacola police officer. His service stands as an example for the young men and women on the battlefields abroad and the young officers on the streets at home. Protecting American citizens has been a way of life for Mr. Chapman, and I am privileged to recognize him for this life of heroism.

He and his wife Helen of 45 years have six children—John, Scott, Lydia, Kevin, Keith, and Sarah—and sixteen grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am honored to venerate the leadership and selfless service of Corporal Norman Chapman. My wife Vicki and I wish him and his family all the best for continued success.

HONORING PATRICIA MATTIMORE UPON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT

**HON. DANIEL E. LUNGREN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight the career of Patricia Mattimore, who is retiring after more than twenty-seven years of service with the U.S. House of Representatives.

Ms. Mattimore began her House career in July of 1984. Throughout the years, Patricia has brought a wealth of professional expertise to all of the positions she has held at the House. She has worked for the Appropriations Committee, Clerk of the House, and Chief Administrative Officer. Over the past eight years, she has ensured accurate reporting to the U.S. Treasury for the House's monthly cash activity. This critical process is necessary for the House to demonstrate financial accountability to the public and was performed with great accuracy due to her attention to detail. Her passionate customer service, organizational skills, resourcefulness and dedication to her work has benefited the House as a whole over her career.

On behalf of the entire House community, I congratulate Ms. Patricia Mattimore for her many years of dedication and outstanding

contributions to the U.S. House of Representatives and wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL  
DEBT

**HON. MIKE COFFMAN**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today our national debt is \$14,343,033,186,678.55.

On January 6th, 2009, the start of the 111th Congress, the national debt was \$10,638,425,746,293.80.

This means the national debt has increased by \$3,704,607,440,384.75 since then.

This debt and its interest payments we are passing to our children and all future Americans.

CONGRATULATING LA PLATA  
HIGH SCHOOL BULLDOGS MEN'S  
BASEBALL TEAM

**HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the La Plata High School Bulldogs Men's Baseball Team for winning the Class 1 A Missouri State Championship on June 2.

These young men and their coaches should be commended for all their hard work throughout the regular season and bringing home the 1 A Baseball Championship to their school and community.

I ask that you join me in recognizing the La Plata Bulldogs for a job well done.

HONORING PROCON.ORG FOR  
BEING NAMED A TOP FREE REFERENCE WEBSITE

**HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the staff of the ProCon.org website. This site has recently been honored by the American Library Association as one of the Top 25 Free Reference Websites of 2011. This achievement is indicative of ProCon's value as a resource empowering citizens with information on some of the most controversial topics of the day.

ProCon.org, like many websites, is the product of a simple idea: to make unbiased information on controversial subjects more accessible without opinion or editorializing interfering. This idea came to the founder and CEO of ProCon.org, Steven C. Markoff, in 1984. While debating with a friend, Mr. Markoff realized that the popular discourse about the big issues of the day is always clouded by rhetoric, opinions and political leanings.

Since its inception, ProCon.org has influenced policy debates with its mission of "pre-

senting research on controversial issues in a straightforward, nonpartisan, and primarily pro-con format." More than 10 million people use this website every month for research and fact finding. ProCon has also been named a "Best Non Profit to Work For" by OpportunityKnocks.org and a "Valued Partner" by GuideStar. ProCon was further honored in 2008, when the Library of Congress asked to archive three of ProCon's websites as "materials of historical importance to the Congress and to the American People."

It is my distinct pleasure to honor the staff of ProCon.org and wish them continued success in their service to the American public. Their unbiased and truthful presentation makes a tremendous contribution to the political system.

INTRODUCTION OF A RESOLUTION  
WELCOMING THE DALAI LAMA  
TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

**HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON**

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a resolution welcoming the Fourteenth Dalai Lama to Washington, DC, July 6–16, 2011, and recognizing his extraordinary example and commitment to world peace, non-violence, human rights, religious freedom and democracy.

The Dalai Lama welcomed me and other members of a congressional delegation, led by then-Speaker NANCY PELOSI, into his home in 2008. It is, therefore, a special pleasure to welcome him to my congressional district and the Nation's Capital. Tibetan children, monks, and exiles lined the streets to greet our delegation in 2008, and I know that my colleagues would want to join me in returning that welcoming officially.

Although the Dalai Lama has visited the Nation's Capital many times, this year, he will preside over the fifth Kalachakra teaching in the United States, the first in the Nation's Capital, which will be held at the Verizon Center. The Kalachakra seeks to enhance the Dalai Lama's non-violent teachings, as well as to reduce conflict and promote peace, both individually and globally.

I urge my colleagues to join me in welcoming this recipient of both the Nobel Peace Prize and the Congressional Gold Medal, and in wishing him a happy 76th birthday today.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JAMES  
"JIM" MARTIN GLENN

**HON. JEFF MILLER**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is with great respect that I rise today to honor the life and service of Northwest Florida's beloved James "Jim" Martin Glenn.

Born November 15, 1928 in Perry, Iowa, Jim Glenn dedicated thirty-five years of his life to serving our country in the United States Air Force. A fighter pilot by trade, he flew 26 dif-

ferent aircraft. During his two combat tours in Southeast Asia, he flew over 200 combat missions and commanded the 13th Tactical Fighter Squadron. His service also included Chief of Flying Safety, Deputy Director of Safety, and Flight Testing Operations Director at Eglin Air Force Base and F-16 Conversion Manager and Director of Operations at Nellis Air Force Base. Upon retirement, he founded and operated his own defense consulting firm and returned to the Emerald Coast.

The impact Jim Glenn had Northwest Florida extended far beyond his firm. A pivotal leader in the local community, Jim Glenn dedicated his time to numerous organizations, including the Emerald Coast Military Affairs Council, the Okaloosa County Economic Development Council, and the Fort Walton Beach Chamber of Commerce, where he was a former President, Ambassador, and Life Director. He also served as a member of the Daedalians, a representative to the ACC/CC Civilian Group through his association with the 53rd Wing at Eglin, and was a former President of the Air Force Association.

Over the course of his distinguished career, Jim Glenn served our nation and with great pride and integrity. Throughout his life, he continued to uphold the Air Force values of Integrity First, Service Before Self, and Excellence in All We Do. To those in Northwest Florida, Jim Glenn will be remembered as a well-respected community leader. To his family, he will be remembered as a loving husband, father, and grandfather. Jim Glenn is survived by his wife of 30 years, Millie; his children Timothy, Theresa, Diane, Lisa, Patricia, Jan, Thomas, and Michael; and his great-grandchildren, Matthew, Seth, Shane and Amy.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to honor the life of Jim Glenn. He truly exemplified a life of honor and service that we will all remember for many years to come. My wife Vicki and I offer our continued prayers for his entire family. He will truly be missed.

IN RECOGNITION OF BRENDA  
GORMLEY

**HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a remarkable public servant, Brenda Gormley. Mrs. Gormley is from Lewisville, and was awarded the first annual Jack Colley Award for Volunteerism, the highest state-wide honor given to a volunteer by Texas's Citizen Corps Council. The award is given to a volunteer who shows unwavering dedication, self-sacrifice, and service to the State of Texas, qualities exhibited by the late Chief Jack Colley, head of the Texas Division of Emergency Management from 1998–2010, for whom the award is named.

As the Denton County Emergency Services Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) Volunteer Coordinator, Mrs. Gormley volunteers an average of 50 hours a week, and has trained over 1,000 community volunteers. She also serves as the Secretary for the Denton County Citizen Corps Council, teaches two Teen CERT courses per semester, and was recently the chair of the North Texas Regional Citizen Corps Council. In 2009, the

Denton County Citizen Corps Council received the National Award for Outstanding Citizen Corps Council under her leadership as chair.

Furthermore, Mrs. Gormley is a cancer survivor, has undergone quadruple bypass surgery and two complete hip replacements, and lives with a progressive bone fusing condition, all of which make her volunteer efforts even more extraordinary.

The Jack Colley Award for Volunteerism recognizes the efforts of outstanding community volunteers. Mrs. Gormley has given her time above and beyond expectations, and it is my honor to recognize her and represent her in Congress.

HONORING RAYMOND L. BAGAGLIA

**HON. TIM RYAN**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Mr. Raymond Bagaglia, who passed away on December 8, 2010.

Born in Warren, Ohio on February 7, 1930 to parents Frank and Mary DeMarco Bagaglia, Raymond led a life centered around serving his community. As a police officer for the Warren City Police Department, Mr. Bagaglia spent his days working to remove crime from the streets of his beloved hometown. When Raymond was able to spend time away from the force, he enjoyed being an active member of St. Mary's Catholic Church.

Raymond is survived by his wife, Rosemarie, and the couple's five children; Daniel, Lynn Marie, Sue Ann, Nancy Ann and Debra Ann. His son, four daughters, and nine grandchildren helped to fill his life with happiness and joy.

Please join me in extending our most sincere and heartfelt sympathies to the Bagaglia family.

COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL WAR BATTLE OF CARTHAGE, MISSOURI

**HON. BILLY LONG**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the Civil War Battle of Carthage, Missouri.

The western plains of Missouri would not likely have been the scene of an important battle in the early months of the Civil War. Yet as the Missouri State Guard, under Major General Sterling Price, moved south toward Confederate reinforcements in Arkansas, with the Union Army under Brigadier General Nathaniel Lyon in hot pursuit, the engagement at Carthage, on July 5, 1861, would become the largest battle of the Civil War thus far.

The Federal pursuit of the secessionist militia was not a single column chase. Lyon's forces split with the intention of cutting off the Missouri State Guardsmen and preventing their reinforcements from arriving from Arkansas. They intended, too, to blunt the wave of pro-militia public sentiment stemming from the humiliation of the Camp Jackson Affair. With a

three pronged attack, Lyon hoped to nip their recruitment and burgeoning morale in the bud.

