



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JULY 22, 2011

No. 111

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

As this House comes together at the end of a long week, bless the work of its Members. Give them strength, fortitude, and patience. Fill their hearts with charity, their minds with understanding, and their wills with courage to do the right thing for all of America.

The work that they have is difficult work. May they rise together to accomplish what is best for our great Nation and, indeed, for all the world, for You have blessed us with many graces and have given us the responsibility of being a light shining on a hill.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

GENERAL AVIATION

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, President Obama has systematically and recklessly attacked the general aviation industry. It's one of America's last remaining great manufacturing industries, employing over 1.2 million people and contributing \$150 billion in economic activity each year. He has demonized its users and drawn a line in the sand for higher taxes.

And whom is President Obama hurting? Bill Gates? Warren Buffett? No. He's hurting line workers in Wichita, Kansas, and all over the country. He's hurting small business owners trying to get from Topeka to Des Moines to close a business deal.

These attacks on our industry are only a diversion, a distraction from the failed economic policies of this administration. His policies have left us with a \$1.6 trillion deficit this year alone and a loss of over 2 million jobs during his time in office.

Mr. Speaker, the aviation industry is not asking for a bailout like he gave the auto guys. Just leave us alone. Get out of the way. We have a community that just wants to create jobs and grow our economy. That may not be your agenda, Mr. President, but it is certainly mine.

THE CHAINED CPI

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

Mr. KUCINICH. The latest attack on elderly beneficiaries of Social Security

is a scheme by which seniors' cost of living benefits would be cut through something called a "chained" consumer price index—the CPI—chained involves a formula which recalculates the cost of living.

The theory behind the chained CPI is that as the cost of living goes up, consumers—in this case, seniors—buy cheaper products. For example, if poor seniors cannot afford to buy and eat steak but can only afford to buy and eat cheaper cat food, their cost of living benefit would be chained to the cost of the cat food because it's cheaper than steak; and as a result, seniors will see their cost of living benefit reduced to the cheaper product and get a smaller Social Security check.

The chained CPI sets up seniors for a reduced standard of living. If you must afford less, you get less Social Security benefits.

The chained CPI, chaining seniors to poverty. It's time to break those chains.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF MASTER SERGEANT KENNETH B. ELWELL

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, today I have the high honor and solemn task of rising to commemorate the life and service of Master Sergeant Kenneth Elwell, who was killed in action in Afghanistan this past Sunday.

Sergeant Elwell, who enlisted in the Army shortly after his graduation from Council Rock North High School, was killed along with a fellow infantryman by an IED during a routine foot patrol in Kandahar on the morning of July 17. He leaves behind a wife Kristen and two children, Elise and Nicholas of Fort Wainwright, Alaska; his mother Janice of Holland, Bucks County, Pennsylvania; and countless other family and friends whose lives he touched.

□ 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.

H5377

While those close to Sergeant Elwell have lost a husband, father, son, brother, and friend, America too has lost a hero. He served our Nation because he loved our Nation. His sister summed up his services perfectly when she said, "He did what he loved, so we could do the simple, everyday things that we take for granted." And although the grief of the family must be overwhelming, I hope that they're able to take a measure of solace in the gratitude of the Nation that Kenneth died defending.

Tonight his community will honor and remember him, but it is the duty of all of us here in Congress and across our grateful Nation to never forget his ultimate sacrifice and the family that he leaves behind.

COMMEMORATING LIBERIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor and recognize the rich history of Liberia as we mark Liberian Independence Day on July 26. We honor people of Liberia and those individuals of proud Liberian descent who are celebrating 164 years of independence.

Today we celebrate a great country, its people, their traditions, and the mark they have made on cities like Providence, Rhode Island, and others, making them great places to live, work, and raise families. Rhode Island's flourishing Liberian community has played an important role in making the State what it is today, and I would like to thank them for their great contributions. I am proud to honor your heritage and the difference you have made in our State and in this country.

Recently, along with my colleagues here in the Congress, I had the opportunity to welcome the President of the Republic of Liberia, Her Excellency Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, to Washington and confirmed our support for Liberian peace efforts. May we continue to be inspired to support the people of Liberia through their democratic tradition as we celebrate Liberian Independence Day.

IT'S TIME TO GET SERIOUS ABOUT THE DEFICIT

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, last night I had a town hall. Obviously I wasn't there; I had to be here. So we did it by way of Internet. And it was amazing how the consensus of those who were there was a request for those of us to take seriously our leadership responsibilities and do something about the fiscal mess we are in.

In answering them, I was thinking about what the President's bipartisan

deficit commission leaders said about the plan we passed here in the House. They called it a serious, honest, straightforward approach to addressing our Nation's enormous fiscal challenges. It sounds like that's the answer to the questions that were being asked last night by our constituents.

Interestingly enough, there is a poll out, rendering an opinion by the American people on the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill that we passed here in the House. Over 60 percent of the American people happen to think it's a good idea. Perhaps we ought to stop the name calling and look at what the American people are telling us to do and get serious, as the President's bipartisan deficit commission said, and come up with a serious, honest, straightforward approach to addressing our Nation's enormous fiscal challenge.

REPRESENTING MY CONSTITUENTS

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I am told on a daily basis by my Republican colleagues what the American people want. I certainly respect the election certificates of my colleagues. I would ask they respect mine. I also am not sure where they find the time to travel to these other districts to hear what is being said. My colleagues and my constituents are telling me we were sent here to make democracy work, to come up with a balanced approach, and take this country's fiscal responsibilities seriously.

The poll the gentleman just mentioned, in the CBS poll that came out yesterday, two-thirds of the American public want a balanced approach. That means a combination of cuts to revenues to balance our fiscal crisis. With that being said, we have a large number of Members who take pledges, pledges to not raise taxes, pledges to not ask oil companies to pay one penny more. The only pledge a Member of this House should ever make is when they raise their hand to serve the Constitution and this country.

I'm also told many times in this House what the intent of our Founding Fathers was. Now, while that's open for debate, there is one thing I'm certainly positive about: When our Founders gathered together, they created a government, not a Wall Street bank.

□ 0910

AN EQUITABLE SOLUTION

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. In December the President caved to the Republicans and extended all the Bush tax cuts, immediately increasing this year's deficit by \$400 billion and the 10-year deficit by \$4

trillion, precipitating the great debt and deficit crisis.

Now we're hearing from the press today that the President is preparing yet another great cave. Instead of saying we will have some revenues to solve this problem, he is apparently about to cut a deal that will be all cuts.

So it's ironic. He cuts taxes to create a crisis, and then we cut spending to protect the tax cuts because tax cuts create jobs, except they haven't created jobs, but we've got to continue to protect them. It's all very, very sad.

If we get rid of all the Bush tax cuts—\$4 trillion—no cuts in Social Security, no cuts in Medicare, no cuts in veterans benefits, and \$4 trillion less in deficits, now, that would be an equitable solution.

TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHY

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, in the 5 years leading up to the economic collapse in 2008, 67 percent of the new wealth that was created in this Nation accumulated in the hands of the richest 1 percent. They now control about two-fifths of all the money in this Nation. But our Republican friends block them out of their line of sight when they look to see who can pay for our mounting deficit. They see only Social Security recipients and Medicare recipients, the disabled and the hungry.

It was bad enough that we were crazy enough as a Nation to fight two trillion-dollar wars while cutting taxes for the wealthy at the same time. Now Republicans are asking only the most vulnerable to help pay for it and threatening to collapse the world's economy by defaulting on American debt at the same time.

I won't stand for it, Madam Speaker, and my constituents won't either. Social Security and Medicare recipients didn't get us into two mismanaged wars. They didn't get the benefit of the Bush tax cuts, and they shouldn't have to pay for it.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 2551, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 359 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. 2551.

□ 0913

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. 2551) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BIGGERT (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, July 21, 2011, amendment No. 11 printed in the House Report 112-173 offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 21, 2011, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 112-173.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 211. There is appropriated, for salaries and expenses of the Office of Technology Assessment as authorized by the Technology Assessment Act of 1972 (2 U.S.C. 471 et seq.), hereby derived from the amount provided in this Act for the payment to the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund \$2,500,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 359, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chair, for 23 years, Congress had the benefit of a really excellent organization, the Office of Technology Assessment. The OTA helped Congress look at the policy implications of new technologies. Then 16 years ago, OTA was defunded. When Congress turned out the lights, they argued that other organizations would provide what OTA did—think tanks, academies, universities.

We now have 16 years of evidence that we have not gotten from these other sources what we got from OTA. We need OTA now more than ever, and my amendment would shift a mere \$2.5 million into OTA to breathe life back into this important agency that had a great record of improving congressional decisionmaking, preventing tax dollar waste, and generally improving the debate on many policy issues.

OTA is still on the books; it was simply defunded and, with this amendment, can be funded again. The money comes from a well-funded, little used trust fund for Capitol building revitalization.

The OTA produced thorough, balanced nonpartisan studies on a huge variety of policy-relevant subjects. Listen to some of the reports, all produced by OTA in the years before it was defunded 16 years ago:

Adverse Reaction to Vaccines, Retiring Old Cars to Save Gasoline and Reduce Emissions, Environmental Impact of Bioenergy Crop Production, Testing in Schools, Treatment of Alzheimer's Disease.

Think about it; these studies, a few of the many on issues of great concern to us today, were written before 1995. The OTA was the best tool Congress has had to deal with our inability to look forward, to recognize and comprehend trends, to find perspective in problem solving—in other words, our congressional attention deficit disorder.

Sixteen years ago, Congress hoped to save money by cutting OTA, and, in the process, we lost one of our best opportunities to save money by avoiding costly mistakes. It is documented that OTA saved taxpayers several hundred million dollars by understanding the best IT system for use by the Social Security Administration, millions of dollars of savings through better Agent Orange programs, billions of dollars by avoiding a poorly constructed Synfuels Corporation.

Now, not every OTA project found favor with everyone. Some in Congress did not like to hear OTA call into question some of the extravagant claims of the missile defense contractors. But history shows OTA was right, and the missile defense folks at the Pentagon have spent a decade working around the problems uncovered.

Some in Congress complained that OTA reports did not have the quick turnaround of, say, CRS, but that is just the point. OTA is the antidote to the myopia that comes from our very short attention cycle.

OTA never advocated policy solutions; it didn't play politics. These are our jobs, but we need help. OTA was of Congress and for Congress. They knew our language and our decisionmaking framework. That's why our organizations never really filled the void created by the defunding of OTA.

If we had a functioning OTA in recent years, I think there's little doubt that we could have been more aware of and better prepared to deal with looming shortages of vaccines, to incorporate new designs for flood control levees, to extend high quality medical care to rural regions, to employee effective techniques for oil spill cleanup, or to reduce the risks of cell phone hacking, to name just a few issues of current interest.

The Office of Technology Assistance is not, and never was, a panacea. However, it is the best institutional tool we have had to recognize the policy implications of technology trends, to digest arguments involving technology, to expose some of our own blind spots—in other words, to illuminate and inform our legislating.

We in Congress have not distinguished ourselves in recognizing and comprehending trends and implications of technology. Now, most of our colleagues here in this body do not know OTA ever existed. Most Members do not miss it. This shows, I think, just how badly we need it. Always the first step in dealing with a shortcoming is acknowledging that we have it. We badly need OTA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0920

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate very much the gentleman from New Jersey's passion for this program. He mentioned that they turned out the lights in 1996, some 15 years ago, and I can't help but wonder why the lights haven't been turned on in the last 15 years.

I talked to the gentleman yesterday, and I didn't know much about the OTA, but I couldn't help but wonder why, in the midst of the financial mess that we find our country in, he would pick this time to try to resuscitate a program that has lay sleeping for 15 years. I don't know whether he has tried every year to resuscitate this program and nobody was listening. I hope he has tried before. There were probably times when money was more plentiful and he might have had a better chance of bringing back a new program, a little more government, but I think this is just bad timing.

I told him that if he wants to continue to try to educate the Members and tell them what a wonderful program this was up until 1996, there may be some day that it would be resuscitated. But the Members should know that in 2008 we gave \$2.5 million to the Government Accountability Office to do these kind of technological assessments, and they've been doing that for the last 4 years.

Mr. HOLT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. In answer to your two questions, the first is, as I said, the fact that this body doesn't know that it lacks OTA is the strongest argument of how badly we need it.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Well, reclaiming my time, if this was simply a question of education, I hope the gentleman has been working diligently for the past few years as hard as he worked for the last 24 hours to make people aware and to crank this thing back up. But again, this is the wrong time to try to start a new government program.

Mr. HOLT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLT. As for the funding, there is an offset from a little-used fund, a

trust fund for building revitalization that is unlikely to be spent in the coming year.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Reclaiming my time, that's an interesting question too. I appreciate that question. And that \$30 million is there to use to make sure that we protect the health and safety of people in our buildings here.

So I understand it won't cost any more money, but it's just a brand-new Federal program that I think is not a good time to be trying to do that. Again, if you've been trying to do that for the last 15 years and no one has been listening, then it must not be all that great a program. But once again, I appreciate your being a champion of that, and maybe someday it will come back to life.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. HONDA. Madam Chair, to answer the question about whether it's a new program, it isn't. It was defunded back in '96.

Since 2008, through GAO, we have been trying to fund it through their end and build it up since then, but still a lot of folks didn't understand that this body really does need the kind of technological development in the public and private sector and harness outside experiences in the form of advisory panels and peer review, something that GAO and CRS cannot do, and we can do it through this program.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chairman, I would just simply say, as I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this, again, I thank the gentleman for bringing it to our attention. It seems strange that it hasn't been funded for the last 15 years. I think this is not the year to crank it back up, resuscitate it. I think we have plenty of bipartisan research that's available to the Members. And maybe there are some private and non-private corporations, big foundations that might want to do this on a voluntarily basis. But again, I urge a negative vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chair, I want to speak about an amendment Mr. MORAN is about to offer. This is about the use of Styrofoam in our cafeterias. You may remember that in 2007, then-Speaker NANCY PELOSI established the Greening the Capitol program, and the goal was to make the U.S. House of Representatives a national leader in resource stewardship and sustainable business practices, and we made significant progress.

One of the places where we made progress was we replaced the Styrofoam in the cafeteria and used recyclable dishware. We are now back to Styrofoam. McDonalds doesn't use Styrofoam. Years ago, McDonalds and other fast food restaurants replaced Styrofoam with recyclable paperboard containers. There is no reason we can't do that. There is no reason we shouldn't do it.

Polystyrene is practically unrecyclable. Most polystyrene containers end up in landfills and incinerators. There are cancer-causing chemicals that are used during its manufacture. In 1986, the EPA report on solid waste named polystyrene manufacturing the fifth largest creator of hazardous waste.

We should adopt the Moran amendment and do it the right way.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 21, 2011, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 112-173.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR
POLYSTYRENE CONTAINERS

SEC. 211. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to obtain polystyrene containers for use in food service facilities of the House of Representatives.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 359, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, at the beginning of the year, the House did away with the composting program that had been part of the Green the Capitol Initiative. It has been a success. People around the country were watching it and in fact following the example that we set. But at the beginning of the year, as I say, the House of

Representatives instituted the use of polystyrene containers instead of clean, biodegradable material.

My amendment would limit the use of funds made available by this Legislative Branch appropriations bill to obtain polystyrene products in our food service facilities. We should show our commitment to the health of our visitors and our employees and to the future of our environment. We should lead by example. That's the program that we had in place until this January.

The House should be using recyclable and biodegradable products and should be avoiding polystyrene foam packaging. We should be a model institution for others to follow. As the gentleman from Vermont said, over 20 years ago, McDonalds and other fast food restaurants replaced polystyrene foam with recyclable and paperboard containers. Making that our standard is the least we can do.

The House of Representatives is the only member of the Capitol Complex to revert to foam packaging. Neither the Senate, the Library of Congress, nor the Capitol Visitors Center food service centers use polystyrene products. Congress should be setting the standard for sustainability in the 21st century. We should be leading by example.

And my amendment provides a way through which we can show that leadership to the thousands of constituents who visit our offices each year.

Polystyrene is practically unrecyclable. Most polystyrene containers end up in landfills or incinerators; and problems with polystyrene include cancerous chemicals that are used during its manufacture, minimal recyclability, enormous bulk during disposal, and toxic byproducts that are released during incineration.

A 1986 EPA report on solid waste named the polystyrene manufacturing process the fifth largest creator of hazardous waste, and toxic chemicals leak out of these containers into the food and drink they contain and endanger the human health and reproductive systems of the people who visit the Capitol and who work in the Capitol.

□ 0930

105 Members have sent a letter to House leadership asking that they eliminate polystyrene from House food service operations. My amendment would do just that by limiting the funds made available in this act from being used to obtain polystyrene containers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chair, I yield myself 1 minute simply to give you three good reasons why we should defeat this amendment.

Number one, it really doesn't do anything because we don't spend any

money in this bill for House restaurant services. They are funded through a revolving trust fund, and that money comes from another source. So it wouldn't have any impact in the first place.

Number two, if it did have any impact, all it would do is raise the cost of everything in the restaurants, which would be passed on to the folks. That's not a great thing, to spend more money.

Number three, my last good reason, the gentleman mentioned that this year there was a bipartisan letter from the chairman of the House Administration Committee along with the ranking member to say we tried this program and we're going to end it.