Union Colonel Franz Sigel arrived in Sarcoxie on June 29, and discovered that not only were Price and his men camped south of Neosho, but deposed Missouri Governor Claiborne Fox Jackson, with his thousands of Missouri State Guardsmen, was waiting in Lamar for Brigadier General John S. Rains, commanding a state force out of Lexington. Sigel decided to move southwest to take out Price, then head north to take on Jackson and Rains. When Sigel reached Neosho on July 3, he was surprised to learn that Price had already reached Arkansas, and was camped near Maysville. That same day Rains reached Jackson's camp, while Lyon moved south out of Boonville, in hopes of buttressing his forces with reinforcements out of Kansas. His goal was Springfield.

Sigel modified his plan, leaving a garrison of 94 men under Captain Joseph Conrad at Neosho. He continued on toward Carthage on July 4, and while camping for the night east of town, his outposts on the northern edge of town discovered that Jackson, and his 4000 men, were camped within 15 miles of Carthage.

Colonel Sigel had 1100 men and eight six-pounder guns. None of the men were cavalry. He couldn't have known that half of Jackson's men were unarmed, and most were untrained, unorganized, and similarly afoot. Though Sigel's men were three month volunteers, they were well trained for the military maneuvers the former German soldier would order. They were well rested, well fed, and well organized under their disciplined leader.

The same could not be said of the Missouri State Guard. They seemed to run on pure adrenaline and excitement—never mind that those that had shoes might not have guns, or those that had guns might not have ammunition. They wore the clothes they enlisted in, thus there were no uniforms to distinguish them from one another, let alone from the opposing side or civilians. Jackson was a civilian, and as a commander in the Missouri State Guard, issued orders in his capacity as commander in chief, albeit a deposed one. Their organization, their discipline, and their capacity to serve as a cohesive military unit operating toward a common goal, was vastly limited before they even met their enemy.

Rains had joined up with Jackson north of Carthage, and the excitement in the camp at the oncoming hostilities created such a stir that most of the men heading out before dawn to battle the Federals had not eaten or adequately rested for the battle. Sigel's men, on the other hand, were fully prepared to endure the long day ahead of them, despite the enormous numbers and seeming advantages of the enemy.

At 8:30 a.m., Sigel's advance guard skirmished briefly with Captain Joseph "Jo" Shelby's cavalry company. Sigel then sent in two companies of infantry in support, and the bulk of his own troops to take on Jackson's main force gathering on a nearby hill. One company and one piece of artillery remained with the wagon train to protect the rear.

The Missouri State Guard forces gathering on the high ground between North Fork and Dry Fork, north of Carthage, were representative of Jackson's forces in whole. There was no reserve, unless the unarmed mass of men at the rear could be considered as such. Jackson seemed to operate on the notion that

sheer numbers would intimidate, and thus force the retreat, of Sigel.

The Union forces began firing, their German sharpshooters and competent artillery an excellent asset. The shots reverberated through the Ozark hills, and word of the battle reached the small Union garrison at Neosho. Captain Conrad received orders from Sigel to retreat to Sarcoxie, if necessary. Knowing his commander was hotly engaged and greatly outnumbered, Conrad commenced to a southward retreat. It was too late. Confederate forces out of Arkansas, alongside Missourians under Sterling Price, were already on a northward march to assist Jackson and Rains. Conrad and his men became prisoners of war.

The Union battery continued to pummel the scattered Missourians, eventually ceasing fire for lack of ammunition. Sigel assumed the Guardsmen guns were running low, as well. He had ordered the advance of his troops when he noticed the mass of Rebel cavalry on his perimeter. He likely believed that the enemy reserve would be armed, but little did he know that there what he saw was not a reserve to speak of, nor were any of them armed. His advance quickly became a retreat, a maneuver for which the German leader would be notorious.

It was a slippery spot from which to escape, and he barely achieved it. He concealed one of his batteries in an advantageous hilly spot, and briefly held the ford. Upon the advance of a State Guard cavalry to the east, which wrapped around the rear of his forces and secured Buck Branch to the south, Sigel realized his strength was in jeopardy. His men blasted their way south through Buck Branch in a furious move, fortuitously through inadequately armed State Guardsmen.

His military skill checked the advancing Rebels at Spring River, and again south of Carthage in a desperate move to save the Union supply line. Reaching the previous night's camp south of James Spring, Sigel ordered his rear guard to keep Confederates out of Carthage proper. The pursuing Guardsmen were met with Union gunfire, and the sun set on a continued barrage of bullets. Sigel moved his forces east, along the Sarcoxie road, and continued to give as good as he got from the Rebels. He marched through the night, rested at Sarcoxie, and moved on to the relative safety of Mount Vernon thereafter.

Both sides claimed Carthage as a victory. At the time, the prevention of further Union encroachment into southwestern Missouri gave the Confederates their sense of victory. Sigel's vastly outnumbered army may have failed to achieve the Union mission of checking the Southern troops, but his precarious escape with relatively low casualties gave his day at Carthage a higher regard in historical interpretation. The Union reported 44 casualties, not counting the 94 men captured at Neosho. The Confederate tally is estimated at between 74–200.

The State Guard united with their Confederate brethren out of Texas and Arkansas, and was reinvigorated by the success at Carthage. The scattered but passionate men received a heavy dose of training, consideration from the leaders in Richmond for their persistence, and a much needed boost to their enthusiasm after their defeat at Boonville. Hoping to parlay the passion into a campaign to recapture the state, Jackson, Price and

their men would continue their struggle against the Union at Wilson's Creek, and beyond.

CONGRATULATING THE NEW  
BLOOMFIELD WILDCATS MEN'S  
BASEBALL TEAM

**HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the New Bloomfield Wildcats Men's Baseball Team for winning the Class 2A Missouri State Championship on June 2.

These young men and their coaches should be commended for all their hard work throughout the regular season and bringing home the 2A Baseball Championship to their school and community.

I ask that you join me in recognizing the New Bloomfield Wildcats for a job well done.

HONORING REV. DR. NORMAN S.  
GREER

**HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

Whereas, our lives have been touched by the life of this one man who has given of himself in order for others to stand; and

Whereas, Rev. Dr. Norman S. Greer's work is present throughout the nation for all to see, being a man of God, a professor of education, a member of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc.; and

Whereas, this giant of a man has preached the gospel of Jesus Christ, taught academics to scholars from across the nation, inspired elected officials, motivated the young and the old, as he accomplished so much during his time on this earth; and

Whereas, this remarkable man gave of himself, his time, his talent and his life; he never asked for fame or fortune; he just wanted to uplift those in need, he just wanted to make a difference by spreading the gospel, educating others, building up a community, while protecting his family; Rev. Dr. Greer inspired others to do the same by witnessing him walk the walk and talk the talk; and

Whereas, Rev. Dr. Greer led by doing behind the scenes and on the front lines for many; Rev. Dr. Greer was a husband, a father, a pastor, a professor and a friend; he was our warrior, our patriarch, a man of great integrity who remained true to the uplifting of the community until his end; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to bestow an honorable distinction and recognition on Rev. Dr. Norman S. Greer for his leadership, friendship and service to all of the citizens of Georgia and throughout the Nation; as a citizen of great worth and so noted distinction;

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR. do hereby attest to the 112th Congress that Rev. Dr. Norman S. Greer of Georgia is deemed worthy and deserving of this "Congressional Honorable Distinction"

Rev. Dr. Norman S. Greer  
U.S. Citizen of Distinction  
in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia  
Proclaimed, this 25th day of June, 2011.

IN OPPOSITION TO THE  
AFGHANISTAN WAR

**HON. SAM FARR**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I have never supported the Afghanistan War. It has cost us 1,650 American lives. And the cost of those lost lives can't be measured. But this war has also cost us \$444 billion. And that can be measured.

Where we spend our money reflects our national values. And we spend \$228,000 a minute on this war. So every minute of every day, we are telling the world that we value war above all else.

But what about peace? What if we spent \$228,000 a minute on peace? If we did that for just one day, we could send 6,566 Peace Corps Volunteers to serve America in the name of peace. Or we could feed 6.6 million school children for a year.

Those are things worth valuing. Those are things worth fighting for. So, I urge my colleagues to vote to bring our brave women and men back home. To bring our money back in line with our values.

To bring peace back now.

HONORING CLARE ROSE, INC. ON  
ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

**HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, family-run businesses are the cornerstone of Long Island's economy. I rise today to honor one such business, Clare Rose, Inc., as it celebrates its 75th anniversary this year.

The success of Clare Rose, Inc. is a testament to the perseverance of the American entrepreneurial spirit. Clare F. Rose founded Clare Rose, Inc. on November 30, 1936 in the quiet hamlet of Patchogue, New York, as a soft drink distribution business and then shifted to beer distribution in 1948.

The company distributed just one brand, Piel's, and eventually added Anheuser-Busch and Heineken brands to its menu of brewed selections. Today, Clare Rose proudly distributes AB InBev, Heineken, Blue Point Craft Beers, and Great South Bay, along with other quality non-alcoholic products. It has grown to be the largest beverage wholesaler on Long Island and the second largest in New York State.

Its initial market territory encompassed only Eastern Suffolk County, later expanding busi-

ness operations to all of Suffolk in the 1960s and Nassau County in the 1990s. Today, Clare Rose sells more than 11 million cases of beer annually to all of Long Island.

Rose started with just two employees, growing over time to a family of over 300 employees. The Rose family has led the company through seven decades of serving Long Island. Clare's sons Mark and Ric assumed management responsibilities in the 1960s and today, Sean, a third-generation Rose, serves as CEO and Chairman. It is a family business in the truest sense—welcoming fathers, sons, daughters, brothers, and many other family combinations.

Mr. Speaker, businesses are not just measured in profits or clientele, but by the role they play in their community. Clare Rose continues to support local educational and medical institutions, as well as local land and wildlife conservation initiatives across Long Island. The company has also participated in efforts to educate the public regarding responsible alcohol consumption, with a special focus on high school students and the dangers of underage drinking and drunk driving.

Mr. Speaker, local businesses with long histories are treasures for any community. On behalf of New York's first congressional district, I congratulate Clare Rose, Inc. and its employees on its 75th anniversary and wish them decades of success to come.

ARTIFICIAL PANCREAS RESEARCH

**HON. ELTON GALLEGLY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for additional research and testing of a new technology that would enable persons with diabetes to better control their blood glucose levels. Type 1 diabetes is a dangerous and debilitating disease. Nearly 26 million Americans are living with diabetes. People with diabetes often suffer heart attacks, seizures, comas, and blindness.

An artificial pancreas is a device that may help people with type 1 diabetes better and automatically control blood glucose level. It combines a continuous glucose monitor and an insulin pump with sophisticated software to provide the right amount of insulin at the right time. A recent study estimates that this technology will result in nearly \$2 billion in savings to Medicare over 25 years.

Several inpatient studies have demonstrated that the use of an artificial pancreas may reduce dangerous fluctuations of blood sugars. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is currently reviewing a proposed guidance developed by the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation that would allow outpatient testing of the artificial pancreas.

It is my hope that the FDA will make the review of this proposed guidance one of its highest priorities, and that outpatient testing of the artificial pancreas will be allowed to begin as soon as possible.



HONORING DR. RON ANDERSON FOR RECEIVING THE LIFE-TIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD FROM THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC HOSPITALS AND HEALTH SYSTEMS

**HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Dr. Ron Anderson who was honored in June, 2011 with the Life-time Achievement Award at the 2011 National Association of Public Hospitals and Health Systems annual conference in Chicago.

Dr. Ron Anderson, is President and Chief Executive Officer of Parkland Health & Hospital System in Dallas, Texas. Parkland is considered the premier public hospital in the United States. It has served the Dallas County community since 1894. Dr. Anderson's leadership, dedication to the underserved, commitment to improving the health care system for not just his hospital but for the state and nation, is ultimately a byproduct of his passion to do what's right for those in need.

Dr. Anderson shaped Parkland with the support of the Dallas community to be considered one of the premier public hospitals in the U.S. and is one of the largest. The system has made groundbreaking strides in delivery of care and hospital operations but also is known for putting theories of public health into application by implementing many educational and preventive programs and concepts such as community-based health care delivery through a county-wide clinic network and a mobile medical program for the homeless.

His 35-year career as a practicing physician and 26-year career as CEO have seen many changes in health care, such as nursing shortages, new technology, HIPAA (patient privacy laws), health maintenance organizations, natural and man-made disasters (plane crashes, hurricanes, etc.) resulting in the loss of countless human lives, and decreases in revenue streams which often resulted in the cutting or rationing of services.

Yet Dr. Anderson has always sought out much more work outside the scope of his job description for the chance to better help those in need. Dr. Anderson has long championed causes that improve health care for the medically underserved and, as a result, he has become one of the nation's leading advocates of health care for the poor.

Throughout his career he has provided sound advice and experience to legislators of both parties regarding health care issues. He has served on the National Health Policy Initiative to advise the White House on health care issues as well. Since 1992, he has served on the Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured.

His vision of health care for all, regardless of ability to pay, and his desire to see that happen have led to groundbreaking changes to the U.S. health care system. In 1985, he played a major role in the passage of landmark legislation concerning indigent health care in Texas that banned "patient dumping."

On behalf of a deeply grateful community, I want to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in thanking Dr. Ron Anderson on a job well done.

RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT COLONEL WILLIAM JOHNSON

**HON. ADAM SMITH**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize and pay tribute to Lieutenant Colonel William "Will" Johnson, United States Army, on the occasion of his departure from the Army House Liaison Office to take Command of 5th Battalion, 82nd Field Artillery Regiment, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 1st Cavalry Division at Fort Hood, Texas. I, and many other Members of the House of Representatives, have had the pleasure of working with him over the past two years that he has served as a part of the U.S. Army Office of Legislative Liaison and as a Liaison Officer in the Army Liaison Office in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Lieutenant Colonel Johnson was commissioned a Second Lieutenant in the Field Artillery from the University of Richmond's Reserve Officer Training Corps in May of 1993. In January of 1994, he entered active military service when he attended the Field Artillery Basic Course at Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Lieutenant Colonel Johnson's first unit of assignment was the 1st Cavalry Division at Fort Hood, Texas, where he served as a Fire Support Officer, Platoon Leader, and General's Aide-de-Camp.

Upon completion of the Infantry Officer Advance Course, Lieutenant Colonel Johnson was assigned to the 3rd Infantry Division at Fort Stewart, Georgia. During his first time at Fort Stewart, he served as a Battalion Fire Support Officer and a Battery Commander. While a commander, he led his men in combat during the ground invasion of Iraq in 2003, stopping first in Baghdad and finishing in Fallujah.

Upon his return from Iraq, Lieutenant Colonel Johnson married the former Jessica M. Parrish.

After graduation from the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, Lieutenant Colonel Johnson was reposted at Fort Stewart, Georgia. While living in Georgia, Will and his wife were blessed with the birth of their son, Davis. Lieutenant Colonel Johnson deployed once again to Iraq in 2007 as part of the "Surge" serving for 14 months as a Brigade Fire Support Officer and later as Battalion Operations Officer. Upon returning, Lieutenant Colonel Johnson and his family moved to the National Capitol Region for their current assignment in Army Legislative Liaison. Lieutenant Colonel Johnson was selected by Representative John M. Spratt, Jr. as his Department of Defense Military Fellow in the Second Session of the 111th Congress.

Upon completion of his Fellowship, Lieutenant Colonel Johnson was assigned to the Army House Liaison Office informing and assisting all the members of this legislative body. Lieutenant Colonel Johnson has never failed to impress my colleagues and me with his energy and dedication to Soldiers, their families, and the United States Army. He is a superb representative of Army values.

It is my great honor to congratulate Lieutenant Colonel William "Will" Johnson on his service to the Army and our Nation and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the

outstanding accomplishments of this Soldier, citizen, and friend.

CONGRATULATING THE COLUMBUS DISPATCH FOR 140 YEARS

**HON. STEVE STIVERS**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate The Columbus Dispatch for 140 years in business as a leading news source in Ohio. When I am home, I start each morning at the table with my daughter Sarah, eating breakfast and reading the Dispatch.

From the inaugural publication on July 1, 1871, to this morning's edition dropped on my doorstep in Columbus, the Dispatch has become a staple in Central Ohio as the region's daily printed and on-line source for local, state, national, and international news. With a proven track record of trustworthy and in-depth analysis, unbiased relaying of the facts, and heartfelt community editorials the Dispatch exemplifies excellence in reporting.

The important events of the past 140 years have been delivered into the homes of our community by the Dispatch. The paper relayed the sinking of the Titanic and the outbreak of WWI. It told of the tragedies of Pearl Harbor and gave us hope after September 11, 2001. And the paper has celebrated our local victories with us, like the Buckeyes National Football Championship in 2002.

Since 1905, the Wolfe family has owned and operated the newspaper, allowing it to become one of the most widely read newspapers in the nation. To the Wolfe family and all Dispatch employees, I offer my congratulations and may your next 140 years be as informative, innovative, and inspiring as your first.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF THE BOYES HOT SPRINGS POST OFFICE

**HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague, Representative MIKE THOMPSON, to honor the 100th birthday of an important community institution, the Boyes Hot Springs Post Office. On July 8, 1911, the Sonoma Index Tribune reported that "A.D. Graham of Graham's Cash Store received the appointment as post master of Boyes Springs. Located at his store."

The store, lost in a 1923 fire along with most of the town, was near the train depot at Boyes Boulevard and the Sonoma Highway (Hwy 12). After rapid rebuilding, the post office was located in the Woodleaf Store (now a diner that is part of the Sonoma Mission Inn) until 1951 when its current site was built at the Plaza Center at Boyes Boulevard and Sonoma Highway.

This site, previously known as the Boyes Springs Plaza, had been the scene of street parties and fiestas. Now, redevelopment plans include a public plaza in the surrounding space, reviving it as a place for celebration.

Boyes Hot Springs has a lively history, integral to the fabric of the Sonoma Valley. Formerly the center of a great resort area, it hosted thousands of visitors during its heyday. There were dozens of resorts, from small motor courts to the grand Sonoma Mission Inn. The Boyes Bath House boasted the second largest indoor swimming pool in the country. And, for many years, the area was a training ground for professional football and baseball teams such as the Cleveland Browns and the San Francisco Seals.

After the demise of the passenger railroad, the area still thrived with the construction of the Golden Gate Bridge and the rise of the automobile. Boyes Springs real estate man L.E. "Bud" Castner was one of the first directors of the Golden Gate Bridge District.

In the 1960s, as the resorts faded, Boyes Hot Springs faded a bit as well. Community pride, however, never waned. The area became attractive in the 1980s and 1990s to home buyers who were priced out of the Bay Area market. Attracted by its rural charm, they purchased its large stock of charming cottages to rehabilitate. At the same time, the population of Mexican immigrants grew, attracted principally by the grape growing and wine businesses.