So for those three reasons, I think it is appropriate to vote "no."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, with regard to the argument that the gentlemen makes, first of all it seems to me that we should set ourselves on record, and the appropriations bill is the ultimate source of funding for the Capitol complex. But the argument that this will save money it seems to me is deficient when we are talking about human health. I mean, we could choose not to spend money on purifying our water. We'd save a lot of money. Just let people drink out of the tap or get their water wherever. But we feel that the health of our employees and our constituents who visit us is important enough that we should spend that extra money.

Science is telling us that, in fact, toxics leak from this material into the food and the drink that our employees and our constituents are using. We may not be as fully aware of that, but we know that polystyrene is a toxic material. It seems to me we should err on the side of caution, particularly when the health of our employees and our constituents is concerned.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California, Chairman LUNGREN, the chairman of the House Administration Committee and the author of the letter that ended the program in January.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me just reiterate, this came to my attention as chairman of the House Administration Committee when we received a letter from the Democratic side of the aisle as part of the transition team recommending that we discontinue this part of the greening initiative process, Greening the Capitol process; that is, this one did not work. It was a Democrat who told us we ought to get rid of it.

So once I heard that, I also heard complaints from both Democratic and Republican Members of the House and their staffs that the recyclable utensils we had didn't work—didn't work—and they asked for something that did work. And so we cancelled the program.

This idea about Styrofoam being a real health hazard, Linda Birnbaum, who is the toxicologist who heads the government agency that declared styrene a likely cancer risk, said this: Let me put your mind at ease right away about Styrofoam. In finished products, certainly styrene is not an issue.

The gentleman has said, and the other gentleman from Vermont said, that we ought to follow McDonald's. They no longer have this product. Well, yesterday my staff went out and got this product from McDonald's, which is Styrofoam; and got this product from McDonald's, which is Styrofoam; and got this product from McDonald's, which is Styrofoam. So I don't know where they get this information.

Lastly, they should understand that polystyrene is approved as safe for use in food service by the FDA. Anything that contains food product that comes into contact with individuals must be approved by the FDA. This is approved by the FDA.

Also, this week we are receiving bids back from our request for proposal on trying to get a waste energy recycling program to get rid of the waste that we have here on the Hill. This is to turn it into energy by way of heat energy and capture any of the offensive by-products that may be produced. This is what we are doing.

Look, you can have good science and you can have bad science. You can have smart science and you can have dumb science. You can have science or you can have no science. Now, I'm not sure which of the latter categories this proposal falls into, but it's not science. Science suggests that this is something that ought to be appropriate.

There are any number of producers of polystyrene in Members' districts around this country. There are 2,100 users of it. This amounts to billions of dollars and thousands of jobs, tens of thousands of jobs, 8,000 just in California alone.

So once again, we are using bad science to scare people. And what's the impact? It's going to cost more money. I approved of this program because it saves a half a million dollars in a single year—half a million dollars. It will save energy, and we will have literally no residue when we move from waste to energy production. It's a win/win/win situation.

By the way, members of our staffs have thanked me for doing this. They now have utensils that actually are usable.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, first of all, the letter that was sent did not request polystyrene products by any means. It was referring to another product that was corn based. Certainly Mr. BRADY was not recommending dangerous Styrofoam material.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairman, before I came here to Congress, I was in the restaurant business. We had to please the customers that we served. We certainly couldn't give them an inferior product. Only in Washington, D.C., would we spend more and get less. The gentleman from California has referenced \$500,000 a year more in cost, and if you did a survey of the people who used those products, it would be dismal.

I had the experience of putting a fork in a hot piece of meat one day, and it melted. That is ridiculous. We in Congress should not give inferior products to people who work here and serve here, and spend more money for it.

So with that, Madam Chairman, let's just do the commonsense thing here and get a product that works and spend less money.

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

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

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

Mr. MORAN. 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 Virginia will be postponed.

Mr. CRENSHAW. 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. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California) having assumed the chair, Mrs. BIGGERT, 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. 2551) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1383. An act to temporarily preserve higher rates for tuition and fees for programs of education at non-public institutions of higher learning pursued by individuals enrolled in the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs before the enactment of the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Improvements Act of 2010, and for other purposes.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1002

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CRENSHAW) at 10 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 359 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. 2551.

□ 1003

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. 2551) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BIGGERT (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 112-173 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112-173 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 5 by Ms. HAYWORTH of New York.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. STUTZMAN of Indiana.

Amendment No. 15 by Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. WATT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) 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 102, noes 302, answered “present” 7, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 622]

AYES—102

Bartlett
Gohmert
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Hensarling
Herger
Huizenga (MI)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Conyers
DesJarlais
Duncan (TN)
Engel
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Flores
Fox
Fudge

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander

Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Braley (IA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Calvert
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Chabot
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello

NOES—302

Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gonzalez
Goodlatte

Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Towns
Moore
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunnelee
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Petri
Pompeo
Price (GA)

Gosar
Gowdy
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)

Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee

Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Labrador
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Loeb
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George

Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarella
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—7

Chandler
Courtney
Edwards

Akin
Baca
Bachmann
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blumenauer
Butterfield

Lofgren, Zoe
Meeks

Castor (FL)
Clay
Davis (IL)
Ellison
Giffords
Griffith (VA)
Hinchey

Sánchez, Linda
T.
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Landry
McIntyre
McKinley
Paulsen
Pence
Schock
Young (AK)

□ 1037

Messrs. RIVERA, WOMACK, GRIMM, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. KINZINGER of Illinois, AUSTRIA, DENHAM, Mrs. BONO MACK, Messrs. REED, LUJAN, WAXMAN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Messrs. CRAVAACK, PITTS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Messrs. VISCLOSKY, JOHNSON of Illinois, BECERRA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Messrs. PERLMUTTER, SCOTT of South Carolina, GOWDY, MCGOVERN, MULVANEY, GARY G. MILLER of California, Ms. BUERKLE, Messrs. LEWIS of California, NUNES, TIBERI, MCCOTTER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. EMERSON, Messrs. ROHRABACHER, HASTINGS of Florida, ROONEY, HUNTER, HURT, BOREN, FLEISCHMANN, and COSTELLO changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. HERGER, SHUSTER, CASSIDY, RIBBLE, KINGSTON, CARSON

of Indiana, BURGESS, and BURTON of Indiana changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. YARMUTH changed his vote from "no" to "present."

Mr. MEEKS changed his vote from "aye" to "present."

Messrs. CONAWAY and HARPER changed their vote from "present" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. HAYWORTH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HAYWORTH) 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 299, noes 112, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 623]

AYES—299

Adams Conaway Gowdy
Aderholt Connolly (VA) Granger
Alexander Cooper Graves (GA)
Altmire Costa Graves (MO)
Amash Costello Green, Al
Andrews Courtney Griffin (AR)
Austria Cravaack Grimm
Bachus Crawford Guinta
Baldwin Crenshaw Guthrie
Barletta Critz Hahn
Barrow Cuellar Hall
Bartlett Culberson Hanna
Barton (TX) Davis (CA) Harper
Bass (NH) Davis (KY) Harris
Benishek DeFazio Hartzler
Berg DeLauro Hastings (WA)
Biggart Denham Hayworth
Bilbray Dent Heck
Bilirakis DesJarlais Heinrich
Bishop (NY) Deutch Hensarling
Bishop (UT) Diaz-Balart Herger
Blackburn Donnelly (IN) Herrera Beutler
Bonner Doyle Higgins
Bono Mack Dreier Himes
Boren Duffy Hochul
Boswell Duncan (SC) Holden
Boustany Duncan (TN) Holt
Brady (TX) Ellmers Huelskamp
Braley (IA) Emerson Huizenga (MI)
Brooks Eshoo Hultgren
Broun (GA) Farenthold Hunter
Buchanan Fincher Hurt
Bueshon Fitzpatrick Inslee
Buerkle Flake Israel
Burgess Fleischmann Issa
Burton (IN) Fleming Jenkins
Calvert Flores Johnson (IL)
Camp Forbes Johnson (OH)
Campbell Fortenberry Johnson, E. B.
Canseco Fox Johnson, Sam
Cantor Franks (AZ) Jones
Capito Frelinghuysen Jordan
Cardoza Gallegly Keating
Carney Gardner Kelly
Carter Garrett Kind
Cassidy Gerlach King (IA)
Chabot Gibbs Kingston
Chaffetz Gibson Kinzinger (IL)
Chandler Gingrey (GA) Kissell
Coble Gohmert Kline
Coffman (CO) Goodlatte Labrador
Cole Gosar Lamborn

Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee

NOES—112

Ackerman
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
DeGette
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Edwards
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hond
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Kildee
King (NY)
Kucinich
Langevin
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lowe
Maloney
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oliver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Akin
Castor (FL)
Davis (IL)
Ellison
Giffords
Griffith (VA)
Hinche
Landry

Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert

Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sires
Slaughter
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (MS)
Towns
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Markey
McIntyre
McKinley
Paulsen
Pence
Schock
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1041

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 153, noes 260, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 624]

AYES—153

Adams Gohmert Noem
Akin Goodlatte Nugent
Amash Gowdy Nunes
Bartlett Graves (GA) Nunnelee
Barton (TX) Graves (MO) Olson
Bass (NH) Green, Gene Palazzo
Benishek Griffin (AR) Paul
Bilbray Hall Petri
Bishop (UT) Harris Platts
Blackburn Heck Poe (TX)
Bono Mack Hensarling Pompeo
Brady (TX) Herger Posey
Brooks Huelskamp Price (GA)
Broun (GA) Huizenga (MI) Quayle
Buchanan Hultgren Reichert
Buerkle Hunter Renacci
Burgess Hurt Ribble
Burton (IN) Issa Rigell
Campbell Jenkins Rogers (MI)
Canseco Johnson (OH) Rohrabacher
Carney Johnson, E. B. Rokita
Carter Johnson, Sam Ros-Lehtinen
Cassidy Jordan Roskam
Chabot Keating Ross (FL)
Chaffetz King (IA) Royce
Coffman (CO) Kingston Ryan (WI)
Conaway Kissell Scalise
Costello Kiene Schilling
Culberson Labrador Schrader
Denham Lamborn Schweikert
DesJarlais Lankford Scott (SC)
Donnelly (IN) LoBiondo Scott, Austin
Duffy Long Sensenbrenner
Duncan (SC) Luetkemeyer Sessions
Duncan (TN) Lujan Smith (NE)
Farenthold Mack Smith (TX)
Fincher Manzullo Smith (WA)
Flake Marchant Southernland
Fleischmann Matheson Stearns
Fleming McCarthy (CA) Stutzman
Flores McCaul Sullivan
Forbes McClintock Terry
Fox McCotter Thornberry
Franks (AZ) McHenry Walsh (IL)
Gallegly Miller (FL) Webster
Gardner Miller (MI) West
Garrett Miller, Gary Wilson (SC)
Gerlach Mulvaney Wittman
Gibbs Murphy (PA) Woodall
Gibson Myrick Yoder
Gingrey (GA) Neugebauer Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—21

McNerney
McGovern
McKinley
Pence
Schock
Young (AK)

NOES—260

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger

Green, Al
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslie
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly
Sarbanes
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (VA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Loefgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marino
Markey
Tontko
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)

Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Townes
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Baca
Bachmann
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blumenauer
Butterfield
Castor (FL)

Davis (IL)
Ellison
Giffords
Griffith (VA)
Hinchev
Landry
McIntyre

McKinley
Paulsen
Pence
Schock
Young (AK)

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

□ 1046

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”
So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. STUTZMAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 194, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 625]

AYES—218

Adams
Akin
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conaway
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)

Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Himes
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslie
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kissell
Kline

Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latta
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Long
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Pearce
Peterson
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey

Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff

Schilling
Schmidt
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)

Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOES—194

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Austria
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez

Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
T.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (VA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Loefgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Maloney
Marino
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver

Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Townes
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Baca
Bachmann
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blumenauer
Butterfield
Castor (FL)

Davis (IL)
Ellison
Giffords
Griffith (VA)
Hinchev
Landry
McIntyre

McKinley
Paulsen
Pence
Schock
Sullivan
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1051

Mr. LUJÁN changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 283, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 626]

AYES—130

Aderholt	Guinta	Olson
Austria	Hall	Palazzo
Barletta	Harper	Paul
Barton (TX)	Hartzler	Pearce
Berg	Hastings (WA)	Peterson
Bishop (UT)	Huelskamp	Pitts
Blackburn	Huizenga (MI)	Platts
Bonner	Hultgren	Poe (TX)
Boustany	Hunter	Posey
Brown (GA)	Hurt	Price (GA)
Buchanan	Issa	Quayle
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Reed
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Campbell	Jordan	Rooney
Canseco	Kelly	Ros-Lehtinen
Cantor	King (NY)	Roskam
Carter	Kissell	Ross (FL)
Chabot	Kline	Runyan
Coble	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	Latta	Scalise
Costa	Long	Schilling
Cravaack	Lucas	Schmidt
Crawford	Luetkemeyer	Scott (SC)
Davis (KY)	Lummis	Scott, Austin
Denham	Mack	Sensenbrenner
DesJarlais	Manzullo	Sessions
Donnelly (IN)	Marchant	Southerland
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Stearns
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Stutzman
Fincher	McCotter	Thompson (PA)
Fleischmann	McHenry	Tiberi
Forbes	McKeon	Tipton
Gallely	McMorris	Turner
Gerlach	Rodgers	Turner
Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Gibson	Miller (MI)	Walsh (IL)
Gingrey (GA)	Miller, Gary	Webster
Gohmert	Mulvaney	West
Gowdy	Murphy (PA)	Westmoreland
Granger	Myrick	Wilson (SC)
Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Wittman
Graves (MO)	Noem	Womack
Griffin (AR)	Nunes	Woodall
Grimm	Nunnelee	Yoder

NOES—283

Ackerman	Bachus	Benishek
Adams	Baldwin	Berkley
Akin	Barrow	Berman
Alexander	Bartlett	Bigert
Altmire	Bass (CA)	Bilbray
Amash	Bass (NH)	Bilirakis
Andrews	Becerra	Bishop (NY)

Bono Mack	Hanna
Boren	Harris
Boswell	Hastings (FL)
Brady (PA)	Hayworth
Brady (TX)	Heck
Braley (IA)	Heinrich
Brooks	Hensarling
Brown (FL)	Herger
Bucshon	Herrera Beutler
Buerkle	Higgins
Calvert	Himes
Camp	Hinojosa
Capito	Hirono
Capps	Hochul
Capuano	Holden
Cardoza	Holt
Carnahan	Honda
Carney	Hoyer
Carson (IN)	Inslee
Cassidy	Israel
Chaffetz	Jackson (IL)
Chandler	Jackson Lee
Chu	(TX)
Ciilline	Jenkins
Clarke (MI)	Johnson (GA)
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (IL)
Clay	Johnson, E. B.
Cleaver	Jones
Clyburn	Kaptur
Coffman (CO)	Keating
Cohen	Kildee
Cole	Kind
Connolly (VA)	King (IA)
Conyers	Kingston
Cooper	Kinzinger (IL)
Costello	Kucinich
Courtney	Labrador
Crenshaw	Lance
Critz	Langevin
Crowley	Lankford
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)
Culberson	Larson (CT)
Cummings	Latham
Davis (CA)	LaTourette
DeFazio	Lee (CA)
DeGette	Levin
DeLauro	Lewis (CA)
Dent	Lewis (GA)
Deutch	Lipinski
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo
Dicks	Loeb sack
Dingell	Lofgren, Zoe
Doggett	Lowey
Dold	Luján
Doyle	Lungren, Daniel
Dreier	E.
Duffy	Lynch
Edwards	Maloney
Ellmers	Markley
Emerson	Matheson
Engel	Matsui
Eshoo	McCarthy (CA)
Farenthold	McCarthy (NY)
Farr	McClintock
Fattah	McCollum
Finer	McDermott
Fitzpatrick	McGovern
Flake	McNerney
Fleming	Meehan
Flores	Meeks
Fortenberry	Mica
Foxx	Michaud
Frank (MA)	Miller (NC)
Frank (AZ)	Miller, George
Frelinghuysen	Moore
Fudge	Moran
Garamendi	Murphy (CT)
Gardner	Nadler
Garrett	Napolitano
Gonzalez	Neal
Goodlatte	Nugent
Gosar	Olver
Green, Al	Owens
Green, Gene	Pallone
Grijaiva	Pascrell
Guthrie	Pastor (AZ)
Gutierrez	Payne
Hahn	Pelosi
Hanabusa	Perlmutter

NOT VOTING—19

Davis (IL)	McKinley
Ellison	Paulsen
Giffords	Pence
Griffith (VA)	Schock
Hinchey	Young (AK)
Landry	
McIntyre	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1057

Messrs. JOHNSON of Illinois, DUFFY, PETRI, SULLIVAN, ROYCE, ROHRBACHER, and SHUSTER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. MACK and LONG changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the 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 176, noes 235, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 627]