To old timers and new residents alike, the post office is the center of the community. Since most of the surrounding streets receive no mail delivery, residents make a daily trip to the post office where they catch up on the latest local news with their friends and neighbors. The immigrant population relies on it for communication with their families back home. The postal workers are personally known to all, a part of the broader community family.

Mr. Speaker, the community is hosting a celebration to honor this anniversary. In the words of one of the organizers, Michael Acker of the Springs Community Alliance, it will "salute the past, show appreciation for service, and look to the future with hope." Please join us in honoring the centennial of the Boyes Hot Springs Post Office.

IN HONOR OF DR. LARRY EUGENE RIVERS, PRESIDENT OF FORT VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY

**HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great leader in higher education in Georgia—someone who has been committed to improving the lives of young men and women throughout his career. Dr. Larry Rivers recently marked his fifth anniversary as the President of Fort Valley State University (FVSU), and what a remarkable 5 years it has been.

Dr. Rivers was born in the suburbs of Philadelphia and graduated from what was then Fort Valley State College. After earning a master's degree in history from Villanova University, and a Doctor of Arts degree in history from Carnegie-Mellon University, he went on to teach at Florida A&M University for more than 20 years and earned the rank of "distinguished university professor," one of only two on the campus.

He returned to his alma mater in 2006, and in 5 short years, FVSU has experienced a remarkable turnaround under Dr. Rivers' leadership. Student enrollment is at the highest point in the 115-year history of the university. Since 2006, the university invested \$160 million in new construction projects that are transforming the campus with additional buildings to accommodate more students and new research facilities. And FVSU now offers new undergraduate courses and master's degrees in fields such as biotechnology, teaching, and early childhood development that will provide the education and training our future leaders need to compete in a 21st century economy.

Because of FVSU's progress, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools recently reaffirmed the university's accreditation, and the school was ranked 25th on U.S. News and World Report's list of "America's Best Black Colleges."

To meet the demands of FVSU's growth, the City of Fort Valley has modernized its infrastructure through several rural development grants and wastewater reclamation projects. These fundamental improvements will attract new businesses to Southwest Georgia that are looking to take advantage of the talented individuals FVSU is producing each and every year.

Dr. Rivers has earned well-deserved praise for his efforts at FVSU. Georgia Trend magazine recognized him as one of the "100 Most Influential Georgians" and one of Georgia's "Top 25 Leaders" in its 25th Anniversary issue. While the transformation at FVSU is remarkable, I know Dr. Rivers will not rest until FVSU is ranked 1st.

As Thomas Jefferson once said, "Universities are based on the illimitable freedom of the human mind." I am confident that under the leadership of Dr. Larry Rivers, we will continue to expand the minds of our young men and women and educate the leaders of tomorrow.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

SPEECH OF

**HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 23, 2011*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chair, I submit the following table on H.R. 2219, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2012 (H.R. 2219)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I					
MILITARY PERSONNEL					
Military Personnel, Army.....	41,403,653	43,596,949	43,859,709	+2,456,056	+262,760
Military Personnel, Navy.....	25,912,449	27,154,384	27,141,334	+1,228,885	-13,050
Military Personnel, Marine Corps.....	13,210,161	13,573,546	13,480,436	+270,275	-93,110
Military Personnel, Air Force.....	27,105,755	28,304,432	28,264,646	+1,158,891	-39,786
Reserve Personnel, Army.....	4,333,165	4,386,077	4,333,507	+342	-52,570
Reserve Personnel, Navy.....	1,940,191	1,960,634	1,948,544	+8,353	-12,090
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps.....	612,191	653,212	645,422	+33,231	-7,790
Reserve Personnel, Air Force.....	1,650,797	1,729,823	1,711,653	+60,856	-18,170
National Guard Personnel, Army.....	7,511,296	7,623,335	7,607,345	+96,049	-15,990
National Guard Personnel, Air Force.....	3,060,098	3,114,149	3,099,629	+39,531	-14,520
<b>Total, title I, Military Personnel.....</b>	<b>126,739,756</b>	<b>132,096,541</b>	<b>132,092,225</b>	<b>+5,352,469</b>	<b>-4,316</b>
TITLE II					
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					
Operation and Maintenance, Army.....	33,306,117	34,735,216	34,581,321	+1,275,204	-153,895
Operation and Maintenance, Navy.....	37,809,239	39,364,688	39,385,685	+1,576,446	+20,997
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps.....	5,539,740	5,960,437	6,036,996	+497,256	+76,559
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force.....	36,062,989	36,195,133	36,065,107	+2,118	-130,026
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide.....	30,210,810	30,940,409	30,682,265	+471,455	-258,144
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve.....	2,840,427	3,109,176	3,047,033	+206,606	-62,143
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve.....	1,344,264	1,323,134	1,323,134	-21,130	---
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve.....	275,484	271,443	271,443	-4,041	---
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve.....	3,291,027	3,274,359	3,310,459	+19,432	+36,100
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard.....	6,454,624	7,041,432	6,979,232	+524,608	-62,200
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard.....	5,963,839	6,136,280	6,094,380	+130,541	-41,900
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Account.....	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.....	14,068	13,861	13,861	-207	---
Environmental Restoration, Army.....	464,581	346,031	346,031	-118,550	---
Environmental Restoration, Navy.....	304,867	308,668	308,668	+3,801	---
Environmental Restoration, Air Force.....	502,653	525,453	525,453	+22,800	---
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide.....	10,744	10,716	10,716	-28	---
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites.....	316,546	276,495	276,495	-40,051	---
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid.....	108,032	107,662	107,662	-370	---
Cooperative Threat Reduction Account.....	522,512	508,219	508,219	-14,293	---
Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund.....	217,561	305,501	105,501	-112,060	-200,000
<b>Total, title II, Operation and maintenance.....</b>	<b>165,560,124</b>	<b>170,759,313</b>	<b>169,979,661</b>	<b>+4,419,537</b>	<b>-779,652</b>
TITLE III					
PROCUREMENT					
Aircraft Procurement, Army.....	5,254,791	7,061,381	6,487,481	+1,232,690	-573,900
Missile Procurement, Army.....	1,570,108	1,478,718	1,464,223	-105,885	-14,495
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army.....	1,461,086	1,933,512	2,178,886	+717,800	+245,374
Procurement of Ammunition, Army.....	1,847,066	1,992,625	1,952,625	+105,559	-40,000
Other Procurement, Army.....	8,145,665	9,682,592	9,371,952	+1,226,287	-310,640
Aircraft Procurement, Navy.....	16,170,868	18,587,033	17,804,750	+1,633,882	-782,283
Weapons Procurement, Navy.....	3,221,957	3,408,478	2,975,749	-246,208	-432,729
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps.....	790,527	719,952	633,048	-157,479	-86,904
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy.....	15,366,658	14,928,921	14,725,493	-641,165	-203,428
Other Procurement, Navy.....	5,804,963	6,285,451	5,996,459	+191,496	-288,992
Procurement, Marine Corps.....	1,236,436	1,391,602	1,453,602	+217,166	+62,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force.....	13,483,739	14,082,527	13,987,613	+503,874	-94,914
Missile Procurement, Air Force.....	5,424,764	6,074,017	5,689,998	+265,234	-384,019
Advanced Extremely High Frequency Communications Satellites, Advanced appropriation FY 2013.....	---	803,417	---	---	-803,417
Advanced appropriation FY 2014.....	---	699,611	---	---	-699,611
Advanced appropriation FY 2015 through FY 2017.....	---	1,709,467	---	---	-1,709,467
<b>Total, Advanced appropriations</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>3,212,495</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>-3,212,495</b>

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2012 (H.R. 2219)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force.....	731,487	539,065	522,565	-208,922	-16,500
Other Procurement, Air Force.....	17,568,091	17,602,036	17,260,619	-307,472	-341,417
Procurement, Defense-Wide .....	4,009,321	5,365,248	5,046,447	+1,037,126	-318,801
Defense Production Act Purchases .....	34,346	19,964	29,964	-4,382	+10,000
<b>Total, title III, Procurement.....</b>	<b>102,121,873</b>	<b>114,365,617</b>	<b>107,581,474</b>	<b>+5,459,601</b>	<b>-6,784,143</b>
FY 2012.....	(102,121,873)	(111,153,122)	(107,581,474)	(+5,459,601)	(-3,571,648)
=====					
TITLE IV					
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION					
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army.....	9,710,998	9,683,980	9,381,166	-329,832	-302,814
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy.....	17,736,303	17,956,431	17,798,950	+62,647	-157,481
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force.....	26,517,405	27,737,701	26,313,196	-204,209	-1,424,505
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide .....	20,797,412	19,755,678	19,324,865	-1,472,547	-430,813
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense.....	194,910	191,292	191,292	-3,618	---
<b>Total, title IV, Research, Development, Test and   Evaluation.....</b>	<b>74,957,028</b>	<b>75,325,082</b>	<b>73,009,469</b>	<b>-1,947,559</b>	<b>-2,315,613</b>
=====					
TITLE V					
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS					
Defense Working Capital Funds.....	1,434,536	1,575,010	1,575,010	+140,474	---
National Defense Sealift Fund.....	1,474,866	1,126,384	1,100,519	-374,347	-25,865
<b>Total, title V, Revolving and Management Funds..</b>	<b>2,909,402</b>	<b>2,701,394</b>	<b>2,675,529</b>	<b>-233,873</b>	<b>-25,865</b>
=====					
TITLE VI					
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS					
Defense Health Program:					
Operation and maintenance.....	29,671,764	30,902,546	30,497,735	+825,971	-404,811
Procurement.....	534,921	632,518	632,518	+97,597	---
Research, development, test and evaluation.....	1,175,513	663,706	1,187,206	+11,693	+523,500
<b>Total, Defense Health Program 1/.....</b>	<b>31,382,198</b>	<b>32,198,770</b>	<b>32,317,459</b>	<b>+935,261</b>	<b>+118,689</b>
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense:					
Operation and maintenance.....	1,067,364	1,147,691	1,147,691	+80,327	---
Procurement.....	7,132	---	---	-7,132	---
Research, development, test and evaluation.....	392,811	406,731	406,731	+13,920	---
<b>Total, Chemical Agents 2/.....</b>	<b>1,467,307</b>	<b>1,554,422</b>	<b>1,554,422</b>	<b>+87,115</b>	<b>---</b>
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense					
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund 2/.....	1,156,957	1,156,282	1,208,147	+51,190	+51,865
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund.....	---	220,634	220,634	+220,634	---
Office of the Inspector General 1/.....	306,794	289,519	346,919	+40,125	+57,400
<b>Total, title VI, Other Department of Defense   Programs.....</b>	<b>34,313,256</b>	<b>35,519,627</b>	<b>35,647,581</b>	<b>+1,334,325</b>	<b>+127,954</b>
=====					