AYES—176

Ackerman	Engel	Lofgren, Zoe
Andrews	Eshoo	Lowey
Bachus	Farr	Luján
Baldwin	Fattah	Maloney
Barrow	Filner	Markley
Barrow	Frank (MA)	Matsui
Bartlett	Garamendi	McCarthy (NY)
Bass (CA)	Gibson	McCollum
Becerra	Gonzalez	McDermott
Berkley	Green, Al	McGovern
Berman	Green, Gene	McNerney
Bishop (NY)	Grijalva	Meeks
Boren	Gutierrez	Michaud
Boswell	Hahn	Miller (NC)
Brady (PA)	Hanabusa	Miller, George
Brooks	Hastings (FL)	Moran
Brown (FL)	Hayworth	Murphy (CT)
Capps	Heinrich	Nadler
Capuano	Higgins	Napolitano
Cardoza	Himes	Neal
Carnahan	Hinojosa	Olver
Carson (IN)	Hirono	Owens
Chaffetz	Hochul	Pallone
Chu	Holt	Pascrell
Ciilline	Honda	Pastor (AZ)
Clarke (MI)	Hoyer	Payne
Clarke (NY)	Inslee	Pelosi
Clay	Israel	Peters
Cleaver	Jackson (IL)	Peterson
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Petri
Cohen	Johnson (IL)	Pingree (ME)
Connolly (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Polis
Conyers	Jones	Price (NC)
Cooper	Kaptur	Rahall
Costa	Keating	Rangel
Costello	Kildee	Reyes
Courtney	Kind	Richmond
Critz	Kissell	Ross (AR)
Crowley	Kucinich	Rothman (NJ)
Cummings	Lance	Roybal-Allard
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Ruppersberger
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Rush
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Sánchez, Linda
Deutch	Levin	T.
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Dingell	Lipinski	Sarbanes
Doggett	LoBiondo	Schakowsky
Doyle	Loeb sack	Schiff
Edwards		

Scott (VA) Thompson (CA) Wasserman
 Scott, David Thompson (MS) Schultz
 Serrano Tierney Waters
 Sewell Tonko Watt
 Sherman Towns Waxman
 Sires Tsongas Welch
 Slaughter Van Hollen Wilson (FL)
 Smith (WA) Velázquez Woolsey
 Speier Visclosky Wu
 Stark Walz (MN) Yarmuth
 Sutton

Griffith (VA) McIntyre Pence Sherman
 Hinchey McKinley Schock Shuler
 Landry Paulsen Young (AK) Sires

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

Thompson (MS) Waters
 Tierney Watt
 Tonko Waxman
 Towns Welch
 Tsongas Wilson (FL)
 Van Hollen Woolsey
 Velázquez Wu
 Visclosky Yarmuth
 Wasserman
 Schultz

□ 1102

Mr. ISRAEL changed his vote from
 “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN)
 on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the noes 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 179, noes 234,
 not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 628]

AYES—179

NOES—235

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

NOT VOTING—21

Baca Blumenauer Davis (IL)
 Bachmann Braley (IA) Ellison
 Bishop (GA) Butterfield Giffords
 Black Castor (FL) Goodlatte

Ackerman Eshoo Markey
 Altmire Farr Matsui
 Andrews Fattah McCarthy (NY)
 Baldwin Filner McCollum
 Bartlett Portenberry McDermott
 Bass (CA) Frank (MA) McGovern
 Becerra Fudge Meeks
 Berkley Garamendi Michaud
 Berman Gonzalez Miller (NC)
 Bishop (NY) Green, Al Miller, George
 Boswell Grijalva Moore
 Brady (PA) Gutierrez Moran
 Braley (IA) Hahn Murphy (CT)
 Burgess Hanabusa Nadler
 Capps Hastings (FL) Napolitano
 Capuano Neal
 Cardoza Heinrich Olver
 Carnahan Higgins Owens
 Carney Himes Pallone
 Carson (IN) Hinojosa Pascarell
 Chandler Hirono Pastor (AZ)
 Chu Hochul Payne
 Cicilline Holden Pelosi
 Clarke (MI) Holt Perlmutter
 Clarke (NY) Honda Peters
 Clay Hoyer Pingree (ME)
 Cleaver Insee Polis
 Clyburn Israel Price (NC)
 Cohen Jackson (IL) Quigley
 Connolly (VA) Johnson (GA) Rahall
 Conyers Johnson, E. B. Rangel
 Cooper Kaptur Reichert
 Costa Keating Reyes
 Costello Kildee Richardson
 Courtney Kind Richmond
 Critz Kissell Rigell
 Crowley Kucinich Rothman (NJ)
 Cuellar Lance Roybal-Allard
 Cummings Cummings Rush
 Davis (CA) Larsen (WA) Ryan (OH)
 DeFazio Larson (CT) Sanchez, Linda
 DeGette Lee (CA) T.
 DeLauro Levin Sanchez, Loretta
 Deutch Lewis (GA) Sarbanes
 Dicks Lipinski Schakowsky
 Dingell Loeb sack Schiff
 Doggett Lofgren, Zoe Schwartz
 Donnelly (IN) Lowey Scott (VA)
 Doyle Luján Scott, David
 Edwards Lynch Serrano
 Engel Maloney Sewell

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

NOT VOTING—19

Baca Butterfield Griffith (VA)
 Bachmann Castor (FL) Hinchey
 Bishop (GA) Davis (IL) Landry
 Black Ellison
 Blumenauer Giffords

McIntyre Paulsen Schock
McKinley Pence Young (AK)

□ 1106

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mrs. BIGGERT, 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. 2551) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 359, reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 159, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 629]

YEAS—252

Adams Chaffetz Gardner
Aderholt Chandler Garrett
Akin Coble Gerlach
Alexander Coffman (CO) Gibbs
Altmire Cole Gibson
Austria Conaway Gingrey (GA)
Bachus Costa Gohmert
Barletta Costello Goodlatte
Barrow Courtney Gosar
Barton (TX) Cravaack Gowdy
Bass (NH) Crawford Granger
Benishkek Crenshaw Graves (GA)
Berg Cuellar Graves (MO)
Berkley Culberson Green, Al
Biggart Davis (KY) Griffin (AR)
Bilbray Denham Grimm
Bilirakis Dent Guinta
Bishop (UT) DesJarlais Guthrie
Blackburn Diaz-Balart Hall
Bonner Doggett Hanna
Bono Mack Dold Harper
Boren Donnelly (IN) Harris
Boustany Dreier Hartzler
Brady (TX) Duffy Hastings (WA)
Brooks Duncan (SC) Hayworth
Buchanan Eillers Hensarling
Bucshon Emerson Herger
Buerkle Farenthold Herrera Beutler
Burton (IN) Fincher Higgins
Calvert Fitzpatrick Himes
Camp Fleischmann Hirono
Canseco Fleming Hochul
Cantor Flores Huelskamp
Capito Forbes Huizenga (MI)
Carney Fortenberry Hultgren
Carter Foxx Hunter
Cassidy Frelinghuysen Hurt
Chabot Gallegly Inslee

Issa Meehan Royce
Jenkins Mica Runyan
Johnson (IL) Miller (FL) Ruppberger
Johnson (OH) Miller (MI) Ryan (WI)
Johnson, Sam Miller, Gary Scalise
Jordan Mulvaney Schilling
Keating Murphy (CT) Schmidt
Kelly Murphy (PA) Schrader
King (IA) Myrick Scott (SC)
King (NY) Neugebauer Sensenbrenner
Kingston Noem Sessions
Kinzinger (IL) Nugent Sherman
Kissell Nunes Shimkus
Kline Nunnelee Shuster
Labrador Olson Simpson
Lamborn Owens Smith (NE)
Lance Palazzo Smith (NJ)
Lankford Pearce Smith (TX)
Larsen (WA) Peters Southerland
Latham Peterson Speier
LaTourette Petri Stivers
Latta Pitts Stutzman
Lewis (CA) Platts Sullivan
LoBiondo Poe (TX) Terry
Loeb sack Pompeo Thompson (PA)
Long Posey Thornberry
Lucas Quayle Tiberi
Luetkemeyer Quigley Tipton
Lummis Reed Tsongas
Lungren, Daniel Rehberg Turner
E. Renacci Upton
Lynch Ribble Walberg
Mack Richardson Walden
Manzullo Rigell Walsh (IL)
Marchant Rivera Waters
Marino Roby Webster
Matheson Roe (TN) West
McCarthy (CA) Rogers (AL) Westmoreland
McCarthy (NY) Rogers (KY) Whitfield
McCaul Rogers (MI) Wilson (SC)
McClintock Rohrabacher Wolf
McCotter Rokita Womack
McHenry Rooney Woodall
McKeon Ros-Lehtinen Yoder
McMorris Roskam Young (FL)
Rodgers Ross (AR)
McNerney Ross (FL) Young (IN)

NAYS—159

Ackerman Flake Moran
Amash Frank (MA) Nadler
Andrews Franks (AZ) Napolitano
Baldwin Fudge Neal
Bartlett Garamendi Olver
Bass (CA) Gonzalez Pallone
Becerra Green, Gene Pascarell
Berman Grijalva Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (NY) Gutierrez Paul
Boswell Hahn Payne
Brady (PA) Hanabusa Pelosi
Braley (IA) Hastings (FL) Perlmutter
Broun (GA) Heck Pingree (ME)
Brown (FL) Heinrich Polis
Burgess Hinojosa Price (GA)
Campbell Holden Price (NC)
Capps Holt Rahall
Capuano Honda Rangel
Cardoza Hoyer Reichert
Carnahan Israel Reyes
Carson (IN) Jackson (IL) Richmond
Chu Jackson Lee Rothman (NJ)
Cicilline (TX) Roybal-Allard
Clarke (MI) Johnson (GA) Rush
Clarke (NY) Johnson, E. B. Ryan (OH)
Clay Jones Sánchez, Linda
Cleaver Kaptur T.
Clyburn Kildee Sanchez, Loretta
Cohen Kind Sarbanes
Connolly (VA) Kucinich Schakowsky
Conyers Langevin Schiff
Cooper Larson (CT) Schwartz
Critz Lee (CA) Schweikert
Crowley Levin Scott (VA)
Cummings Lewis (GA) Scott, David
Davis (CA) Lipinski Serrano
DeFazio Lofgren, Zoe Sewell
DeGette Lowey Shuler
DeLauro Luján Sires
Deutch Maloney Slaughter
Dingell Fincher Stark
Doyle Matsui Stearns
Duncan (TN) Doyle McCollum Sutton
Edwards McDermott Thompson (CA)
Engel McGovern Thompson (MS)
Eshoo Meeks Tierney
Farr Michaud Tonko
Fattah Miller (NC) Towns
Filner Moore Van Hollen
Velázquez

Visclosky Watt Wittman
Walz (MN) Waxman Woolsey
Wasserman Welch Wu
Schultz Wilson (FL) Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Baca Davis (IL) McKinley
Bachmann Ellison Paulsen
Bishop (GA) Giffords Pence
Black Griffith (VA) Schock
Blumenauer Hinchey Scott, Austin
Butterfield Landry Smith (WA)
Castor (FL) McIntyre Young (AK)

□ 1125

Mr. LEVIN changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PAULSEN, Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 629 I was unable to attend today's vote on H.R. 2551—Legislative Branch Appropriations. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PENCE, Madam Speaker, I was absent from the House floor during rollcall votes 615 and 622–629. Had I been present I would have voted “no” on 615, “aye” on 622, “aye” on 623, “aye” on 624, “aye” on 625, “aye” on 626, “no” on 627, “no” on 628, and “yea” on 629.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 25, 2011

Mr. CRENSHAW, Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING GOVERNOR BRUCE SUNDLUN

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

Mr. CICILLINE, Madam Speaker, I rise this afternoon to honor a great citizen, a good friend, and a wonderful political leader, Rhode Island Governor Bruce Sundlun, who passed away last evening.

My fellow Rhode Islanders and I have lost a great friend and a great leader in Bruce's passing. He will be long remembered for leading Rhode Island through some very difficult times. His commitment to public service and his honorable and courageous service to our country both at home and abroad set him apart as a great American.

Governor Sundlun distinguished himself as a patriotic war hero, a talented business leader, a spirited athlete, and a gifted political leader.

A great friend to me, his courage and passion set him apart as one remarkable man whose spirit will live on in

our memories. His legacy and visionary accomplishments, including leading Rhode Island out of the credit union crisis, establishing Rite Care, a national model for health care for low-income families and children, and his vision for our State's airport expansion at T.F. Green will continue to benefit Rhode Islanders for many years to come.

My thoughts and prayers continue to be with the entire Sundlun family. Governor Bruce Sundlun will be sorely missed.

FAA BILL

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I'm excited about the number of Members who welcome guests to the United States Capitol. It is an important place because it belongs to the American people. I'm delighted that the Poindexter family has joined me.

But many of those people who have traveled have traveled by airplanes and have gone through the Nation's airports.

I am the ranking member on the Transportation Security Committee addressing security issues across America; and I am disappointed, but I would like to say a little outraged, that right now the FAA bill is held up on minor issues such as whether or not we'll allow our workers to engage in discussions about their work conditions. It is being held up because the bill cancels FAA and air traffic controllers in small airports and the supplemental support, if you will, the supplemental support that has been given to small airports in rural areas.

It's time to get to work. Our Republican friends need to stop holding up this bill for minor issues so that Americans can fly in safety and security.

□ 1130

THE FUTURE OF MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BUEKLE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I promise I will not take the whole 60 minutes, because I know many folks have flights to get to.

Madam Speaker, one of the reasons I'm here—and we are also working on some additional, shall we say, display items for maybe next week. Maybe I'm out of my mind, but this last couple of weeks I've been actually reading from top to bottom, beginning to end, the Medicare trustees' Federal hospital insurance and Federal supplemental medical insurance trust fund actuarial report for 2011. It's actually more in-

teresting than you would think, because you go through about 270 pages, lots of great information, not that hard to read, so anyone that's actually watching this, I strongly suggest, if you have the stomach for it and you really need a little help in falling asleep, this might be the occasion. Google it, take it off the Internet, but do this for me: This is one of those occasions I'm going to ask you to go to the very end of the report and start with the last three pages, because that's what I'm standing here to talk about is you have a report that basically gives a window of a dozen-some years of actuarial soundness, but when you get to the last three pages, it basically says something like Roseannadanna, that character from Saturday Night Live from 20 years ago: "Never mind."

I brought a couple of the boards we already had printed up to sort of demonstrate what's going on, and then I wanted to talk about this.

Day after day after day after day in the political theater of this Congress, I see Members walk up to the floor, walk up to the press, send out press releases saying, "We don't want to change Medicare as it is in law today." How many times have we heard the attacks on the Republicans saying, "They're trying to change Medicare as we know it"? I need you to think about that comment, because what's in this report is Medicare as it is in law today. You need to understand what the left is defending and the crash that is just a few years away; and I'm standing here today to defend the fact that, as Republicans, we're saving the program. We are actually trying to find a way to make Medicare actuarially sound so that you and I can have it but also our kids and our grandkids can have it.

So let's actually first walk through the numbers, and then I'm going to read parts of these last three pages. I promise it's more interesting than it sounds, and it's more depressing than you can ever imagine, and this is the current law.

All right. A couple of primers on some spending out there.

2010, how much of our spending is mandatory?

2016, you'll start to notice mandatory spending is consuming everything we are.

Another point of reference. Today, when we borrow, we're actually having to borrow to cover all the discretionary. That's defense. That's all the alphabet agencies. We even have to borrow today to cover a portion of the mandatory spending. Think of that. The Medicares, the Social Securities, the Medicaid, the VA benefits, interest on the debt are actually living on borrowed money. I would think that would set off an alarm bell in someone's head that there's something horribly wrong out there.

So let's actually bounce on to this graph and just sort of give you a concept of how fast these numbers are

eroding and why things like the battle over cut, cap, and balance are going on in this body, because there seems a willingness here by many Members—and I've got to be very careful how I phrase this—that I believe telling the public the truth of how difficult these numbers are and how dangerous they are to our Republic may mean they don't get reelected, may mean they have to stand up in front of an audience that for years and years and years they've said, "Don't worry. It's fine." How do you go back in front of that same audience and now tell them, well, maybe the numbers weren't fine, because the truth is in front of us right now.

Here is the 2010 sort of breakdown. Department of Defense, Military, Other Discretionary. We use this one, because this is last year's numbers. It's all done. We know what it was.

Do you see this? That's probably about 62, 63 percent of all spending was in the mandatory category. Think of this. This here, from the President's own numbers, is the 2016 projection, which is four budget cycles away, because, remember, right now we're working on the 2012. This is the 2016.

Do you see the difference in these two boards? Do you see that growth in that blue area? We go from something in the low sixties to 72, and I have one person who keeps telling me it's 73 percent of all spending.

But think of this. In about 13½ years, every dime of this pie chart, every dime of spending, will be consumed by the mandatory portion of our spending. So 13½ years. There's nothing left in defense. There's nothing left in the alphabet agencies. Mandatory spending, the entitlements, consume everything we are. And, remember, this is as the law is written today. So every time you see a Member walk up and say, "I don't want to make changes; I want to keep everything as it is in law today," they're basically saying your future is a crash. Everything will be consumed in these mandatory numbers.

Now let's actually walk through a couple of things that are in these last three pages of the 2011 Medicare actuarial report. Once again, please, I ask you, if you don't believe me, if you're someone who has trouble believing these statements that I come here to the floor and try to walk through, go take it off the Internet yourself and read these last three pages.

Part of the premise here is, to his credit—and I believe he is actually the chief actuary for Medicare, actually wrote a little Statement of Actuarial Opinion, the last three pages, and he puts it in perspective. He basically says, yeah, the numbers in here are fine if you live in a fantasy world and assume Congress will never make certain changes. And understand, baked into these numbers, you'll love this one. I'll read it, and then I'll explain what this means. This is in the second paragraph. I'm going to read the second half of this paragraph:

“They are not reasonable as an indication of actuarial future costs. Current law would require a physician fee reduction of an estimated 29.4 percent on January 1, 2012—an implausible expectation.”

Did you hear that? Built into these numbers, January 1—what is that? Five months from now? January 1, doctors are to get a 29.4 percent cut in their compensation, and that’s built into these numbers because these numbers don’t work without taking that type of hit to the doctors.

How many doctors are going to see Medicare patients come January 2 when they’ve taken a 29.4 percent cut? So what traditionally happens around here is the Members of this body sometime in November, December, we’re going to run to the floor, we’re going to say that’s not fair, we want to make sure Medicare recipients can actually see their doctor, and we’re going to go back and raise up that compensation and keep it flat. We’re going to get rid of that 29.4 percent cut that’s already built into the law. The next day we should have a new actuarial report saying, oh, by the way, the dozen-some years that we said Medicare was fine is crashing, because it’s built on premises that don’t have reality.

I’m trying to find nice ways to phrase this. When you read an actuarial report, it’s based on current law. What happens if built into that current law is absolute fantasy, and that 29.4 percent cut, which I will be one of the people who will walk onto this floor and do my best to stop that because that’s not fair. It’s not fair to the doctors. It’s not fair to the people in the program. But you’ve got to understand. Then when Members of this body walk up here and say, “We want no changes to Medicare,” when they say they want no changes, are they saying they want the law as it is today? They want doctors in January to get a 29.4 percent cut? You can’t have it both ways. You can’t walk up here and say, “We want to keep the law exactly as it is, no protection, no changes.”

“Oh, by the way, you’re never going to see your doctor again after January 2.”

You have to actually go through more of these last three pages, this statement of opinion. It’s devastating. And you start to realize the political theater around here hasn’t been telling our public the truth. They’re more concerned about winning political points than helping the American people understand we have a huge, important program here that’s about to collapse under its own weight. We have the documents. We have the data. We’re trying to step up and be responsible. But by being responsible, you get demagogued, you get attacked, you have people going out and holding up little protest signs. And then you talk to them and say, “Hey, read this,” and they read it, and they look at you with these eyes saying, “I can’t believe my own side’s been lying to me. Why didn’t they fess up and tell us this was coming?”

□ 1140

There are a couple of other things in here. Medicare prices for hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, home health, hospice, ambulatory surgery centers, diagnostic laboratories, and many other services would be less than half of their levels under prior law. That is built into this Medicare actuary report. Think that through. Built into the formulas today, those groupings are going to be receiving half the compensation? How many of them are ever going to treat, take care, diagnose, or provide hospice care for Medicare recipients? That’s what the Republicans are trying to save. We’re trying to fix it. We’re trying not to let that happen.

Anyone that says they do not want changes to Medicare, they are actually supporting the downfall of the program. And that is actually why I stand here. I will be back next week with a series of slides that actually break out a number of segments from this Medicare actuary report, because it’s time we start having Members come to this floor and tell the truth.

One last little thing here. For these reasons, the financial projections shown in this report for Medicare do not represent a reasonable expectation for actual program operations. What the Medicare actuary is basically saying is, What we’ve based much of the rhetoric on around here, if you dig into the numbers, this program has already changed as people know it. It was changed last year when they did the health care takeover vote. It’s already built into the law.

As a Republican, we’re trying to find ways to save this program, make it actuarially sound so it is there for the folks who are on it, for our children, for ourselves, and for the next generation. We are here to do the right thing. And if you don’t believe me, go pull the report, and read through it yourself.

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

AMERICA’S DEBT CEILING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I always appreciate the honor and the privilege.

I, like every Member in this Congress, and most Americans, have some strong opinions about the workings and the necessity for this Congress to step up and lead, as we have led, on the issue of the debt ceiling.

And I will start with this: Some weeks ago, the Secretary of the Treasury, Tim Geithner, laid out a date; and he said August 2 is a hard break deadline beyond which we can’t extend our borrowing and our spending and that

the government will not be able to pay its bills, and we will have to default on our debt. That, I think, Madam Speaker, is an irresponsible statement on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury, and we should keep in mind that his first boss is the President of the United States.

So the things that come out of the mouth of the Secretary of the Treasury often reflect the best interests of the President and perhaps are explicit or implied directive that comes from the President. And I happen to have this belief that when someone goes to work for the President, their judgment becomes what they think the President would do if he happened to be doing their job.

I have watched the transition of executive offices over the years, in places like the Governor’s office in Iowa, where I come from and have served in the Iowa Senate before I came here. I watched as the transition in the executive branch took place, and I watched as some of the people that survived the transition did so by accommodating their positions to that of their new chief executive officer, their new Governor.

I watched as the United States of America has transitioned from a George W. Bush administration to a Barack Obama administration. And I have watched as some of the survivors of that transition accommodated their positions to their new President, their new Commander in Chief. So I’m a little cynical about the knowledge base and what is declared to be the deep convictions of some of the appointees of the President.

When I hear the Secretary of the Treasury say, This August 2 date is the date beyond which we can’t go, we can’t borrow beyond that, and so we’ll have to start defaulting on our debt, why does Tim Geithner say that? I say he does because that accommodates the President’s argument that this “we’ve got to put up or shut up date” is a hard date, August 2, beyond which is a financial calamity. I don’t believe that, Madam Speaker. I don’t believe we get into a financial calamity if we go on the other side of August 2.

It may be a fairly accurate calculated date, beyond which we won’t have the borrowing capacity to continue to pay our bills on time. I think that’s probably close to August 2. I don’t know that it’s the accurate date of August 2, however. So I just caution people to think about what it really means when you hear a Cabinet official take a position and promise Americans that they can count on their word. You know, they’re sometimes falling on their sword for the President of the United States.

In fact, the Secretary of the Treasury, Tim Geithner, doesn’t give me a lot of confidence. Just a few weeks ago as he was under oath before the Small Business Committee, I asked him his opinion on several of the top economists that America and the world have

produced throughout history. A couple of those people would be Adam Smith and John Maynard Keynes. And Secretary of the Treasury Tim Geithner's response was—and I remind you, Madam Speaker, under oath—his response was, he is not an economist; therefore, he wouldn't offer an opinion on lead economists in the history of the country and the world because he's not a trained economist.

So when Tim Geithner tells us that we have a deadline of August 2 and it's a potential calamity, is he giving us an economic opinion? He refused to give an economic opinion when he was under oath. So when he's in front of the press, is that a different equation? Is he an economist or isn't he? He says he's not. If he says he's not, then should I accept his word that the Secretary of the Treasury is not an economist?

Therefore, I would have to tell you, Madam Speaker, I would discount his opinion because he's a self-professed noneconomist. And it seems as though America wants to accept the word of the Secretary of the Treasury even though he has put disclaimers out there on his own credibility multiple times. And I will just put another disclaimer out there on his own credibility by saying the President of the United States impacts the opinion of his Cabinet members and his other appointees.

So here's what the President has said, Madam Speaker, and that's this. In so many words, speaking of it, he said, I can't guarantee that the pensions of our military or that Social Security for our seniors will be paid on time. That was a statement that he made a little over a week ago. Yet I listened to that. Madam Speaker, I have to tell you that it wasn't a directly factual statement made by the President. He has to know this. He has to know the truth.

The truth is the President of the United States is the only person who can guarantee that our military pensions are paid on time, and he's the only person that can guarantee our Social Security is paid on time. He's the only person that can guarantee that the revenue stream that's coming in, which is \$200 billion a month, on average, would be used in a priority fashion to service our debt, to pay our military on time, to pay the military pensions on time, to take care of our national security interests, to pay the Social Security on time, and to pay the Medicare bills on time.

□ 1150

Take the seniors off the table, along with our military, as I have clearly advocated when I introduced the Promises Act a little over a week ago. The Promises Act pays our military first, services our debt second; goes no further than that. We did a major press conference on that issue—myself, Congressman GOHMERT, and MICHELE BACHMANN of Minnesota. We laid that principle out.

There are others that have good bills out here. TOM MCCLINTOCK has a good bill that requires that we service our debt, pay the debt on time. It's called the Full Faith and Credit Act. It's mirrored, I believe, off of that of PAT TOOMEY in the Senate. It has a good number of cosponsors.

LOUIE GOHMERT has a good bill that guarantees that our troops are paid on time every time. It doesn't go far enough. It's got a sunset date on it. It doesn't happen to include hitting a debt ceiling. It addresses the funding gap that came from the CR a few months ago, but the concept of it is good, and he's led very well on it.

DAN WEBSTER from Florida has a very good prioritization bill. His bill, and should we send it to the President and it becomes law, services the debt first. That's about \$20 billion a month. It pays the military second. That's about \$11 billion a month. And now that's \$31 billion. If you divide 31 billion by 200 billion, 31 divided by 200 works out to be 15.2 percent. So 15.2 percent of the incoming revenue stream is all that it takes to guarantee that our military is paid on time every time, and that they, in harm's way, defending our liberty with their lives on the line and sacrificing their lives from time to time, should never have to wonder if their earned paycheck is going to be transferred into their account for their family on time every time. That should be a guarantee that this Congress makes, and it should be a guarantee that lasts for all time. My bill does that.

I believe the language in DANIEL WEBSTER's bill does that as well. But, in any case, his services the debt first, pays the military second, provides that the President can direct funding into national security issues third, pays the Social Security fourth and the Medicare bills fifth. I actually think his is the best bill. I would take it and massage it and flip a couple of things within it, but I am not taking a deep objection to it, nor do I think that we wouldn't get the job done with DAN WEBSTER's bill. I think we would.

But I would like to see a prioritization bill be moved here in the House of Representatives and send it over to the Senate. We've already passed Cut, Cap, and Balance. We've said, Here's the debt ceiling increase. You send a constitutional amendment to the States so they can ratify an amendment that guarantees that this Congress would be bound to a balanced budget.

The balanced budget amendment passed here in this House in 1995, and it was messaged down that hallway to the Senate in '95. And it was brought up on the floor of the Senate with the votes counted for passage. One Senator flipped unexpectedly, and the balanced budget amendment failed on the floor of the Senate that day in '95. Had that balanced budget amendment passed, it would have been messaged to the States for ratification.

It requires three-quarters of the States to ratify a constitutional amendment, which clearly would have been the case for a balanced budget amendment. Had the States had that opportunity, I believe they would have ratified a balanced budget amendment. Had they done so, I believe, Madam Speaker, that we would not be having this discussion today. I believe that we would have enshrined in our Constitution a requirement that this Congress be bound by the same standards that most of the States are, balanced budget amendments. And if that had been the case, we would not be having this discussion. We wouldn't have this overspending. We wouldn't have more than \$3 trillion in deficit spending that's been driven by the President of the United States.

Some say Republicans are responsible, too. Republicans spent too much money, too, and in that case, I'd agree with that.

But here's the real comparison, and it's this: During the height of the Iraq war, with expenses going out in armed conflict in the Middle East, when things were going badly there, this Congress came within \$160 billion of balancing the budget. A little bit more economic activity, a little tweak here or there, and we would have seen a balanced budget in the middle of the past decade, in the middle of the Iraq war. We fell \$160 billion short. All right. I'll take that on us. We should have done a better job. We should have had enough cushion that we achieved a balanced budget. We didn't get that done.

But today, the President's deficit is \$1.65 trillion. And I no longer have to say trillion with a "t." I used to have to say billion with a "b." Sometimes people were thinking million when you said billion. But now we talk about trillions, and then the concept of we don't have to say trillion with a "t" anymore. It comes out of our mouths. We're discussing trillions of dollars.

So the President has given us a \$1.65 trillion single-year deficit, more than 10 times greater than the \$160 billion deficit that Republicans had during the height of the Iraq war. That's his responsibility, over \$3 trillion in deficit spending in two short budget years.

By the way, no budget approved by Democrats during that period of time. Nothing brought up in the Senate now. We did pass the Ryan budget. We voted on an RSC budget. I stuck with the toughest and the strongest budget that we could bring to this floor, one that balanced in less than 9 years. I'm a little embarrassed to say that. I'm a little embarrassed to say a budget that balances in less than 9 years, but it's easier to say that than it is a budget that balances in 26 years. And that's the budget that Democrats voted against because it didn't spend enough money.

The Ryan budget balances in 26 years, when my sons are ready for retirement. That's too long. I want something much shorter than that. I'd like

to find a way to balance this budget tomorrow if I could, but the price to do that would be too many calamities across this country. So we need to get there as fast as we can before the financial markets leave us. We need to get there before we become the Greece of the world. This isn't going to wait 26 years to be resolved.

And if you want to push the American economy and our credit over the edge, just adopt the ideas that come out of the Democrat side of the aisle or out of the HARRY REID majority in the Senate—the ideas that we should extend the debt ceiling without restraint; whatever the President asks for, give it to him; let him borrow and spend money—and somehow or another, the magic of Obamanomics is going to create this huge economic chain letter of spending. There's always another sucker in a chain letter, isn't there? The President believes that. He believes there's always another sucker in a chain letter. And so he wants to borrow and borrow and borrow and spend and spend and spend and take something like FDR's New Deal to the infinite power and apply it to today's economy, and somehow the magic of the consumer-driven economy will save us from our lack of discipline, and the economy will start to grow again.

I'll submit, Madam Speaker, another viewpoint on this. I think this. I think that last summer was not "recovery summer" as it was declared to be by the President of the United States. Nobody is saying this summer is "recovery summer" with 9.2 percent unemployment. I would submit instead that we have to recover from Obamanomics before we actually will be in recovery.

We may have already recovered from the downward spiral of the recession that was the financial crisis that came to us in the fall of 2008. We may have already recovered from that, but we've not recovered from Obamanomics. We've not recovered from the economic stimulus plan. We've not recovered from the \$3 trillion in unnecessary spending. We have interest. We have to service this debt.

I think there are a good number of Americans by now that have lived through this, and on the other side of this recession that we've been in, they will be learning this again, this thing that I know from experience, and it's this: If you are too highly leveraged, another loan—borrowing more money with more interest to pay and more principal to pay—doesn't sometimes help you. Sometimes when you're too highly leveraged, you just simply have to go broke and declare that you're insolvent, and now maybe you get a chance to start again.

But businesses have been beaten down, beaten down, beaten down, and along comes a natural disaster, like, for example—to inject it into this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—the natural disaster of the Missouri River floods of 2011 that go on right now. We have victims that are underwater now and that

are so far behind that a disaster loan at low interest rates over a long term doesn't help them because they won't be able to service their loan.

□ 1200

They won't have the cash flow to do it. They will just have another interest payment; they will just have another principal payment, and it weighs them down to the point where they can't recover.

This Federal Government could find itself in the same position. The Federal Government has to pay the interest; the Federal Government has to pay the principal. Who's going to pay that? The American people. It has to come out of the profits of the private sector in order for that to happen.

And when we look at the growth in government spending and government spending-created jobs when it's created from borrowed money, it's got to come from somewhere. Where does it come from? It comes from the private sector. What does the private sector produce that can be tapped and taxed by, let's say, Tim Geithner, the IRS? Well, first of all, the Federal Government taxes all productivity in America. Every single thing that's productive the Federal Government has figured out how to tax.

If you punch a time clock in the morning—let's say Monday morning, 8 o'clock, Americans by the millions step up and punch that time clock. From that instant forward, Uncle Sam has his hand out. It just comes out automatically. He hears the time clock, and his hand goes out. It's like a Pavlovian reflex that comes from Uncle Sam. There's a mystical little image of Uncle Sam there beside that time clock, and when he hears that noise, it's like Pavlov's dog. When he heard the bell ring, he salivated because he got fed when the bell rang. And when the time clock kicks in, Uncle Sam's hand goes out.

And all the money that you earn from that moment forward until he gets his fill goes into Uncle Sam's hand for that day. And some time—oh, maybe, if you're lucky, before noon—he gets enough of it that he can put his hand in his pocket and walk away for the day. Uncle Sam has taxed—he has punished, actually—your productivity because there is a disincentive to produce if the government is going to take your production from you and put it in its pocket.

Now, we don't mind sharing some of this. I mean, we go to church and provide our donations there, and Americans are very generous people when it comes to charity. There is no one more generous than Americans when it comes to that. But it is discouraging to have the Federal Government take the first dollar from the first hour and every dollar from every hour until they get all that they want. But that's what happens.

But out of that, out of that first lien on all productivity—and by the way,

Madam Speaker, it's not just those people who punch the time clock; it's those people that work on commission, too. If your commission check is, say, 10 percent of what you sell, Uncle Sam is going to get his out of that before you get your commission. You all know that. If you have earnings, savings or investment, Uncle Sam is going to get his tax out of that, too. It is a punishment for productivity.

The Federal Government taxes all productivity in America, and they tax it first. They have the first lien on all earnings, savings and investment in America. And then out of that—and by the way, that private sector that I'm talking about produces goods and services that have a marketable value here in this country and abroad. That's our export market. That's what has value. And the rest of all of this is just what supports it and what runs off of taxes on it, but you have to increase the productivity of your goods and services that have a marketable value domestically and abroad if you're going to recover from this economy.

The private sector in America has to produce those goods and services in a volume and in a competitive way adequate to recover now from Obamanomics, to recover from the more than \$3 trillion in irresponsible spending. And it has to have enough confidence that the government is not going to step in and punish that productivity and tax that productivity by increasing taxes on it or putting that heavy burden of regulation on it, and someone put out a number here a couple of weeks ago that the annual burden of regulation is something like \$1.7 trillion a year in America.

I can tell you, Madam Speaker, what it was like for me when I started a business up in 1975. I didn't have any money, I didn't have any capital, but I thought I knew how to do something that had a marketable value, and I had enough confidence to step up and do that; but my fear was, not that I couldn't do the work or that I couldn't market, sell my skills or that I couldn't manage the books or fix the equipment or get it moved to the location or do the job, do all the things that were part of the function of the business that I started.