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2012 (H.R. 2219)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE VII					
RELATED AGENCIES					
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund.....	292,000	513,700	513,700	+221,700	---
Intelligence Community Management Account (ICMA).....	649,732	592,213	458,225	-191,507	-133,988
Total, title VII, Related agencies.....	941,732	1,105,913	971,925	+30,193	-133,988
TITLE VIII					
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Additional transfer authority (Sec. 8005).....	(4,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(4,000,000)	---	(-1,000,000)
Indian Financing Act incentives (Sec. 8020).....	15,000	---	15,000	---	+15,000
FFRDC (Sec. 8024).....	-125,000	---	-125,000	---	-125,000
Overseas Military Facility Invest Recovery (Sec. 8029)	1,000	1,000	1,000	---	---
Rescissions (Sec. 8040).....	-2,013,536	---	-1,080,105	+933,431	-1,080,105
O&M, Defense-wide transfer authority (Sec.8051).....	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	---	---
O&M, Def-wide to HUD transfer authority .....	---	(22,930)	---	---	(-22,930)
O&M, DW to Interior transfer authority.....	---	(10,070)	---	---	(-10,070)
Fisher House Foundation (Sec. 8069).....	4,000	---	4,000	---	+4,000
National grants (Sec. 8078).....	65,200	---	44,000	-21,200	+44,000
Shipbuilding reappropriation (Sec. 8082).....	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
Shipbuilding & conversion funds, Navy (Sec. 8083).....	10,000	8,000	8,000	-2,000	---
Working Capital Fund excess cash.....	-1,983,000	---	---	+1,983,000	---
Fisher House transfer authority (Sec. 8096).....	(11,000)	(11,000)	(11,000)	---	---
ICMA transfer authority (Sec. 8097).....	(24,000)	(20,000)	(22,000)	(-2,000)	(+2,000)
Business Transformation (transfer authority).....	(50,000)	---	---	(-50,000)	---
Tanker Replacement Transfer Fund .....	538,875	---	---	-538,875	---
Alternative Energy Resources for Deployed Forces (Sec. 8115).....	---	---	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide.....	300,000	---	---	-300,000	---
Energy Security Pilot Projects.....	20,000	---	---	-20,000	---
Revised economic assumptions (Sec. 8121).....	-1,477,000	---	-1,310,100	+166,900	-1,310,100
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (Sec. 8122)....	250,000	---	250,000	---	+250,000
Civilian pay freeze reduction.....	-723,000	---	---	+723,000	---
Total, Title VIII, General Provisions.....	-5,117,461	29,000	-2,183,205	+2,934,256	-2,212,205
TITLE IX					
OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS 3/					
Military Personnel					
Military Personnel, Army (GWOT).....	11,107,033	7,105,335	6,822,635	-4,284,398	-282,700
Military Personnel, Navy (GWOT).....	1,308,719	919,034	919,034	-389,685	---
Military Personnel, Marine Corps (GWOT).....	732,920	675,360	675,360	-57,560	---
Military Personnel, Air Force (GWOT).....	1,843,442	1,436,353	1,436,353	-407,089	---
Reserve Personnel, Army (GWOT).....	268,031	207,162	207,162	-60,869	---
Reserve Personnel, Navy (GWOT).....	48,912	44,530	44,530	-4,382	---
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps (GWOT).....	45,437	25,421	25,421	-20,016	---
Reserve Personnel, Air Force (GWOT).....	27,002	26,815	26,815	-187	---
National Guard Personnel, Army (GWOT).....	853,022	661,879	646,879	-206,143	-15,000
National Guard Personnel, Air Force (GWOT).....	16,860	9,435	9,435	-7,425	---
Total, Military Personnel.....	16,251,378	11,111,324	10,813,624	-5,437,754	-297,700
Operation and Maintenance					
Operation & Maintenance, Army (GWOT).....	59,162,782	44,302,280	39,175,755	-19,987,027	-5,126,525
Operation & Maintenance, Navy (GWOT).....	8,970,724	7,006,567	6,749,489	-2,221,235	-257,078
Coast Guard (by transfer) (OCO) 3/.....	---	(258,278)	---	---	(-258,278)
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps (GWOT).....	4,008,022	3,571,210	3,571,210	-436,812	---
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force (GWOT).....	12,969,643	10,719,187	10,739,587	-2,230,056	+20,400
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide (GWOT).....	9,276,990	9,269,411	9,312,876	+35,886	+43,465
Coalition support funds (GWOT).....	(1,600,000)	---	---	(-1,600,000)	---
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve (GWOT).....	206,784	217,500	217,500	+10,716	---
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve (GWOT).....	93,559	74,148	74,148	-19,411	---
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve (GWOT).....	29,685	36,084	36,084	+6,399	---

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2012 (H.R. 2219)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (GWOT).....	188,807	142,050	142,050	-46,757	---
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard (GWOT).....	497,849	387,544	387,544	-110,305	---
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard (GWOT).....	402,983	34,050	34,050	-368,933	---
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund (GWOT).....	---	---	5,000,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance.....	95,807,828	75,760,031	75,440,293	-20,367,535	-319,738
Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (GWOT).....	400,000	475,000	475,000	+75,000	---
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (GWOT).....	11,619,283	12,800,000	12,800,000	+1,180,717	---
Iraq Security Forces Fund (GWOT).....	1,500,000	---	---	-1,500,000	---
Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund (GWOT).....	800,000	---	1,100,000	+300,000	+1,100,000
Total, Operation and Maintenance.....	110,127,111	89,035,031	89,815,293	-20,311,818	+780,262
<hr/>					
Procurement					
Aircraft Procurement, Army (GWOT).....	2,720,138	423,400	387,900	-2,332,238	-35,500
Missile Procurement, Army (GWOT).....	343,828	126,556	118,412	-225,416	-8,144
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (GWOT).....	896,996	37,117	37,117	-859,879	---
Procurement of Ammunition, Army (GWOT).....	369,885	208,381	208,381	-161,504	---
Other Procurement, Army (GWOT).....	6,401,832	1,398,195	1,398,195	-5,003,637	---
Aircraft Procurement, Navy (GWOT).....	1,169,549	730,960	492,060	-677,489	-238,900
Weapons Procurement, Navy (GWOT).....	90,502	41,070	41,070	-49,432	---
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (GWOT).....	558,024	317,100	317,100	-240,924	---
Other Procurement, Navy (GWOT).....	316,835	281,975	249,514	-67,321	-32,461
Procurement, Marine Corps (GWOT).....	1,589,119	1,260,996	1,183,996	-405,123	-77,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (GWOT).....	1,991,955	527,865	440,265	-1,551,690	-87,600
Missile Procurement, Air Force (GWOT).....	56,621	28,420	46,920	-9,701	+18,500
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (GWOT).....	292,959	92,510	139,510	-153,449	+47,000
Other Procurement, Air Force (GWOT).....	2,868,593	3,204,641	3,213,010	+344,417	+8,369
Procurement, Defense-Wide (GWOT).....	1,262,499	469,968	406,668	-855,831	-63,300
National Guard and Reserve Equipment (GWOT).....	850,000	---	1,500,000	+650,000	+1,500,000
Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund (GWOT).....	3,415,000	3,195,170	3,195,170	-219,830	---
Total, Procurement.....	25,194,335	12,344,324	13,375,288	-11,819,047	+1,030,964
<hr/>					
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation					
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army (GWOT).....	143,234	8,513	8,513	-134,721	---
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy (GWOT).....	104,781	53,884	53,884	-50,897	---
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force (GWOT).....	484,382	142,000	182,000	-302,382	+40,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide (GWOT).....	222,616	192,361	192,361	-30,255	---
Total, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation.....	955,013	396,758	436,758	-518,255	+40,000
<hr/>					
Revolving and Management Funds					
Defense Working Capital Funds (GWOT).....	485,384	435,013	435,013	-50,371	---
Total, Revolving and Management Funds.....	485,384	435,013	435,013	-50,371	---
<hr/>					
Other Department of Defense Programs					
Defense Health Program:					
Operation and maintenance (GWOT).....	1,398,092	1,228,288	1,228,288	-169,804	---
Research, development, test & evaluation (GWOT).....	24,000	---	---	-24,000	---
Total, Defense Health Program 1/.....	1,422,092	1,228,288	1,228,288	-193,804	---