My fear was that the government would come in and punish me in a way that I didn't expect, that the government would come in and maybe do an IRS audit at a time that—we all feared the IRS then. I think we do now. That happened. It happened over and over again. It looked like the IRS wanted to haunt me there for a while. And to this day, I don't think that I did anything other than comply with all of those laws. I was punished anyway.

Another fear I had was: What about government regulation? How could I possibly know which government regulator would come swooping in on me and shut my business down and punish me with penalties that I couldn't anticipate? Fortunately, I was never really at that point where the regulators

came in and shut me down in that fashion, but many businesses have been. The weight of this regulation—if that's the number, \$1.7 trillion a year—is a tremendous amount of American capital that is consumed in trying to comply with regulators.

I would pose this question, Madam Speaker: Out of the millions of businesses that there are, let's just say, does anyone know of a single business in America that has ever uttered a statement or put up on their Web site or printed a business card that would say words to the effect of: "We are in compliance with all government regulations"? Can anybody think of a single business that has made such a statement or taken such a stand? I'd say not.

Now, I ask that question because it is a good question that calls us to examine why it is that no business claims that they're complying with all government regulations. The reason is because it's impossible, Madam Speaker.

Years ago, I had a task of doing seminars in five different States at State conventions. And one of the things that I began to do was ask my colleagues who were in similar business—and these were self-employed people. Most of them started the businesses themselves. Sometimes they were second- and third-generation businesses as King Construction is today, a second-generation business.

But I would ask the question, How many agencies regulate our trade, Earth-moving business? How many agencies regulate our trade? And so they would say, well, the EPA does and the DNR does and the IRS does and the DOT does and the tax man does. And as we began writing that down on a—it was a chalkboard in those days—we came to this conclusion that we were directly regulated by 43 different agencies. So I would begin to ask the question—in a closed room, no press—are you in compliance with these EPA regulations? And then we would have a long discussion about how hard it was.

And they were never comfortable, even back then in the eighties, that they were in compliance with the EPA regulations, because they could always be read in a different way by the next generation of environmental extremists that would get a job. Where would you go? What if you're genetically born to be an environmental extremist? Where would you look for a job? The EPA. And wouldn't you think that you had a cause that was as worthy as the cause of your father or your mother, who advanced the Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act and a number of the other environmental legislation that passed through here without a lot of restraint in the seventies, and had some justification then, and did clean up our waters and our sewers and our landfills and continue to do so to this day?

They had a cause. They were on a crusade of environmental clean-up back in the seventies, and now their

children have jobs working for the EPA, and they have a belief and a conviction and a crusade that is as powerful to them as it was to their parents or their successors, the earlier generation.

But we've cleaned up the environment a lot since the seventies. Most people now enjoy clean water and good sanitary sewer systems and a pretty good system of handling the waste that comes out of society. But the people that are involved as regulators don't see it that way because they have a cause, and now they think they need to trudge forward on a cause. They will never be satisfied because that's what they do.

So regulations are never going to be all complied with; they keep changing the rules as you go forward. Now they want to regulate anybody that has a 1,000-gallon fuel tank, that it has to have a storage levee or dike built around it or some type of a structural containment for that, as if there's going to be a spill in every location and it can't be cleaned up. Well, we know they can be cleaned up. We don't have a problem, but they have a solution for us regardless. That's just the EPA. And we can go on down the line.

Is anybody in compliance with every IRS opinion?

□ 1210

The old story goes this way. If you want an argument, just ask two lawyers their opinion. Well, if you want an argument, just ask two representatives of the IRS their opinion and you will get two different opinions, almost as a rule. Anything that's halfway contentious, you'll get two different opinions, which means no one can be confident they are in compliance with the IRS rules because the rules aren't clear enough. Even the people who enforce them can't agree what they are. We can go on down the line.

In my State, the Department of Natural Resources, they do enforce the EPA rules. There are conflicting opinions there, and the conflicting opinions go on and on and on. But, Madam Speaker, it's not just 43 agencies. Those are the 43 that we identified that regulated my trade back in the 1980s. Now there's a Web site called Constitution Daily that counted these all up a couple of years ago, and they came up with 682 different agencies. Now, I'll admit, these are departments and divisions of agencies, but 682 entities that regulate in America—682. No one person could memorize them all. It's impossible to know all of the regulations that they have written.

We have ObamaCare now coming at us, grinding up and consuming American liberty. And what do we get out of that? 2,600 pages of legislation, and the regulations at this point have reached over 8,700 pages of regulations just on ObamaCare. And we saw here the other day that the CEO of Home Depot said he believes that ObamaCare, itself, will generate over 150,000 pages of regulation.

Now, it makes it real clear, even if you are a huge, huge corporation, you cannot analyze all of this and be sure that you are in compliance with regulations. So what do businesses do? One is they don't start up because of fear of all of this. Who in their right mind would start up a business right now that employed 51 people, for starters? They would be under the requirement to establish the health insurance plan that the government would approve for every one of their employees. So instead, they sit on their capital and they don't invest, and part of it is the tax burden.

Another thing we know is if this Congress doesn't act between now and the end of 2012, we will see a huge tax increase. That was part of the negotiations last fall that bridged us over until we get past another Presidential election. So we have a huge tax increase ahead of us when the Bush brackets expire, and it triggers back in all of those brackets—all of that going on—while there is \$23.6 billion that is automatically appropriated, that \$23.6 billion of the \$105.5 billion that is automatically appropriated, and I say deceptively appropriated in ObamaCare, itself.

So we have ObamaCare regulations going in place. The roots of ObamaCare are going down. The American people are starting to think that we don't have the determination here in this House to repeal ObamaCare.

I come here, Madam Speaker, to remind you and anybody that might be listening to this deliberation here on the floor of the House that this House has passed the repeal of ObamaCare. Every Republican voted to repeal ObamaCare. We sent it over to the Senate. The Senate also held a vote, and every Republican in the Senate voted to repeal ObamaCare. However, they didn't pass the repeal in the Senate, and so the repeal failed. Well, that had something to do with the President, who has a lot of belief in his signature piece of legislation. His future and his destiny are wrapped up in ObamaCare.

However, we know that the American people have said that they want all of ObamaCare ripped out by the roots. They want it gone, lock, stock, and barrel, with not one shred, not one DNA particle of ObamaCare left behind. The American people understand that ObamaCare is a malignant tumor that is metastasizing and consuming the liberty of the American people, and it must be repealed. This House is resolute in their repealing of ObamaCare.

We have also passed out of this House with a significant majority the legislation that cuts off all funding that would be used to enforce or implement ObamaCare. We did that as a part of the CR that came out of here that finally the President signed. They stripped the funding out of it and voted it out in the Senate at the direction of HARRY REID.

So, Madam Speaker, this House is resolute. The American people are resolute. And I will make this prediction

that I think needs to be understood, and that is this: If President Obama is reelected in 2012, that will guarantee that all of ObamaCare will be implemented and enforced. That operation of its implementation will be completed by 2014. That's kind of the schedule that it's on now. If the President is reelected, we get ObamaCare as the law of the land in perpetuity.

If he is not and we elect another President, a different President, that will be on the foundation that we will repeal ObamaCare under the signature of the next President of the United States.

I see that the Speaker of the House has arrived on the floor, and I'd be happy to yield to whatever cause that might be.

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there is a huge gulf between Washington, D.C., and the American people. They are dealing with tough times. They're struggling to pay their bills. They look to Washington, and they see politicians who can't stop spending money, their money.

Listen, we're broke, and we need to stop the out-of-control spending spree that's going on in Washington, D.C.

The House has acted. We passed a bill that raised the debt limit, cuts spending, puts real reforms in place, and requires that Congress send to the States a balanced budget amendment. It's called Cut, Cap, and Balance. We've done our job.

The Democrats who run Washington have done nothing. They can't stop spending the American people's money. They won't, and they have refused. The Senate majority leader says that they won't offer a plan to cut spending or a plan to raise the debt limit. Frankly, that's irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, where is their plan?

President Obama talks about being the adult in the room. Where is his plan to cut spending and raise the debt limit?

Listen, we're in the fourth quarter here. We're fighting for jobs; we're fighting for the country's future, and we're fighting for the American people.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARDNER). The gentleman has approximately 12 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am very happy that the Speaker arrived on the floor to make that point. The point is this: We have passed Cut, Cap, and Balance. We have done our job. Now the challenge is for the United States Senate and the President of the United States to do their job.

I would prefer they just accept the model that has been messaged down that hallway over to the Senate, and I'd prefer that the President would endorse that and step up in the next few minutes and say let's get this done. This can be done in a very short period

of time. All we have to do is agree. Instead, the President and the Democrats in the majority in the Senate seem to want to insist upon tax increases being part of any package that might come through.

Well, this goose that lays the golden egg is the free enterprise private sector goose. This goose has to live off of some profits, and they have to have profit in order to have jobs.

I would add to the Speaker's statement the question about it has been about jobs. We've done our job. This is about jobs. But I think we fail to remind the American people that wages are what pay for jobs. Nobody is going to say, I have a job, but it doesn't pay. The money has to come from somewhere. Where does it come from?

That needs to be stated and restated that the money for wages that pays for jobs has to come out of profit. Nobody can operate at a loss, so companies have to make some money. If they don't have an opportunity to do so because of the burden of taxes or because of the burden of regulation or the burden of the indecision in not knowing what the government is going to do next, which keeps a lot of that capital on the sidelines, they are not going to expand or do new hires. In fact, they're not going to provide wages and benefit packages of increases unless they have profit.

□ 1220

So I'm one of those people that thinks I want businesses to make money. I want them to make money, and I want them to expand the jobs, and I want them to invest the money with confidence they can make more. If it goes to their head too far and they become too vertically integrated or too monopolistic, then it's up to the entrepreneurs out there to take a look and say, I think I can gather the capital together and compete against them and provide a good or a service that has a better value—and make money doing it. And in doing so, that profit turns into jobs.

I am one who has met payroll for over 1,440 consecutive weeks. I made it every week on time. There were times that we didn't do very well in our household because I paid me last. I paid the employees first because they're the frontline troops. I paid the interest at the bank second because I had to have the capital to operate. You set those priorities when you go through those things. But jobs come from profit. And let's have a scenario that allows businesses to invest and to have confidence in the future. And Cut, Cap, and Balance does lay out the right scenario.

I know that Speaker BOEHNER has been concerned about hitting this August 2 deadline that I think is not as hard a deadline as Tim Geithner believes it is. I think the Secretary of the Treasury is carrying water for the President of the United States and putting statements out there. I think the President of the United States is willfully scaring seniors.

I think he's doing so when he says that he can't guarantee that military pensions or Social Security would be paid on time. Mr. Speaker, yes, they can. The only person on the planet that can guarantee they would be paid on time is the President of the United States. So you couldn't be any more wrong than when he says he can't guarantee it. Yes, he can. Does he know this truth? Can he not understand his job? He seems to exert his power where it doesn't exist. Doesn't he know that he can exert his power where it does exist?

I'll just tell this anecdote that was part of a political commercial, and I'll let people draw their own conclusions on this. Back in 1996, when Bill Clinton was up for reelection, there was a commercial that was run, and it was the face and voice of—a lot of us think of him as Moses since he passed away—Charlton Heston. He looked into the camera, and he was speaking presumably to President Clinton when he said, Mr. President, when you say something that's wrong and you don't know that it's wrong, that's a mistake. But when you say something that's wrong and you know that it's wrong, that's a lie. That was what Charlton Heston said back in 1996.

I reflect upon those words today, and I make this point that I know the truth. The American people need to know the truth. And that truth is the President of the United States can set the priorities on how to spend the \$200 billion a month on average that comes in in revenue stream. All he has to do is step outside the Oval Office, step up to the microphones in the East Room or outside in this nice, beautiful, warm summertime we have in Washington, D.C., and say, I'm going to set those priorities.

If we can't make a deal with Speaker BOEHNER, who was just here on the floor, and with HARRY REID and MITCH MCCONNELL and all the folks that have to vote in the Senate—and by the way, the people that have to vote here in the House—if we can't make a deal, here's what I'd do. The President could do this in the next minute. I'm going to make sure our troops get paid first—on time every time. He can say that. He can say, And right behind that \$11 billion a month comes \$20 billion a month out of the funding stream we have. Whether we borrow or not, I'm going to guarantee that we service our debt, \$20 billion. And then, I want to make sure to take care of the national security issues. Those things will change, but I'll work those priorities. Right behind that we'll pay Social Security, and right behind that we'll pay Medicare.

If the President stood up and said that, we would have confidence that he isn't going to be in the business of scaring seniors or putting doubt into the minds of our military while they are dodging bullets in places like Afghanistan. We would have confidence. But instead, he says he can't guarantee. Mr. Speaker, we know he can.

We know he can guarantee. We should push that on him out of this House to let him know where we stand so the American people understand there is a moral standard here. One is: Tell the truth. The second moral standard is: Pay our military. The third moral standard is: Guarantee the full faith and credit of the United States Government. I've laid out the rest of these priorities, Mr. Speaker.

Cut, Cap, and Balance is an important position to stand on. This leverage that's here now must be used or we shirk our responsibility. Had the leverage been stronger back in 1995, that extra vote in the Senate that I spoke about some minutes ago would have been there, I believe. I believe the balanced budget amendment would have been sent to the States, and I believe the States would have ratified it. If that had been part of the Constitution the day I came here in January of 2003, I wouldn't have had to walk around on this floor and go find the chairman of the Budget Committee and say, Where's our balanced budget? And I wouldn't have gotten the answer back that I did get that day, We can't balance the budget. It's too hard. Well, if it was too hard in January of 2003, how hard is it now? It is a lot harder.

Yes, we can balance the budget. The States do that. The question becomes: When we send a balanced budget amendment to the States, do they ratify it? A lot of them would right away. Some of them would hold a special session to ratify a balanced budget to send that message as quickly as possible. But then you get out there to some of those States that have decided that they want to do irresponsible spending. California and Illinois come to mind. A lot of States went to austerity. They decided, We're going to borrow money, and we're going to ask the Federal Government to bail us out. In those States, if they're needed for ratification, there will have to be a changing of the political guard within their State legislatures. That means constitutional conservatives will step up, step out of their normal walk of life, advance themselves as candidates to run for State legislatures on the agenda of: I will go there, and I will push to ratify a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget. Those candidates that stand on that position will be elected in significant numbers in the States where they're needed. And over a period of time we have a chance that the State legislatures would ratify—three-quarters of them—a balanced budget amendment. If that happens, it would be a wonderful gift for our posterity. It would be one of the best things that we could do in a generation, Mr. Speaker. And I urge that the American people weigh in on this and demand that the Senate and the President embrace Cut, Cap, and Balance.

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

BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There are a lot of things going on right now. One of them should be the business of the country. This body this week passed what many have said was truly historic. A truly historic bill passed the House of Representatives. It was not exactly what I wanted. I thought there was too much in it in the way of debt ceiling increase. I thought there was not enough in the way of budget cuts.

But what we found in the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill was that it included a provision that, before the debt ceiling would ever be increased again, we would have to have a constitutional amendment pass the House of Representatives with two-thirds and pass the Senate with two-thirds, which would not send it to the President for him to veto, as apparently he wants to do, but it would send it to the States directly. There's no provision for the President to sign a constitutional amendment after it passes the House and Senate with two-thirds of the vote. It goes to the States. If three-fourths ratify it, it's a part of the Constitution.

□ 1230

But in order to get the debt ceiling raised, we would have to have a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution pass the two-thirds in the House and Senate. That seemed like an appropriate thing to do because, as many of us have said, the only way we're voting for a debt ceiling increase is if there is a real game changer as part of that that we can't get any other way that will set this country on the course to being fully fiscally responsible.

One of the reasons so many of us on both sides of the aisle ran for Congress was to come try to make sure that the liberties and the opportunities that we had growing up would be available to future generations. The only reason that I was born in the greatest country in the history of mankind was because prior generations did smart things, did things that the Bible would say are blessed things. They did things that caused future generations to be blessed. It wasn't because I deserved it. I'd done nothing in my mother's womb to deserve to have the liberties and opportunities I'd had, but it was because prior generations sacrificed. So many laid down their lives so that we would have these opportunities.

So we have an open process.

It's supposed to be.

We've got people in the gallery, Mr. Speaker. We've got people who are free to come to the U.S. Capitol because we're in the people's House right now. There are people across Capitol Hill—

Members who have their televisions on. People don't come to the floor like they once did to listen to speeches here, because they can sit in the comfort of their own offices and do other work and have C-SPAN on and listen. That has been going on for 30 years, and it has been a helpful thing. You can see what's going on on the floor and not just around Capitol Hill but all over the country. Most of us came here to try to make sure that those same opportunities are afforded to others.

There are a lot of different motivations, a lot of noble motivations for running for Congress, but I think most of us came here for that purpose. We disagree on the way to do it, but it is shocking that there could be so much disagreement over the absolute historic, unwavering principle that any nation that continually spends more than it brings into its government will cease to exist as a government. There is no historic element contrary to that. You can't find it. If a country, if a government, keeps spending more than it brings in, it is going to cease to exist.

The only question remains: When does that happen?