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2012 (H.R. 2219)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
-----					
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (GWOT).....	440,510	486,458	469,458	+28,948	-17,000
Joint IED Defeat Fund (GWOT).....	2,793,768	2,577,500	2,577,500	-216,268	---
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund (GWOT) 3/.....	---	100,000	---	---	-100,000
Office of the Inspector General (GWOT).....	10,529	11,055	11,055	+526	---
-----					
Total, Other Department of Defense Programs.....	4,666,899	4,403,301	4,286,301	-380,598	-117,000
-----					
TITLE IX General Provisions					
Additional transfer authority (GWOT) (Sec. 9002).....	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(-1,000,000)	(-1,000,000)
National Intelligence for Overseas Contingency Operations (transfer authority)(GWOT)(Sec.9xxx).....	(3,375)	---	---	(-3,375)	---
Rescissions (GWOT) (Sec.9017) 3/.....	---	---	-595,000	-595,000	-595,000
-----					
Total, General Provisions.....	---	---	-595,000	-595,000	-595,000
-----					
Total, Title IX .....	157,680,120	117,725,751	118,567,277	-39,112,843	+841,526
=====					
Total for the bill (net).....	660,105,830	649,628,238	638,341,936	-21,763,894	-11,286,302
Less appropriations for subsequent years....	---	-3,212,495	---	---	+3,212,495
-----					
Net grand total (including other appropriations)	660,105,830	646,415,743	638,341,936	-21,763,894	-8,073,807
=====					
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Lease of defense real property (permanent).....	8,884	22,000	22,000	+13,116	---
Disposal of defense real property (permanent).....	10,317	9,000	9,000	-1,317	---
O&M, Defense-wide transfer to HUD:					
Defense function.....	---	-22,930	---	---	+22,930
Non-defense function.....	---	22,930	---	---	-22,930
O&M, Defense-wide transfer to Interior Department:					
Defense function.....	---	-10,070	---	---	+10,070
Non-defense function.....	---	10,070	---	---	-10,070
Tricare accrual (permanent, indefinite auth.) 4/..	10,872,070	10,733,000	10,733,000	-139,070	---
(GWOT) 3/.....	143,000	117,000	117,000	-26,000	---
-----					
Total, scorekeeping adjustments.....	11,034,271	10,881,000	10,881,000	-153,271	---
=====					
Adjusted total (includ. scorekeeping adjustments)	671,140,101	657,296,743	649,222,936	-21,917,165	-8,073,807
Appropriations.....	(673,153,637)	(657,296,743)	(650,303,041)	(-22,850,596)	(-6,993,702)
Rescissions.....	(-2,013,536)	---	(-1,080,105)	(+933,431)	(-1,080,105)
-----					
Total (including scorekeeping adjustments).....	671,140,101	657,296,743	649,222,936	-21,917,165	-8,073,807
Amount in this bill.....	(660,105,830)	(646,415,743)	(638,341,936)	(-21,763,894)	(-8,073,807)
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	(11,034,271)	(10,881,000)	(10,881,000)	(-153,271)	---
=====					
Total mandatory and discretionary.....	671,140,101	657,296,743	649,222,936	-21,917,165	-8,073,807
Mandatory.....	(292,000)	(513,700)	(513,700)	(+221,700)	---
Discretionary.....	(670,848,101)	(656,783,043)	(648,709,236)	(-22,138,865)	(-8,073,807)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2012 (H.R. 2219)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
RECAPITULATION					
Title I - Military Personnel.....	126,739,756	132,096,541	132,092,225	+5,352,469	-4,316
Title II - Operation and Maintenance.....	165,560,124	170,759,313	169,979,661	+4,419,537	-779,652
Title III - Procurement.....	102,121,873	114,365,617	107,581,474	+5,459,601	-6,784,143
Title IV - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation.....	74,957,028	75,325,082	73,009,469	-1,947,559	-2,315,613
Title V - Revolving and Management Funds.....	2,909,402	2,701,394	2,675,529	-233,873	-25,865
Title VI - Other Department of Defense Programs.....	34,313,256	35,519,627	35,647,581	+1,334,325	+127,954
Title VII - Related Agencies.....	941,732	1,105,913	971,925	+30,193	-133,988
Title VIII - General Provisions (net).....	-5,117,461	29,000	-2,183,205	+2,934,256	-2,212,205
Title IX - Overseas Contingency Operations (GWOT).....	157,680,120	117,725,751	118,567,277	-39,112,843	+841,526
Total, Department of Defense.....	660,105,830	649,628,238	638,341,936	-21,763,894	-11,286,302
Total funding available (net).....	660,105,830	649,628,238	638,341,936	-21,763,894	-11,286,302
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	11,034,271	10,881,000	10,881,000	-153,271	---
Less appropriations for subsequent years.....	---	-3,212,495	---	---	+3,212,495
Total mandatory and discretionary.....	671,140,101	657,296,743	649,222,936	-21,917,165	-8,073,807

FOOTNOTES:

- 1/ Included in Budget under Operation and Maintenance
- 2/ Included in Budget under Procurement
- 3/ Global War on Terrorism and other activities (GWOT) pursuant to FY 2012 budget resolution (H.Con.Res. 34). The President proposes overseas contingency operations
- 4/ Contributions to Department of Defense Retiree Health Care Fund (Sec. 725, P.L. 108-375)(CBO est)



AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2219, OFFERED BY CONGRESSMAN POSEY (FL-15)

**HON. SANDY ADAMS**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mrs. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment and commend my friend Congressman POSEY for his work on this jobs initiative.

Florida is home to Kennedy Space Center, the heart of NASA's space shuttle program. With tens of thousands of highly-skilled men and women currently working on the Space Coast in support of NASA's human space flight program, their jobs are threatened by the Administration's decision to end the shuttle program and cancel Constellation without a viable plan for the future of space exploration. These jobs will be lost, possibly forever, and in the midst of a housing and economic recession not seen in Florida in decades. Mr. Speaker, the truth is that the Space Coast cannot afford to lose these jobs.

That is why I am proud to stand with Mr. POSEY in support of this much needed amendment. Make no mistake, this is a jobs amendment—one that will help support families and small businesses throughout Central Florida. Specifically this amendment commits the Department of Defense to use the National Shuttle Logistics Depot to the greatest extent practicable and to assist in the preservation of our highly skilled aerospace and engineering workforce. By utilizing already existing infrastructure and a trained workforce, the government can leverage this unique skill set to advance our nation's space and defense missions at minimal cost to the American taxpayer.

The aerospace workers across the country have already been hit by an economy struggling under the tax and spend policies of the President and now, without a solid plan from NASA on what is next for the space program, the industry base will simply disappear. This is an easy way for the federal government to utilize the resources we already have to help create aerospace jobs throughout the country, without throwing away decades of technology

and laying off tens of thousands of highly skilled workers.

Mr. Speaker, when governments like China are gearing up for the next big explosion in space industry and technologies, preserving this workforce is not just about ensuring people have jobs—it is about the national security interests of our nation.

If we lose this national asset, I fear we will forever be remembered as the country that gave up the last frontier. One that looked to the stars and told the world we weren't interested.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this jobs amendment to help save a workforce we desperately need.

INTRODUCING AMENDMENT TO  
THE DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS  
BILL

**HON. BILL POSEY**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 6, 2011*

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce an amendment to the Defense Appropriations bill that directs the Secretary of Defense to utilize to the fullest extent practicable the incredible resource that exists at the NASA Shuttle Logistics Depot, NSLD, in Central Florida.

The Department of Defense would be well served to make greater use of the facility's unique manufacturing capabilities and highly-skilled workforce for Department of Defense supply chain and repair needs. The loss of this facility and its workforce would not only be a blow to our nation's space program but represent a missed opportunity to serve U.S. national security interests.

The unique combination of technologically-advanced equipment used in the 300,000 sq. ft. NSLD facility for aerospace manufacturing, repair, and overhaul combined with the critical workforce is extremely capable of providing warfighter support for our military. Although the NSLD's operator, the United Space Alliance, USA, has procured a recent DLA contract, the work is not enough to maintain the NSLD.

This irreplaceable workforce will go elsewhere once the Shuttle Program comes to an end. The skills the NSLD facility and personnel offer are a direct match to those the DoD needs to reduce the risk of vanishing vendors and diminishing manufacturing sources in its supply chain. USA's performance-based logistics operations have maintained on-time delivery greater than 98 percent, and a customer acceptance rate of 99.99 percent.

USA has managed NASA assets of 250,000 unique part numbers valued at \$1.5 billion per year. During the Shuttle Program, over 80 OEM hardware repair or manufacturing tasks—260 Orbiter Line Replaceable Units comprised of over 7,000 line items—were transitioned to and certified by USA at the NSLD. By Shuttle Program end, more than 80 percent of all completed Orbiter Line Replaceable Unit repairs were done at NSLD by USA resources.

This Amendment is directly tied to jobs. The final flight of the Space Shuttle Orbiter, scheduled for Friday, sets the stage for a mass exodus of highly skilled labor and specialized resources from Florida's Space Coast. This void will further strain our economy and dilute the workforce and capabilities needed to sustain the technologies required to achieve the diversification of Florida's economy.