There are movements around the world to try to end the dollar as being the world's reserve currency. When that happens, the dollar is going to fall farther than it ever has, and it may not recover. That's why I think some countries want to see that happen. That's probably why George Soros wants to see that happen. We also are told that our rating of our indebtedness, our bonds, may be downgraded if we don't get our indebtedness under control. It only makes sense that that would happen if we don't get our spending under control.

It should be a no-brainer, but apparently that is a malady that exists here in Washington. Under the rules of the House of Representatives, I certainly can't say that there is anybody in the House or Senate who has no brain. We know, biologically, you have to have a brain, but it is possible that you can have a brain and not use it fully. I don't know how you explain the vote that took place right through that door and down that hall at the end of the Senate today. I don't know how to explain that. It's not that the Senate today had too much work to get done or too many bills to take up that they just didn't have time to try to save the country from ceasing to exist because it can't stop spending.

So it wasn't because there are too many other bills to take up. They have no bill to deal with the financial issues of this country. There is no bill down there that is going to be brought to the floor that will save this country from its own government's stupidity. According to the House rules, it's not that there is anybody stupid here in the House and Senate, but as a group, sometimes we do very stupid things. I would submit that what has happened today, from an historic standpoint, is a statement that, although nobody in a

body, according to the House rules, is stupid, a body can do a stupid thing.

So, even though there are no other bills being brought to the Senate floor to take up and vote on today, even though there are bills that have been filed to take care of this very issue, there is a Cut, Cap, and Balance bill in the Senate that has been filed to address this issue. Many have signed onto bills that will address these issues. They're down there, but they're not bringing them to the floor. There's not an overwhelming amount of work to be done on the Senate floor today, so they bring up the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill—not for debate.

Why would anybody be afraid of debating a bill that so many believe could help us save the country for future generations? Why would you be afraid to bring that up?

If you don't want to talk about it, if you don't want to have a debate on the House or the Senate floor on some bill that so many believe will help us save the country for future generations, you make a procedural move called a "motion to table," and that is what happened in the Senate today.

What courage that took.

It must have taken a lot of courage, and I'm not kidding about that when you know that there are so many people in the Senate body who want to talk about a game changer, who want to talk about what they believe with all their hearts could set us on a course to fiscal responsibility, that could save the country for future generations. You know all those people wanted to talk about it. It takes a lot of courage to stand up and say, "I move to table that bill." Now, I don't know what the motivation is that would cause someone to stand up and say, "I move to table. I second that." I don't know. I don't know why you would move to table.

I don't know the motivation, but I know it takes courage when right at half of the 100 people in the Senate want to take this bill up and talk about it and debate it and maybe amend it—because I would love to amend it. I would love to knock down the \$2.4 trillion in debt ceiling increase. I'd love to raise the amount of cuts. There are a number of things I'd like to tighten up in that bill, but it was the best bill we had available. What a great idea. Bring it to the floor. Let's talk about it. Let's amend it. Let's get it done.

The thing is, when you're in the majority of the House or the Senate and if you don't like a bill and if you bring it to the floor on an open rule, you can amend it on the floor. You can have the debate on whether or not it ought to be amended. We just went through that, and we voted for and against a lot of different amendments this week, many of which I didn't think we necessarily needed to vote on, but that's part of the process.

Why would anyone in the Senate be afraid of having that process on the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill?

I don't get it.

I know it took courage to move to table when all the polls show America is concerned about its future. Poll after poll shows that American adults in around the 70 percentage area believe that the next generation will not have the opportunities that our generation had. You know those feelings are out there in America. You know that there is a group that wants to change the way we do business in Washington, so we have to live within the amount of money that comes in and not spend more than that. You know that feeling is out there. You know that this is a bill that could change the way we do business.

Why wouldn't you want to even allow it to the Senate floor to talk about it?

It took courage to move to table. Here are the courageous Senators who voted to table, which means to prevent debate on the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill in the Senate. It truly took courage for these people in the face of 60, 70—some have indicated 80—but 60, 70 percent of America that wants us to get our financial house in order. There is a bill that will mandate that we do that. So it takes courage to prevent that bill from coming to the floor, not for a vote on the bill, but just to debate the bill, to talk about it in front of God and everybody on the Senate floor. It took courage.

□ 1240

I don't know the motivation for all of these people voting to prevent debate and prevent the bill from coming to the floor. I just know that these people had courage to prevent what the majority of the American people believe needs to be discussed and debated and voted on.

And these are the Senators with that courage to prevent what the majority of the American people wanted done:

From Hawaii, Senator AKAKA; from Montana, Senator BAUCUS; and from Alaska, Senator BEGICH; from Colorado, Senator BENNET; from New Mexico, Senator BINGAMAN; from Connecticut, Senator BLUMENTHAL; from California, Senator BOXER; from Ohio, Senator BROWN; Washington State, Senator CANTWELL; from Maryland, Senator CARDIN; from Delaware, Senator CARPER; from Pennsylvania, Senator CASEY; from North Dakota, Senator CONRAD; from Delaware, Senator COONS; from Illinois, Senator DURBIN; from California, Senator FEINSTEIN; from Minnesota, Senator FRANKEN.

And then these are the people who had the courage to say: We will not allow the debate on the floor of the Senate that might lead to a balanced budget amendment being passed. We're not going to allow that to come to the Senate floor.

So let me go through the remainder of the Senators.

Senator HAGAN from North Carolina, Senator HARKIN from the State of Iowa, Senator INOUE from Hawaii, Senator JOHNSON from South Dakota, Senator KLOBUCHAR from Minnesota,

Senator KOHL from Wisconsin, Senator LANDRIEU from Louisiana, Senator LAUTENBERG from New Jersey, Senator LEAHY from Vermont, Senator LEVIN from Michigan, Senator LIEBERMAN from Connecticut, Senator MANCHIN from West Virginia, Senator McCASKILL from Missouri, Senator MENENDEZ from New Jersey, Senator MERKLEY from Oregon, Senator MIKULSKI from Maryland, Senator MURRAY from Washington.

And again, I attribute nothing but courage to these people for voting to prevent what a vast majority of American people want to have debated on the Senate floor. They were able to have the courage to say: We're not going to allow debate. We're not going to allow the chance that you might get this bill passed that could save America for future generations.

Further courageous Senators: Senator NELSON from Florida, Senator NELSON from Nebraska, Senator PRYOR from Arkansas, Senator REED from Rhode Island, Senator REID from Nevada, Senator ROCKEFELLER from West Virginia, Senator SANDERS from Vermont, Senator SCHUMER from New York, Senator SHAHEEN from New Hampshire, Senator STABENOW from Michigan, Senator TESTER from Montana, Senator UDALL from Colorado, Senator UDALL from New Mexico, Senator WARNER from Virginia, Senator WEBB from Virginia, Senator WHITEHOUSE from Rhode Island, and Senator WYDEN from Oregon.

It took a lot of courage to take a stand and vote in the Senate that: we will not allow debate on this floor over a balanced budget amendment. We're not going to allow it despite the vast majority of Americans knowing that we have to get our fiscal house in order, knowing that a balanced budget amendment would force this body and the Senate body to do just that, knowing that that would prevent the White House from ever demanding that we spend \$3.8 trillion when we're only bringing in \$2.1 or \$2.2 trillion, knowing that it would force Congress and the government to live within their means. They had the courage to stand up and say: We're not going to allow that debate. We're not going to allow the risk that you might pass a bill that forces us to be fiscally responsible. It took a courageous stand, and they stood and took that stand.

Now, to have the President of the United States stand before the American public and say, I can't guarantee that seniors will get their Social Security checks, just requires a little bit of research to find out that apparently the President, just like all of us in Congress, we rely on our staffs; we rely on those around us to get us information so that we can speak truthfully from the information we glean for ourselves that our staffs help us gather.

That tells you, though, that whoever is helping the President is not giving him truthful, accurate information because the fact is the President is the

only person in this country who can guarantee that Social Security checks will go out just as the law requires. I can guarantee that the money is there and that it will be good even if this Congress does nothing for 3 years. Even if everything else falls apart, we can guarantee that the Social Security trust fund has, right now, \$2.6 trillion in treasury notes in the Social Security trust fund that can be converted to cash, that can, by law, only be used for Social Security benefits and expenses.

So, the only reason that I or anyone else here in the House could not absolutely unforeseen guarantee that seniors will get their Social Security checks is because there is one element that could prevent that on the 2nd or 3rd of August, and that's if the President or Timothy Geithner ordered that checks would not go out, knowing—well, I don't know if the President knows. He may not have been given accurate information. I know Timothy Geithner knows that there is \$2.6 trillion in the Social Security trust fund, that in 1985 there was a shortfall, and there was not enough cash to pay Social Security payments, and so they sold some of the treasury notes to get cash to make sure all of the Social Security checks were paid. 1985.

Some were apparently concerned that might not have been legal. So in 1996, a Republican majority in Congress passed a law that basically says, hey, if there is a shortfall some month, then since there are trillions of dollars in the treasury notes in the Social Security trust fund, the administration can sell those treasury notes, just enough to make up the shortfall and assure that Social Security checks will go out. They made that a matter of law so that the administration may do that.

What I've been proposing that we should make as a part of a prioritization bill that passed—we bring before the House and pass it, bring before the Senate, and these same courageous people would probably table that, too, but it would say not that Social Security is a group of bills with others that must be paid, because by law Social Security is separate. By law, it is paid with Social Security payroll taxes; and by law, if there's not enough cash to do that some month, you may take the treasury notes and sell just enough to make up that shortfall.

Since the United States bonds and treasury notes are still about the most desirable financial bond note to be purchased in the world, especially when you look at the alternatives—Greece, Portugal, Spain, France—not a lot of good choices. So they're buying our notes, and they would. That would continue at least until we quit paying our bills properly.

□ 1250

But I think the law ought to be changed to say not “may” but “must,” so that in the future no President could ever go before the American pub-

lic and say, “I can't guarantee Social Security checks won't go out,” because he is the one person in America that is the only person in America, he and his Secretary of the Treasury, that can stop them from going out, and if we make that “may” a “must” or a “shall,” then he has no option. Then we can guarantee that Social Security checks will not be interrupted, because then we would know that the President has no option. He cannot interrupt the money that is there from going to Social Security recipients. It has to go, or he violates the law, and that could be grounds, if he stepped in—heck, if he stepped in even now and said, “look, the money's there in the trust fund, but I want to make a political issue out of this and I need a crisis in order to do that, so I'm going to step in and prevent the Social Security checks from going out this month,” there would have to be action taken against the President. That is just irresponsible. I think it's totally inappropriate for a President to scare our seniors.

I also think it's totally inappropriate to scare our military, and that's why I've been pushing for months a bill to ensure that people in harm's way never have to have it cross their mind that their check may not go home to their families. They should never have to have that cross their mind, never have it be a thought. I thought about that a month or so ago as I accompanied the body of one of our heroes from New York to Gladewater, Texas. The family, the military member, should never have to worry that their check won't be there. If there is a shutdown, if the government decides, we've got money here, but we're not going to pay our bills, well, we ought to make sure that a number of things get done.

We keep being told that, gee, what if we default? There is absolutely, unequivocally no reason we would default on our debt unless for some strange reason the President and the Treasury Secretary, either/or, decide that they want to create and instigate such a financial crisis that they get whatever they want. That's the only reason there would be a default.

As Steve Moore from the Wall Street Journal said yesterday, there's nothing that magic about August 2. There is no way that the President or Tim Geithner would be insane enough not to pay what we owe as it comes due. It's one thing for Secretary Geithner not to pay his taxes for 4 years in a row. It's quite another to put a nation at risk by refusing to send out the payments for the debts as they come due for the U.S.

It should also be noted that there are hundreds of billions of dollars that the United States owes to the United States. So if the United States doesn't pay itself, what are we going to do—send out a notice that the United States didn't pay the United States, so we're deadbeats now? I mean, come on. There is so much political gamesmanship going on, and we were sent here to

deal with the critical issues of this country, and being financially responsible is one of those things.

Now, I doubt that very many people actually look at the back of their dollar bills, and I know they're having more and more trouble getting those dollar bills; but if you look at the back of the dollar bills, on either side, you see the two sides of the United States great seal that was adopted initially in the first version around the time of the revolution. The eagle has changed a little bit over the centuries but was basically this by 1790.

Some people think that “e pluribus unum,” which is on the light fixture up here, Latin meaning “out of many, one,” come from all over the world and come to America, we become one people, we speak one language, we become one people, “e pluribus unum.” Some think that's the national motto. It's not. It's part of the great seal and has been since the Revolution. “E pluribus unum” is on the ribbon that runs through the eagle's mouth.

You've got 13 stars that cause us to remember the 13 original States.

You've got a pyramid symbolizing this masterful, huge work, and above the pyramid is an eye in a triangle with a glow around it. The eye was put in the great seal back in the 1700s to symbolize the eye of God, the all-seeing eye of God. It's why there's the halo, the glow, around it. And above those words in Latin are the words “annuit coeptis.” They're also above one of the doors in the Senate, so that every Senator can look up, and if they know what the Latin means, they should be deeply touched and should be reminded of how important our job is, because “annuit coeptis” on the back of every dollar bill everywhere in America means this: He, God, has smiled on our undertaking.

The reason that the Senate desired to have “annuit coeptis” above one of the doors is so Senators would be reminded that at this country's inception, He, God, smiled on our undertaking. I can't help but wonder, today, as the all-seeing eye of God symbolized here looks at what is going on with our financial responsibility and our refusal to even debate becoming financially responsible in the Senate, if He, God, continues to smile on our undertaking.

Some bank, for a joke at one time, had said, “In God we trust. From all others, we accept cash.” In God We Trust is our national motto. And as I mentioned to Prime Minister Netanyahu as he came down the aisle before he took the podium here and spoke recently, I said, “Keep in mind the entire time you're addressing us, our national motto is above your head.” He said, “I had already thought about that.”

Everybody in this body ought to think about it. Our trust is in God, but does He have any trust in us after what has been done, spending so much more than the amount we've been entrusted with as stewards? We've got to do better.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

□ 1300

To close, I want to finish with a short prayer that was prayed by the U.S. Senate Chaplain in the 1940s, Peter Marshall:

“May our prayer, O Christ, awaken all Thy human reminiscences, that we may feel in our hearts the sympathizing Jesus. Thou hast walked this earthly vale and hast not forgotten what it is to be tired, what it is to know aching muscles, as Thou didst work long hours at the carpenter’s bench. Thou hast not forgotten what it is to feel the sharp stabs of pain, or hunger or thirst. Thou knowest what it is to be forgotten, to be lonely. Thou dost remember the feel of hot and scalding tears running down Thy cheeks.

“O, we thank Thee that Thou wert willing to come to Earth and share with us the weaknesses of the flesh, for now we know that Thou dost understand all that we are ever called upon to bear. We know that Thou, our God, art still able to do more than we ask or expect. So bless us, each one, not according to our deserving, but according to the riches in glory of Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.”

From the Senate history.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from improper references to the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of family reasons.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o’clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 25, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Gary L. Ackerman, Sandy Adams, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Rodney Alex-

ander, Jason Altmire, Justin Amash, Robert E. Andrews, Steve Austria, Joe Baca, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Tammy Baldwin, Lou Barletta, John Barrow, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Charles F. Bass, Karen Bass, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Rick Berg, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Judy Biggert, Brian P. Bilbray, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Jo Bonner, Mary Bono Mack, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Dan Boren, Leonard L. Boswell, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bruce L. Braley, Mo Brooks, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Vern Buchanan, Larry Bucshon, Ann Marie Buerkle, Michael C. Burgess, Dan Burton, G. K. Butterfield, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Francisco “Quico” Canseco, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Dennis A. Cardoza, Russ Carnahan, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, John R. Carter, Bill Cassidy, Kathy Castor, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Ben Chandler, Donna M. Christensen, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Hansen Clarke, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. “Gerry” Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Jerry F. Costello, Joe Courtney, Chip Cravaack, Eric A. “Rick” Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Mark S. Critz, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Danny K. Davis, Geoff Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, Rosa L. DeLauro, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Robert J. Dold, Joe Donnelly, Michael F. Doyle, David Dreier, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Bob Filner, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Jeff Flake, Charles J. “Chuck” Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Virginia Foxx, Barney Frank, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Elton Gallegly, John Garamendi, Cory Gardner, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Gabrielle Giffords, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Charles A. Gonzalez, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Al Green, Gene Green, Tim Griffin, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Michael G. Grimm, Frank C. Guinta, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutierrez, Janice Hahn, Ralph M. Hall, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Richard L. Hanna, Jane Harman*, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Nan A. S. Hayworth, Joseph J. Heck, Martin Heinrich, Dean Heller*, Jeb Hensarling, Wally Herger, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Brian Higgins, James A. Himes, Maurice D. Hinchey, Rubén Hinojosa, Mazie Hirono, Kathleen C. Hochul, Tim Holden, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Tim Huelskamp, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Robert Hurt, Jay Inslee, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Sheila Jackson Lee, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. “Hank” Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, Timothy V. Johnson, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, Marcy Kaptur, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Dale E. Kildee, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Adam Kinzinger, Larry Kissell, John Kline, Raúl R. Labrador, Doug Lam-

born, Leonard Lance, Jeffrey M. Landry, James R. Langevin, James Lankford, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, Robert E. Latta, Barbara Lee, Christopher J. Lee*, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Lujan, Cynthia M. Lummis, Daniel E. Lungren, Stephen F. Lynch, Connie Mack, Carolyn B. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Edward J. Markey, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Kevin McCarthy, Carolyn McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, Thaddeus G. McCotter, Jim McDermott, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. “Buck” McKeon, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNERney, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Brad Miller, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, George Miller, Jeff Miller, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, Mick Mulvaney, Christopher S. Murphy, Tim Murphy, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Kristi L. Noem, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee, Pete Olson, John W. Olver, William L. Owens, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Ron Paul, Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Ed Perlmutter, Gary C. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Joseph R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platts, Ted Poe, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Benjamin Quayle, Mike Quigley, Nick J. Rahall II, Charles B. Rangel, Tom Reed, Denny Rehberg, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Silvestre Reyes, Reid J. Ribble, Laura Richardson, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, David Rivera, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Peter J. Roskam, Dennis Ross, Mike Ross, Steven R. Rothman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Jon Runyan, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Robert T. Schilling, Jean Schmidt, Aaron Schock, Kurt Schrader, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. “Bobby” Scott, Tim Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Heath Shuler, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar Smith, Steve Southerland, Jackie Speier, Cliff Stearns, Steve Stivers, Marlin A. Stutzman, John Sullivan, Betty Sutton, Lee Terry, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Scott Tipton, Paul Tonko, Edolphus Towns, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, Chris Van Hollen, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Joe Walsh, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Daniel Webster, Anthony D. Weiner, Peter Welch, Allen B. West, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Frederica Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Frank R. Wolf, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, Lynn C. Woolsey, David Wu, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, C.W. Bill Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2585. A letter from the Planning and Regulatory Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC): Exclusion of Combat Pay From WIC Income Eligibility Determinations (RIN: 0584-AE04) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2586. A letter from the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Child and Adult Care Food Program Improving Management and Program Integrity (RIN: 0584-AC24) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2587. A letter from the Deputy Director for Policy, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2588. A letter from the Chief, Competition Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rules and Regulations Implementing the Truth in Caller ID Act of 2009 [WC Docket No. 11-39] received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2589. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive/Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-53; Introduction [Docket FAR 2011-0076, Sequence 5] received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2590. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive/Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Equal Opportunity for Veterans [FAC 2005-53; FAR Case 2009-007; Item I; Docket 2010-0101, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AL67) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2591. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive/Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Unique Procurement Instrument Identifier [FAC 2005-53; FAR Case 2009-023; Item II; Docket 2010-0094, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AL70) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2592. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive/Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; TINA Interest Calculations [FAC 2005-53; FAR Case 2009-034; Item VI; Docket 2010-0098, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AL73) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2593. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reorganization of Title 30, Code of Federal Regulations [Docket No. ONRR-2011-0015] (RIN: 10112-AA06) received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2594. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulation Division, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Adjustment of Civil Money Penalty Amount for Inflation [Docket No. FR-5490-F-01] (RIN: 2501-AD02) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under Clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1938. A bill to direct the President to expedite the consideration and approval of the construction and operation of the Keystone XL oil pipeline, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-140, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Ms. FOX: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2117. A bill to prohibit the Department of Education from overreaching into academic affairs and program eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; with an amendment (Rept. 112-177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HUNTER: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2218. A bill to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; with an amendment (Rept. 112-178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 2623. A bill to establish a National Commission to Review the National Response Since the Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 2624. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for qualified tuition and related expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2625. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to human subject research to improve protections for human subjects and, where appropriate because of the type research involved, to reduce regulatory burdens; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2626. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain high-performance loudspeakers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2627. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty certain electrical transformers rated at 40VA; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself,

Mr. TURNER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. RIGELL):

H.R. 2628. A bill to prohibit the awarding of Federal grants and contracts to 4-year institutions of higher education that fail to offer academic credit for the successful comple-

tion of courses offered by a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 2629. A bill to amend the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act to modify the 9-1-1, E9-1-1, and Next Generation 9-1-1 program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WU (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut):

H.R. 2630. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of emergency service volunteers as independent contractors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H. Res. 365. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should cut the United States' true debt burden by reducing home mortgage balances, forgiving student loans, and bringing down overall personal debt; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. LEE (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H. Res. 366. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "National Passport Month"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. TIBERI):

H. Res. 367. A resolution urging the people of the United States to observe October of each year as Italian and Italian American Heritage Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. KING of New York:

H.R. 2623.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 2624.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution: Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.”

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2627.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.”

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2628.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2629.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce, and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution Federal powers, as enumerated in section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 2630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 100: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 110: Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 179: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 181: Mr. RUNYAN and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 186: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 198: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 432: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 452: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 593: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HALL, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 615: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Mr. CRAWFORD.
 H.R. 645: Mr. QUAYLE and Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 687: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 969: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
 H.R. 997: Mrs. SCHMIDT.
 H.R. 1093: Mr. HARPER and Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 1116: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
 H.R. 1146: Mr. BROWN of Georgia.
 H.R. 1161: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 1164: Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 1173: Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 1179: Mr. TERRY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 1240: Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 1244: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 1254: Mrs. BONO MACK.
 H.R. 1288: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 1327: Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 1354: Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 1370: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.
 H.R. 1380: Mr. NEAL.
 H.R. 1386: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1427: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 1449: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 1465: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
 H.R. 1546: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 1588: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 1591: Ms. JENKINS.
 H.R. 1732: Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 1734: Mrs. MYRICK.
 H.R. 1776: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 1817: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1834: Mr. SCHILLING.

H.R. 1905: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. AUSTRIA, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1916: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1996: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 2020: Ms. BUERKLE.

H.R. 2033: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 2040: Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 2071: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 2117: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 2124: Mr. HALL.

H.R. 2140: Mr. GALLEGLEY.

H.R. 2195: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 2214: Mr. AUSTRIA, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. DENT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KELLY, Mr. REED, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 2223: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2236: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 2264: Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 2319: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 2324: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 2369: Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2401: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 2402: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 2426: Ms. FOXF, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.

H.R. 2437: Mr. HANNA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 2492: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2494: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2500: Ms. MOORE, Mr. HALL, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 2529: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2540: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

H.R. 2544: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. LEE, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2563: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 2587: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. HURT.

H.J. Res. 47: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.J. Res. 69: Mr. RUSH and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. FORBES.

H. Res. 130: Ms. RICHARDSON.

H. Res. 177: Mr. JONES.

H. Res. 207: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H. Res. 295: Mr. FILNER.

H. Res. 352: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H. Res. 364: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BARROW, Ms. HOCHUL, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 1 by Mr. CRITZ on House Resolution 310: Earl Blumenauer, David E. Price, Collin C. Peterson, Edolphus Towns, Loretta Sanchez, Corrine Brown, Heath Shuler, and Jim McDermott.

Petition 2 by Mr. GOHMERT on H.R. 1297: Bill Posey, Sue Wilkins Myrick, André Carson, Trent Franks, Mike Pence, Tim Scott, Jason Altmire, Marsha Blackburn, David P. Roe, Rob Bishop, Thomas J. Rooney, and Cynthia M. Lummis.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MRS. CHRISTENSEN

AMENDMENT No. 3: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VII—DEREK M. HODGE VIRGIN ISLANDS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2011

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Derek M. Hodge Virgin Islands Improvement Act of 2011”.

SEC. 702. TAX-FREE DISTRIBUTIONS FROM CERTAIN RETIREMENT PLAN ASSETS INVESTED UNDER A VIRGIN ISLANDS INVESTMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part I of subchapter D of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to pension, profit-sharing, stock bonus plans, etc.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 409B. TREATMENT OF DISTRIBUTIONS FROM CERTAIN RETIREMENT PLAN ASSETS INVESTED UNDER A VIRGIN ISLANDS INVESTMENT PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—If an individual under the age of 61 makes a one-time designation of an amount of qualified retirement savings as being under investment by the Virgin Islands Investment Program for at least 30 years, then, as of the close of the 10th year, such amount (and any earnings properly allocable to such amount) shall be treated for purposes of this title—

“(1) as a designated Roth account in the case of qualified retirement savings described in subsection (b)(1), or

“(2) as a Roth IRA in the case of qualified retirement savings described in subsection (b)(2).

No amount shall be includible in gross income by reason of the change in treatment under the preceding sentence.

“(b) QUALIFIED RETIREMENT SAVINGS.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘qualified retirement savings’ means—

“(1) amounts attributable to elective deferrals under an applicable retirement plan, and

“(2) amounts held in an individual retirement plan which is not a Roth IRA.

“(c) VIRGIN ISLANDS INVESTMENT PROGRAM.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘Virgin Islands Investment Program’ means a program of the Virgin Islands which meets the requirements of paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5).

“(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT ACCEPTED FOR MANAGEMENT.—A program meets the requirements of this paragraph if the amount accepted for management under the program does not exceed \$50,000,000,000.

“(3) FEES AND TAXES.—A program meets the requirements of this paragraph if—

“(A) the fees charged by investment managers under the program do not exceed the fees customarily imposed by investment managers for managing like qualified retirement savings outside the Virgin Islands Investment Program,

“(B) the program imposes an annual tax (in addition to the fees permitted under subparagraph (A)) equal to—

“(i) 1.5 percent of the amount designated for management under the program for the first 10 years of the account, and

“(ii) 1 percent of the amount designated for management under the program for the remainder of the life of the account without regard to account balance, and

“(C) the 1 percent tax is imposed notwithstanding the Roth designation.

“(4) INVESTMENT MANAGER.—A program meets the requirements of this paragraph if

the investment managers under the program are chosen by the Governor of the Virgin Islands.

“(5) SEPARATE ACCOUNTING.—A program meets the requirements of this paragraph if the program—

“(A) establishes separate accounts for each type of qualified retirement savings held for the benefit of each individual and any earnings properly allocable to such assets, and

“(B) maintains separate recordkeeping with respect to each account.

“(d) USE OF 1 PERCENT ANNUAL TAX.—

“(1) REVENUES TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS DURING FIRST 20 YEARS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Revenues from the tax referred to in subsection (c)(3)(B) shall be collected, held, and distributed for the benefit of the Virgin Islands in a manner similar to section 7652(b) (relating to rum excise tax).

“(B) DISTRIBUTIONS TO VIRGIN ISLANDS.—Funds and accrued interest described in subsection (d)(1)(A) may be paid from escrow to the Virgin Islands for expenditure only if—

“(i) the expenditure is pursuant to a qualified infrastructure development plan, and

“(ii) the expenditure is approved by the Secretary of the Interior as being pursuant to such plan.

“(C) QUALIFIED INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT PLAN.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘qualified infrastructure development plan’ means a plan for improving and enhancing the infrastructure of the Virgin Islands which is—

“(i) developed and approved by the committee described in subparagraph (D), and

“(ii) approved by the Governor of the Virgin Islands.

“(D) COMMITTEE.—The committee described in this subparagraph is a committee—

“(i) comprised of 5 members, each serving a term of either three or five years—

“(I) 2 of whom are appointed by the Governor of the Virgin Islands, one for a 3-year and one for a 5-year term,

“(II) 2 of whom are appointed by the Virgin Islands legislature, one for a 3-year and one for a 5-year term, and

“(III) 1 of whom is appointed by the Secretary of the Interior for a 5-year term, and

“(ii) with respect to which a vacancy is filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

“(2) REVENUES TO THE UNITED STATES AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS.—

“(A) DURING FIRST 20 YEARS.—Revenues from the fee referred to in subsection (c)(3)(B) imposed on designated assets after the first 10 years under management by the Virgin Islands Investment Program shall be collected by the United States Treasury in a manner similar to section 7652, upon which—

“(i) $\frac{1}{3}$ of the proceeds shall be distributed to the Virgin Islands for the first 10 years of management, and

“(ii) half of the proceeds shall be distributed to the Virgin Islands for the next 10 years of management.

“(B) AFTER THE FIRST 20 YEARS.—Beginning in the 21st year, the entire 1 percent tax collected shall be retained by the United States Treasury.

“(C) MINIMUM HOLDING PERIOD.—No withdrawals may be made by an investor from

the account during the minimum holding period of ten years. Should the investor choose to withdraw money from the account during the minimum holding period, the investor would forfeit the tax advantages of the Fund. Any funds so withdrawn would be included in gross income and subject to Federal income tax, minus payments of the 1 percent tax.

“(3) EARLY WITHDRAWAL.—Should an investor withdraw the entire balance of the funds after the 10-year minimum holding period but before the end of the 30 years, his account will be liable for the entire 1 percent tax for each of the remaining years.

“(e) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) ELECTIVE DEFERRALS; APPLICABLE RETIREMENT PLAN.—The terms ‘elective deferrals’ and ‘applicable retirement plan’ have the respective meanings given such terms by section 402A.

“(2) VIRGIN ISLANDS.—The term ‘Virgin Islands’ means the United States Virgin Islands.

“(3) SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—The term ‘Secretary of the Interior’ means the Secretary of the Interior or his designee.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such part I is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 409B. Treatment of distributions from certain retirement plan assets invested under a Virgin Islands investment program.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JULY 22, 2011

No. 111

Senate

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Spirit, the fountain of every blessing, hallowed be Your Name. In these tempestuous times, give our lawmakers strong minds, great hearts, and true faith. Make them people whom the lust of office does not kill or the spoils of office cannot buy. May they be people of honor, who live above the fog in public duty and in private thinking. Lord, empower them to use their gifts to magnify Your Name. May Your Kingdom come and Your will be done on Earth as it is in heaven. Our souls silently wait for You, O God, for from You alone comes salvation. You alone are this Nation's rock and sure defense.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable RICHARD BLUMENTHAL 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 assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RICHARD BLUMEN-

THAL, a Senator from the State of Connecticut, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will resume the motion to proceed to the bill H.R. 2560. The time until 10 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. At 10 a.m., I will be recognized to make a motion to table the motion to proceed; therefore, Senators should expect a rollcall vote at approximately 10 a.m. To accommodate Senators on both sides, this vote will take a little longer than usual.

I say to you, Mr. President, and to everyone within the sound of my voice, this is an effort to move this piece of legislation off the floor. It is interfering with the negotiations between the White House and the House of Representatives, and it is without merit. This is a motion to table. It is a vote on this bill. And we on this side of the aisle are going to look at every vote cast. We feel comfortable where we are on this issue, and I would suggest to my Republican friends that they should look at where they are on this issue. This is a very, very bad piece of legislation. Anyone voting for it will have to respond in many different ways to the people of their State.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 2553

Mr. REID. Mr. President, H.R. 2553 is at the desk and due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2553) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings at this time on this bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill will be placed on the calendar.

CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in about an hour we will vote on the Republicans' so-called cap, cut, and balance legislation. As I have said before—in fact, just a few minutes ago—this is one of the worst pieces of legislation to ever be placed on the floor of the U.S. Senate. It violates the spirit of our Constitution and certainly what we are trying to accomplish here in Washington, and we as a Senate refuse to waste even one more day on this piece of legislation.

We have 11 days left until the United States simply stops paying its bills, and, frankly, we have wasted too much time already. The U.S. House of Representatives needs to know this legislation has expired. It is gone.

Republicans wanted a vote on their radical plan to kill Medicare and Social Security before they would consider helping Democrats avert this crisis. In an hour, they will get that chance. At least one of the Republican Senators went over to a large gathering in the House of Representatives,

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4813

I am told, and said: We are going to get at least 60 votes.

Please, Mr. President.

Their extreme plan would, within 25 years, cut in half every Federal benefit on the books, including Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, military pay, veterans' benefits, and much more. Meanwhile, it would erect constitutional protections for hundreds of billions of dollars in special interest tax breaks to oil companies, corporations that ship jobs overseas, and millionaires and billionaires who are able to buy those yachts and corporate jets for which they get tax benefits.

Republicans have demanded we pass this radical proposal before they will even consider cooperating with Democrats to avert a default crisis that would rock the global financial markets. They are, in effect, holding this Nation's economy hostage and demanding the death of Medicare and Social Security as its ransom. But we all know their failed prescription will fail in the U.S. Senate. They do not have the votes to pass a plan that would balance the budget on the backs of seniors and middle-class families while protecting unfair tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires.

So we must move on, Mr. President. And I want to be very, very clear: There is simply no more time to waste debating and voting on measures that have no hopes of becoming law. We have no more time to waste playing partisan games. As the saying goes, indecision becomes decision with time. Our time is running out before this gridlock—this refusal by the other side to move even an inch toward compromise—becomes a decision to default on our debt. The markets are already reacting to our inaction. Every responsible voice, including those of my Republican colleagues—many of them, at least—has warned that much worse is to come if we do not take action and take it soon. That is a risk we cannot afford to take.

So I ask my Republican colleagues again to join Democrats in seeking common ground. The American people have demanded it of us. Overwhelmingly, they have said a national default is a serious problem—and that is an understatement—and that both parties in Congress must meet in the middle.

We all know there are talks going on between President Obama and Speaker BOEHNER. I wish them well. We await their efforts. What I am told, there will be revenue measures in that. If that is the case, we know constitutionally the matter must start in the House of Representatives.

I say to both the President and to the Speaker here on the Senate floor, representing my Democrats—and I am confident many Republicans—be very careful. Show a lot of caution as this negotiation goes forward because any arrangement must be fair to all of America, not just the wealthy.

Would the Chair announce the proceedings for this morning.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE ACT OF 2011—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 2560, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the bill (H.R. 2560) to cut, cap, and balance the Federal budget.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 10 a.m. shall be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, in about an hour, we are going to vote on a package that was sent to this body by the House of Representatives.

Let me first comment on the context within which we consider this legislation. I think it is very important to remind our colleagues and remind citizens across the country who are perhaps watching and listening that our country is borrowing more than 40 cents of every \$1 we spend. That is unsustainable. It cannot be continued for long.