Aside from being a great asset to the Department of Defense, greater utilization of this important asset will keep the facility functioning as we look to NASA's next mission. This workforce would have been sustained as NASA transitioned to the Constellation Program, that is before it was vitiated. The retirement of the Shuttle Program presents an excellent opportunity for the Department of Defense, the Defense Logistics Agency specifically, to take advantage of the highly skilled workforce as they process and refurbish equipment returning from theater in Iraq and Afghanistan. This is an opportunity which can preserve a national asset, preserve jobs, and assist the Department of Defense in cycling through the equipment returning from combat.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I am submitting this amendment to encourage DoD to make better use of this rich resource so that it does not winnow away.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, July 7, 2011 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 12

- 10 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To hold hearings to examine enhanced investor protection after the financial crisis. SD-538
- Energy and Natural Resources  
To hold hearings to examine S. 1160, to improve the administration of the Department of Energy, S. 1108, to provide local communities with tools to make solar permitting more efficient, and S. 1142, to promote the mapping and development of the United States geothermal resources by establishing a direct loan program for high risk geothermal exploration wells, to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to improve geothermal energy technology and demonstrate the use of geothermal energy in large scale thermal applications. SD-366
- Environment and Public Works  
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Environmental Protection Agency's implementation of the Safe Drinking Water Act's Unregulated Drinking Water Contaminants Program. SD-406
- 10:15 a.m.  
Joint Economic Committee  
To hold hearings to examine manufacturing in the United States of America, focusing on training America's workforce. SH-216
- 2:30 p.m.  
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs  
Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security Subcommittee  
To hold hearings to examine if new technology and private sector business

- practices can cut waste and fraud in Medicare and Medicaid. SD-342
- Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions  
To hold hearings to examine pensions, focusing on building a strong middle class and strong economy. SD-430
- Intelligence  
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters. SH-219

JULY 13

- 10 a.m.  
Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
To hold hearings to examine unauthorized charges on telephone bills, focusing on why crammers win and consumers lose. SR-253
- Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions  
Business meeting to consider S. 958, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program of payments to children's hospitals that operate graduate medical education programs, S. 1094, to reauthorize the Combating Autism Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-416), an original bill entitled, "Workforce Investment Act Reauthorization of 2011", and any pending nominations. SD-419
- Room to be announced  
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs  
To hold hearings to examine ten years after 9/11, focusing on preventing terrorist travel. SR-253
- Judiciary  
To hold hearings to examine the "Violence Against Women Act", focusing on building on seventeen years of accomplishments. SD-628
- 2:30 p.m.  
Judiciary  
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of 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
- Armed Services  
SeaPower Subcommittee  
To hold hearings to examine the required force level of strategic airlift aircraft mandated by title 10, United States Code, and the administration's request to eliminate that requirement in review of the Defense Authorization Request and the Future Years Defense Program. SR-232A
- 3 p.m.  
Foreign Relations  
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Paul D. Wohlars, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Macedonia, William H. Moser, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to

the Republic of Moldova, John A. Heffern, of Missouri, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Armenia, Thomas M. Countryman, of Washington, to be Assistant Secretary for International Security and Non-Proliferation, Jeffrey DeLaurentis, of New York, to be Alternate Representative for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador, and to be an Alternate Representative to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during his tenure of service as Alternate Representative for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, all of the Department of State.

JULY 14

- 10 a.m.  
Energy and Natural Resources  
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business. SD-366
- Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions  
To hold hearings to examine learning from what works for employment for persons with disabilities. SD-430
- Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Science and Space Subcommittee  
To hold hearings to examine the National Nanotechnology Investment, focusing on manufacturing, commercialization, and job creation. SR-253
- 2:15 p.m.  
Indian Affairs  
To hold an oversight hearing to examine native women. SD-628
- 2:30 p.m.  
Intelligence  
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters. SH-219

JULY 21

- 2:15 p.m.  
Indian Affairs  
To hold an oversight hearing to examine floods and fires, focusing on emergency preparedness for natural disasters in the native communities. SD-628

JULY 27

- 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

JULY 28

- 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

# Daily Digest

## Senate

### Chamber Action

*Routine Proceedings, pages S4333–S4401*

**Measures Introduced:** Eight bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1328–1335. **Page S4394**

**Measures Considered:**

*Sense of the Senate Regarding the Budget Deficit—Agreement:* Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1323, to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit. **Pages S4335–82**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, July 7, 2011; with the time until 10 a.m. equally divided and controlled between the two Leaders, or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each; and that at 10 a.m., Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S4401**

**Finance Committee—Agreement:** A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that if the

Committee on Finance meets on Thursday, July 7, 2011 at 9 a.m., it be authorized to meet during tomorrow's session of the Senate. **Page S4382**

**Measures Placed on the Calendar:**

**Pages S4333, S4392**

**Executive Communications:**

**Pages S4392–94**

**Additional Cosponsors:**

**Pages S4394–95**

**Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:**

**Pages S4395–S4401**

**Additional Statements:**

**Pages S4388–92**

**Adjournment:** Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:24 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, July 7, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4401.)

### Committee Meetings

*(Committees not listed did not meet)*

No committee meetings were held.

---

## House of Representatives

### Chamber Action

**Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced:** 27 public bills, H.R. 2406–2432; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 338 was introduced. **Pages H4670–71**

**Additional Cosponsors:**

**Pages H4672–74**

**Report Filed:** A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 337, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 112–135). **Page H4670**

**Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2012:** The House resumed consideration of H.R.

2219, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012. Consideration of the measure began on June 23rd. **Pages H4594–H4625, H4638–69**

Agreed to:

Jackson Lee (TX) amendment (No. 69 printed in the Congressional Record of July 5, 2011) that increases funding, by offset, for the Defense Health Program by \$500,000; **Pages H4598–H4600**

Stearns amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the Defense Health Program by \$16 million; **Pages H4607–09**

Sessions amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the Defense Health Program by \$10 million; **Pages H4609–12**

Carter amendment (No. 31 printed in the Congressional Record of June 23, 2011) that strikes section 8127 relating to military musical units;

**Pages H4624–25**

Kucinich amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the Defense Health Program by \$3,600,000 (by a recorded vote of 253 ayes to 167 noes, Roll No. 498);

**Page H4598**

Amash amendment (No. 62 printed in the Congressional Record of July 5, 2011) that strikes section 8015 (by a recorded vote of 212 ayes to 208 noes, Roll No. 500);

**Pages H4612–14, H4641–42**

Sessions amendment that strikes section 8101 (by a recorded vote of 217 ayes to 204 noes, Roll No. 501); and

**Pages H4620–24, H4642–43**

Holt amendment (No. 44 printed in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2011) that increases funding, by offset, for the Defense Health Program by \$35 million.

**Pages H4660–61**

Rejected:

Broun (GA) amendment (No. 24 printed in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2011) that sought to reduce funding for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army by \$25,798,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account;

**Pages H4603–04**

Broun (GA) amendment (No. 25 printed in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2011) that sought to reduce funding for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army by \$22,796,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account;

**Page H4604**

Broun (GA) amendment (No. 26 printed in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2011) that sought to reduce funding for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy by \$21,714,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account;

**Pages H4604–05**

Connolly amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide by \$10 million (by a recorded vote of 175 ayes to 241 noes, Roll No. 495);

**Pages H4595–96, H4638–39**

Broun (GA) amendment (No. 23 printed in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2011) that sought to reduce funding for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide by \$216,556,400 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 87 ayes to 328 noes, Roll No. 496);

**Pages H4596–97, H4639**

Connolly amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide by \$15 million (by a recorded vote of 152 ayes to 266 noes, Roll No. 497);

**Pages H4597–98, H4639–40**

Broun (GA) amendment (No. 21 printed in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2011) that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide by \$9,140,000 (agreed by unanimous consent to withdraw an earlier request for a recorded vote);

**Page H4605**

Broun (GA) amendment (No. 22 printed in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2011) that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide by \$4,424,000 (agreed by unanimous consent to withdraw an earlier request for a recorded vote);

**Pages H4606–07**

Welch amendment that sought to reduce funding for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force by \$297,023,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 98 ayes to 322 noes, Roll No. 499); and

**Pages H4605–06, H4641**

McCollum amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being provided to the Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan or used to carry out section 9012.

**Pages H4667–68**

Withdrawn:

Jackson Lee (TX) amendment (No. 67 printed in the Congressional Record of July 5, 2011) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have increased funding, by offset, for the Defense Health Program by \$500,000 and

**Pages H4600–03**

Holt amendment (No. 43 printed in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2011) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited funds from being used to close the defense commissary store at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey.

**Pages H4668–69**

Point of Order sustained against:

Sutton amendment that sought to indicate in the report from the Department of Defense to Congress whether such items or parts of purchases from foreign entities are available for purchasing in the United States;

**Pages H4614–20**

Boswell amendment that sought to include sense of Congress language stating that suicide prevention programs should be a priority of the military departments with respect to reinvesting efficiency savings;

**Page H4648**

Welch amendment that sought to reduce funding for Operation and Maintenance, Army by \$200 million and apply the savings to the spending reduction account;

**Pages H4652–53**

Clarke (MI) amendment (No. 39 printed in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2011) that sought to require the Secretary of Defense to transfer \$236

million to the Secretary of Transportation for the National Infrastructure Investments program; and

**Pages H4658–59**

Clarke (MI) amendment (No. 37 printed in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2011) that sought to require the Secretary of Defense to transfer \$2 billion to the Secretary of Homeland Security for the State Homeland Security Grant Program.

**Pages H4661–62**

**Proceedings Postponed:**

Lee amendment that seeks to reduce funding for title IX, Overseas Contingency Operations, by \$33,000,124,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account;

**Pages H4648–51**

Garamendi amendment that seeks to reduce funding for title IX, Overseas Contingency Operations, by \$20,887,651,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account;

**Pages H4651–52**

Nadler amendment that seeks to redirect \$15 million with respect to Operation and Maintenance, Army;

**Page H4653**

Poe amendment that seeks to reduce funding for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide by \$1 billion and apply the savings to the spending reduction account;

**Pages H4653–55**

Lee amendment that seeks to eliminate the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund and apply the savings to the spending reduction account;

**Pages H4655–56**

Cohen amendment (No. 41 printed in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund by \$200 million and apply the savings to the spending reduction account;

**Pages H4656–57**

Cicilline amendment that seeks to eliminate the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund and apply the savings to the spending reduction account;

**Pages H4657–58**

Cohen amendment that seeks to reduce funding for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund by \$4 billion and apply the savings to the spending reduction account;

**Pages H4659–60**

Poe amendment that seeks to reduce funding for the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund by \$1 billion and apply the savings to the spending reduction account;

**Pages H4662–66**

McCullum amendment that seeks to reduce by \$124,800,000 the total amount of appropriations made available by this Act; and

**Page H4666**

McCullum amendment that seeks to limit funds to pay motorsport drivers, racing teams, or racing cars or otherwise conduct recruiting outreach through motor sports to \$20 million.

**Pages H4666–67**

H. Res. 320, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to on June 23rd.

**Suspension:** The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

*Belarus Democracy Reauthorization Act of 2011:* H.R. 515, amended, to reauthorize the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004.

**Pages H4632–38**

**Suspension—Proceedings Postponed:** The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed:

*Reaffirming the United States' commitment to a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict:* H. Res. 268, to reaffirm the United States' commitment to a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations.

**Pages H4625–32**

**Discharge Petition:** Representative Critz presented to the clerk a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from the consideration of H. Res. 310, providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 639) to amend title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 to clarify that countervailing duties may be imposed to address subsidies relating to a fundamentally undervalued currency of any foreign country (Discharge Petition No. 1).

**Senate Message:** Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H4594.

**Amendments:** Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages H4674–76.

**Quorum Calls—Votes:** Seven recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4638, H4639, H4639–40, H4640–41, H4641, H4641–42, H4642–43. There were no quorum calls.

**Adjournment:** The House met at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 10:53 p.m.

## Committee Meetings

### FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SPECTRUM USE

*Committee on Energy and Commerce:* Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled “Federal Government Spectrum Use.” Testimony was heard from Lawrence E. Strickling, Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information and Administrator, National Telecommunication and Information Administration.

### MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2012, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

*Committee on Rules:* Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 2354, making appropriations for energy and

water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes. The Committee granted, by voice vote, an open rule providing one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI. Under the Rules of the House the bill shall be read for amendment by paragraph. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the Congressional Record. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Rep. Frelinghuysen; and Rep. Visclosky.

### SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION'S \$500 MILLION FLEECING OF AMERICA

*Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:* Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, hearing entitled "The Securities and Exchange Commission's \$500 Million Fleecing of America: Part Two." Testimony was heard from Mary L. Schapiro, Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission; and H. David Kotz, Inspector General, Securities and Exchange Commission.

## Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 7, 2011

*(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)*

#### Senate

*Committee on Finance:* business meeting to consider proposed legislation implementing the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement, the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement, the United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement, and the associated proposed Statements of Administrative Action, 9 a.m., SD-215.

#### House

*Committee on Agriculture,* Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry, hearing on Agricultural Program Audit: Examination of Conservation Programs, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Nutrition and Horticulture, hearing on Agricultural Program Audit: Examination of Specialty Crop Programs, 2 p.m., 1300 Longworth.

*Committee on Appropriations,* Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies, markup of the FY

2012 Interior and Environment Appropriations Bill, 9 a.m., B308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, markup of the FY 2012 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Bill, 10:15 a.m., H-140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, markup of the FY 2012 Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, 11:30 a.m., H-140 Capitol.

*Committee on the Budget,* Full Committee, hearing entitled "Budgeting for America's National Security," 10 a.m., 210 Cannon. Prior to the hearing the committee will meet to mark up the Committee Activity Report.

*Committee on Education and the Workforce,* Full Committee, hearing entitled "Rushing Union Elections: Protecting the Interests of Big Labor at the Expense of Workers' Free Choice." 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

*Committee on Energy and Commerce,* Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled "PDUFA V: Medical Innovation, Jobs, and Patients." 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled "The Views of the Independent Agencies on Regulatory Reform." 10:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

*Committee on Financial Services,* Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, joint hearing entitled "Mortgage Servicing: An Examination of the Role of Federal Regulators in Settlement Negotiations and the Future of Mortgage Servicing Standards." 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

*Committee on Foreign Affairs,* Full Committee, hearing on Time To Pause the Reset? Defending U.S. Interests in the Face of Russian Aggression, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights and the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, joint hearing on Assessing the Consequences of the Failed State of Somalia, 12:30 p.m., 2112 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Massacre at Camp Ashraf: Implications for U.S. Policy, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

*Committee on Homeland Security,* Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Management, hearing entitled "Homeland Security Investigations: Examining DHS's Efforts To Protect American Jobs and Secure the Homeland." 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence, hearing entitled "Hezbollah in Latin America—Implications for U.S. Homeland Security." 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

*Committee on the Judiciary,* Full Committee, markup of the following: H.R. 966, the "Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2011"; H.R. 1439, the "Business Activity Tax Simplification Act of 2011"; H.R. 527, the "Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act of 2011"; and H.R. 1932, the "Keep Our Communities Safe Act of 2011." 10:15 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

*Committee on Oversight and Government Reform,* Full Committee, hearing entitled "Cybersecurity: Assessing the Nation's Ability To Address the Growing Cyber Threat." 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

*Committee on Rules,* Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 1309, the "Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011." 3 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

*Committee on Science, Space, and Technology*, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing entitled “Hitting the Ethanol Blend Wall: Examining the Science on E15.” 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

*Committee on Small Business*, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy and Trade, hearing entitled “Regulatory Injury: How USDA’s Proposed GIPSA Rule Hurts America’s Small Businesses.” 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

*Committee on Veterans’ Affairs*, Subcommittee on Economic Recovery, hearing on the following: H.R. 1911, the “Protecting Veterans’ Homes Act;” H.R. 240, to amend title 38, United States Code, to promote jobs for veterans through the use of sole source contracts by Department of Veterans Affairs for purposes of meeting the contracting goals and preferences of the Department of Veterans Affairs for small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans; H.R. 1263, to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide surviving spouses with certain protections relating to mortgages and mortgage foreclosures; H.R. 120, the “Disabled Veterans’ Surviving Spouses Home Loans Act;” H.R. 2274, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress annual reports on the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program, and for other purposes; H.R. 2301, the “Streamlining Education Claims Processing Act of 2011;” H.R. 2302, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to notify Congress of conferences sponsored by the Department of Veterans Affairs; H.R. 2345, to amend title 38, United

States Code, to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay a monthly assistance allowance to disabled veterans training or competing for the Paralympic Team and the authorization of appropriations for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide assistance to United States Paralympics, Inc.; and H.R. 2329, the “Ensuring a Response for Servicemembers Act.” 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, hearing on the following: H.R. 923, the “Veterans Pensions Protection Act of 2011;” H.R. 1025, to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law; H.R. 1826, to amend title 38, United States Code, to reinstate criminal penalties for persons charging veterans unauthorized fees; H.R. 1898, the “Veterans 2nd Amendment Protection Act;” and H.R. 2349, the “Veterans’ Benefits Training Improvement Act of 2011.” 1:30 p.m., 334 Cannon.

*Committee on Ways and Means*, Full Committee, hearing on legislation regarding the following: the “United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act”, the “United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act”, and the “United States-South Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act.” 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

*House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence*, Full Committee, hearing on Afghanistan/Pakistan Update, 10 a.m., HVC-304. This is a closed hearing.

## Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, July 7

## Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, July 7

## Senate Chamber

**Program for Thursday:** Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1323, Sense of the Senate Regarding the Budget Deficit, with a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, at 10 a.m.

## House Chamber

**Program for Thursday:** Resume consideration of H.R. 2219—Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2012.

## Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

## HOUSE

Adams, Sandy, Fla., E1248  
 Andrews, Robert E., N.J., E1237  
 Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1241  
 Bishop, Timothy H., N.Y., E1239  
 Brown, Corrine, Fla., E1234  
 Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E1237  
 Burton, Dan, Ind., E1236  
 Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E1228  
 Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1227, E1237  
 Costa, Jim, Calif., E1230  
 Courtney, Joe, Conn., E1232  
 Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E1233  
 Donnelly, Joe, Ind., E1227

Farr, Sam, Calif., E1239  
 Gallegly, Elton, Calif., E1239  
 Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1240  
 Johnson, Henry C. "Hank", Jr., Ga., E1228, E1239  
 Kind, Ron, Wisc., E1235  
 Kissell, Larry, N.C., E1229  
 Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E1229, E1230, E1230, E1231, E1232, E1232, E1233, E1234, E1235  
 Lamborn, Doug, Colo., E1235  
 Lee, Barbara, Calif., E1231  
 Levin, Sander M., Mich., E1230  
 Long, Billy, Mo., E1238  
 Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E1228, E1233, E1237, E1239  
 Lungren, Daniel E., Calif., E1236  
 McCollum, Betty, Minn., E1233

Miller, Jeff, Fla., E1236, E1237  
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E1237  
 Peters, Gary C., Mich., E1229  
 Platts, Todd Russell, Pa., E1232  
 Posey, Bill, Fla., E1248  
 Rokita, Todd, Ind., E1231  
 Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E1238  
 Smith, Adam, Wash., E1240  
 Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E1234  
 Stivers, Steve, Ohio, E1240  
 Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E1235  
 Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E1227, E1228  
 Wolf, Frank R., Va., E1233  
 Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E1240  
 Young, C.W. Bill, Fla., E1241



# 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.fdsys.gov](http://www.fdsys.gov), free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, [contactcenter@gpo.gov](mailto: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](http://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.