I think all of us know that the circumstance we are in is extraordinarily serious. Here is what the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff told us just a year ago:

Our national debt is our biggest national security threat.

I believe that is the case. Our gross debt now is approaching 100 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States. We have not seen a debt that high since after World War II. It is extraordinarily important that we take on this debt threat. It is extraordinarily important for our country's future economic well-being that we change course.

The legislation that has been sent to us by the House is one of the most ill-considered, ill-conceived, internally inconsistent pieces of legislation I have seen in my 25 years in the U.S. Senate. It has all the earmarks of something that was hastily thrown together, really pasted together.

This legislation includes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. We are better than this. The Congress is better than this. Certainly, the country is better than this. Let me just be brief.

The fundamental problems with this balanced budget amendment are as follows: One, it restricts the ability to respond to economic downturns, having all the potential to make an economic downturn even more serious. It uses Social Security funds to calculate balance and subjects that important program to the same cuts as other Federal

spending, even though it is funded separately. It shifts the ultimate decisions on budgeting in this country to unelected and unaccountable judges. Finally, it requires a State ratification process that could take years to complete. We need a long-term debt resolution now, not in the sweet by-and-by.

The proposal before us has all of the potential to turn a recession into a depression. Why do I say that? Because it would prevent Congress from taking urgent action to provide lift to the economy in the midst of a severe economic downturn.

Here is what Norman Ornstein, a distinguished scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, said about this:

Few ideas are more seductive on the surface and more destructive in reality than a balanced budget amendment [to the constitution]. Here is why: Nearly all our states have balanced budget requirements. That means when the economy slows, states are forced to raise taxes or slash spending at just the wrong time, providing a fiscal drag when what is needed is countercyclical policy to stimulate the economy. In fact, the fiscal drag from the states in 2009-2010 was barely countered by the federal stimulus plan. That meant the federal stimulus provided was nowhere near what was needed but far better than doing nothing. Now imagine that scenario with a federal drag instead.

The Washington Post editorialized:

Worse yet, the latest version [of the balanced budget amendment] would impose an absolute cap on spending as a share of the economy. It would prevent federal expenditures from exceeding 18 percent of the gross domestic product in any year. Most unfortunately, the amendment lacks a clause letting the government exceed that limit to strengthen a struggling economy.

That has all of the potential to turn a recession into a depression.

Two of this country's most distinguished economists, Alan Blinder, former Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve, and Mark Zandi, former consultant, adviser to Senator MCCAIN in his Presidential campaign, evaluated the government response to the last downturn. Their conclusion: Absent that Federal response, we would have had "Great Depression 2.0." The legislation before us would have prevented that Federal response.

They call this legislation cut, cap, and balance. They misnamed it. They should have called it "cut, cap, and kill Medicare" because that is precisely what it would do. Why do I say that? Because when I referred earlier to the inconsistency of this legislation, this is what I was referring to. They have two different spending caps in the legislation before us. In one part of the legislation, they say the spending cap would take spending from 24.1 percent of GDP to 19.9 percent. That is in one part of the bill before us. In another part of the bill—the constitutional amendment—they say the spending cap would be 18 percent of GDP. So I do not know who cooked this up, but you would think they would have at least gotten on the same page as to what is the limitation on spending.

What does it mean if you have a balanced budget amendment with a cap of

18 percent of GDP? Here is what it means—by the way, the constitutional provision would certainly trump the conflicting provision that is in this legislation. So the cap would not be 19 percent of GDP, the cap would not be 19.9, it would be 18 percent of GDP. What would that mean? Well, this dotted black line is 18 percent of GDP. If you fund just Social Security, defense and other nonhealth spending, and interest on the debt, you are at 18 percent of GDP. There is not a dime left for Medicare. There is not a dime left for Medicaid. Is that really what they intend? It must be because that is what it says. So Medicare is finished. Medicaid is finished. Anybody who votes for this ought to understand what they are voting to do.

Here is a former top economic adviser to President Reagan. Here is what he said about the amendment that is before us:

In short, this is quite possibly the stupidest constitutional amendment I think I have ever seen. It looks like it was drafted by a couple of interns on the back of a napkin. Every Senator cosponsoring this legislation should be ashamed of themselves.

That is a former top economic adviser to Ronald Reagan.

I have been here 25 years. I don't think I have ever seen a piece of legislation more unprofessionally constructed than the legislation before us.

But those are not the only problems. When they titled this "cut, cap, and balance," they could have also called it "preserve, protect, and defend tax havens and tax shelters" because that is the other consequence of this legislation. Why do I say that? Because it would take a two-thirds vote to increase revenue—a two-thirds vote. That means attempts to shut down these offshore tax havens, these abusive tax shelters—because they would raise revenue—would take a two-thirds vote.

What does that mean? Well, here is a little building down in the Cayman Islands. I have talked about this many times. It is a little 5-story building that claims to be home to 18,857 companies. They claim they are doing business out of this little building. I have said this is the most efficient building in the world. Quite remarkable that 18,857 companies are doing business out of this little 5-story building. I am told there are not many people coming and going from this building during the day.

Are 18 companies really doing their business—they call this "headquarters." Is that really their headquarters? We all know that is not their headquarters. We all know what is going on. It is not business; it is monkey business. What they are doing down there is avoiding the taxes all the rest of us pay.

This amendment would protect this scheme. You want to protect this scheme, vote for this amendment. How big is this scheme? Well, here is what our own Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has told us:

Experts have estimated that the total loss to the Treasury from offshore tax evasion alone approaches \$100 billion a year, including \$40 billion to \$70 billion from individuals and another \$30 billion from corporations engaging in offshore tax evasion. Abusive tax shelters add tens of billions of dollars more.

You want to lock in these abuses? You prefer to pay more in taxes yourself so that people can engage in these scams? Vote for this amendment. Vote for the legislation that is before us. Vote for what is on the floor because you will protect them forever more.

I end as I began. This is perhaps the most ill-conceived, ill-considered, internally inconsistent legislation I have ever seen in my 25 years in the Senate. I hope my colleagues have the wisdom to vote no.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana.

HONORING THE 88TH BIRTHDAY OF ROBERT DOLE

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I would like this Chamber to know that today marks the 88th birthday of one of the great Members of this Senate body, a true American hero, former majority leader Bob Dole.

As I reflected on the extraordinary life he has led—I had the privilege of serving under him as a Senator and working with him in the private sector, getting to know him and his wife—I could not help but note that the leadership he provided in comparison to the lack of leadership that is being provided in this body now stands in great contrast. There is an absence of leadership and seriousness of purpose that Bob Dole would never have allowed had he been majority leader.

I say that because I come to the floor today greatly troubled by the remarks that were made here in this Senate yesterday and again this morning by the majority leader regarding the bill that is before us.

The issue here takes two tracks, one of which is the content of the amendment and the bill that is before us that was voted on by the House of Representatives, passed by the House of Representatives, and sent over for us to debate and pass. We can disagree—and I think there has been some misrepresentation of what this bill actually does—we can disagree about the contents of it, but we have an obligation and a responsibility to debate those contents and to put every Member of this body in a position of saying "yea" or "nay" on amendments that might be offered to improve it or to change it or to modify it and, finally, whether to support it or not support it. The vote here this morning denies us that opportunity. This is a vote on a motion to table.

You know, there are a couple of definitions of "table"—more than a couple. One of those is getting to the table to negotiate something, just as the NFL players and owners are doing and, much more seriously and with many more consequences to the future of this country, what we ought to be doing—

putting it on the table, debating it, addressing it, expressing your support or nonsupport, defending it, characterizing, mischaracterizing. That is what this body is about. It is the world's greatest deliberative body, and we are deciding not to deliberate this bill at all.

The second definition of "table" is taking it off the table. So the majority leader has said: I am not going to allow you to debate it. I am not going to allow amendments. I am not going to allow up-or-down votes so the American people know where we are.

This is a motion to table, so we don't even have the opportunity to debate it.

It was the majority leader himself who said: We are going to be in session every day until we get this settled. Now he comes down here and says: I am not going to waste 1 more day on this. Yet there is nothing on the agenda. Senators who were told to be here every day, that there will be a vote on Saturday, are now told: We are having a vote this morning—on Friday at 10 o'clock—and then you can go home for the weekend. He hasn't even told us when we need to come back. What kind of a contradiction is that? What kind of leadership is that? We don't know whether we are supposed to be here or are not supposed to be here. Are we supposed to be debating what is happening with one of the most serious crisis we are facing, that the country has ever seen? Particularly in the financial area, it is the most serious, perhaps except for the Great Depression. And we are told we do not even have time to debate this, that this is a waste of time.

I quote the unbelievable statement that has been made by the majority leader:

This piece of legislation is about as weak and senseless as anything that has ever come on this Senate floor.

Really? I can spend half an hour talking about senseless legislation, egregious legislation, discriminatory legislation that has come to this floor and been debated and not just tabled. To characterize the serious efforts of the Members of the House of Representatives and the Members of the Senate, including some Democratic Members, to try to fix this problem—to characterize that as "senseless and wasteful"—"I am not going to spend one more day of time," he said, "on this senseless legislation."

I thought on reflection the majority leader would come here this morning and say: Perhaps I overstated the problem. Let me better explain where I think we are, where we need to go.

But, no, he comes down and he doubles down this morning—doubles down—and says: "It is a very, very bad piece of legislation." "Without merit." "It gets in the way." It gets in the way? We are talking about dealing with cutting spending that we know we cannot afford. We talk about putting some caps on it so we don't keep doing this in the future, so we have a path to

fiscal responsibility. We are talking about a balanced budget so we live within our means. That is getting in the way?

This body has failed its responsibility to be faithful to the Constitution and faithful to the people of America. As a consequence of that, we are sitting here saying we are not even going to debate something that was brought forward with hundreds, if not thousands of hours of effort. Maybe you don't like it, and maybe you don't agree with it. Well, stand up and say so and tell us what you want to do about it.

The majority leader and his party have not brought one piece of legislation to this floor. The President of the United States has not offered one proposal in writing that we can work with. We have not had the opportunity to debate for 1 minute anything the other side has offered. So we bring something forward, and it is called a "worthless piece of junk." Is that what the American people sent us here to do?

I came here to find a result to the dire fiscal situation our people are in, and the majority leader comes down here and says we are not responding to the will of the people. Where has he been? What planet is he on? Responding to the will of the people? They are sick and tired of government spending more than it has. They are sick and tired of being told they are handing over debts to their children that are never going to be repaid. And we are told that we want to take this off the table so we can't even debate it.

I woke up in the middle of the night so frustrated and so angry after spending last evening saying I am hopeful that we can come together and work something out, and the well gets poisoned last evening by the majority leader and gets poisoned again this morning. Those of us who have worked our tails off to try to get something done are told this is a piece of junk. That is not what I came here to do. That is not what we came here to do.

I didn't come here to get mad this morning. But I am just tired of this stuff that goes on around here. When Democrats and Republicans—and the majority leader knows it—are meeting in back rooms together, signing letters together to the President to ask him to step up—32 Democrats and 32 Republicans—the President ignores that and does nothing until the very end, and he comes here and says: Look at me. I took care of everything.

America is worried to death about the future. To say we haven't done anything except put forward a worthless piece of legislation—it is so worthless we are not even going to allow you to talk about it or debate it, we are not allowing amendments to take place, we are not going to give it the respect it is due. So if you do not like it, come down here and tell us you do not like it, and let's have a vote on why you do not like it instead of just simply saying: Take it off the table.

I guess we are all getting frustrated. There is a 100-and-some degree heat

index outside. I can understand people getting worked up about all of this sort of thing. But the future of America is at stake. This majority leader is not allowing us to deal with it.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, I stand here today as a cosponsor of the cut, cap, and balance legislation and as a supporter of that legislation. Here is the insanity that has gripped not only this body but all of Washington. We are literally in here where we will have the third year in a row of deficits over \$1 trillion.

In fact, current projections are that this annual deficit will set a record—a very dubious record, I might add—of \$1.6 trillion-plus. We were promised 3 years ago if this enormous, gargantuan effort to force more spending into the economy with the stimulus plan were passed, that trillion-dollar effort would put this country on a path to recovery. It has done nothing except raise our debt and pass the problem on to our children and grandchildren.

After weeks and months of work on an idea to rein in the spending and to come to grips with where we are in this country, we are literally at a point where, within minutes, we will vote on a motion to table that effort. We will be right back to where we are today. We will be right back to a situation where we will face trillion-dollar deficits. We will be right back to a situation where every economist in the world is telling the United States of America—the largest economy—that its spending is not sustainable. We will be right back to rating agencies looking at our government debt and saying: You have not come up with a plan to rein this in, so you are being targeted to be downgraded.

What we are really right back to is this: We have a government that is too big. We have too many promises that have been made, where no one had any idea how they would be paid for. By the end of the year, we will have a deficit of \$15 trillion, which is significantly understated. In 4 more years, we will have a debt of \$20 trillion, which will still be significantly understated. Somehow there are Members of this body who are arguing that this is a better way—to table cut, cap, and balance so we can return to where we are today.

Is it any wonder that those of us who are concerned about this and concerned about the future of our children and grandchildren are coming to the floor and saying: Wait a minute. This is destroying our Nation.

Mr. President, I have risen today, as I have many times over the last days, to say: Support this effort. Support cut, cap, and balance. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this very important legislation which has the potential to change the direction of what we are doing. I am going to be one of the people who support this legislation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I echo the comments of my colleagues from Nebraska and Indiana who have expressed their support for the cut, cap, and balance approach to dealing with our debt crisis. It had 234 votes in the House, and it is the only plan out there.

As my colleague from Indiana said, the Democratic leadership in the Senate has yet to produce a plan that will meaningfully deal with the greatest crisis our country has faced in my service in the Congress; that is, this massive, out-of-control debt the Senator from Nebraska pointed out which could lead to much higher interest rates along the lines of what we are seeing in some of the European countries, which would absolutely crush this economy.

If we are serious about growing the economy and creating jobs, we have to get Federal spending under control. We need a smaller Federal economy and a larger private economy. What has been happening since this President took office is that we continue to grow government. We have added 35 percent to the debt. Spending has increased by 24 percent—non-national security discretionary spending—at a time when inflation was 2 percent. Federal spending has been growing at 10 times the rate of inflation. The number of people receiving food stamps has gone up by 40 percent. The unemployment rate is up by 18 percent, and 2.1 million more people are unemployed today than when this President took office.

The policies of this administration are not working when it comes to getting people back to work and getting spending and debt under control.

I was listening to my colleague from North Dakota with great interest when he was here earlier denouncing the whole idea of a balanced budget amendment—like it was coming from some foreign planet. He talked about how ill-conceived and ill-considered and stupid this approach is—cut, cap, and balance.

Well, my observation about that is, the failure of the Democrats to produce a budget in over 800 days is exhibit No. 1 for why we need a balanced budget amendment. We ought to be embarrassed in Washington, DC; we are not doing the people's work; we have not passed a budget in over 800 days. Yet the other side comes down here and denounces the idea of a balanced budget amendment, which all 49 States have some form of, that requires them to balance their budgets every single year.

My colleague from North Dakota knows that. His State has it and my State of South Dakota has it. It is a very straightforward concept that the people of this country clearly understand.

Now, he takes issue with the way this particular balanced budget amendment is written. Fine. Come up with your

own proposal. But don't suggest that having a constitutional amendment that requires this place to do something that it hasn't been doing for the last 25 or 30 years is literally a bad idea. What we have today is dysfunctional. It is broken. It doesn't work for the American people. It is an embarrassment. That is why we need to put something on the books that will impose a discipline on this Congress to get spending and debt back under control and help us do something about the runaway debt that is putting a crushing burden on future generations of Americans.

If you don't like this balanced budget amendment and think the cut, cap, and balance proposal is not prescriptive about this particular balanced budget amendment that many of us are co-sponsors of, then come up with another one. But let's put something in place that enshrines a responsibility and obligation and a requirement for us to live within our means every single year.

We cannot continue to spend money we don't have. We have demonstrated year after year around here that we continue to add more and more and more to this debt. Under the President's budget proposal, that debt would have doubled in the next decade. That is why I think when his budget proposal was put on the floor of the Senate it got zero votes. Not a single Democrat or Republican voted in favor of what this President put forward in his budget submission earlier this year.

Since that time there has been an absolute lack of leadership out of the White House. The President has been completely missing in action. The Democratic leadership has put forward no plan of their own. We have in front of us something that achieved majority support in the House a few nights ago when 234 Members of the House voted for this proposal. It is a serious, meaningful effort to cut spending now, cap it in future years, and put in place a balanced budget amendment which is long overdue and, frankly, if it had passed 15 years ago in the Senate, we would not be in the position we are today. It failed by a single vote—one vote—in the Senate in 1997.

I cannot help but think how much better off we would be today in terms of the spending situation had we gotten the necessary two-thirds vote in 1997. But it is never too late to do the right thing. We have an opportunity to do that today.

To hear our colleagues on the other side get up and belittle the effort that has been made by a lot of people who are trying to do something about a problem that will wreck this country if we don't fix it is not befitting of this institution.

This is going to be a tabling motion instead of a debate on cut, cap, and balance because my colleagues have decided this isn't worthy of consideration on the floor of the Senate. I think it is a terrible reflection on this institution,

when something is brought forward in good faith—a serious, meaningful effort to address spending and debt and to put this country back on a sustainable fiscal course—and we are not even going to debate it. We are going to have a tabling motion in a few minutes.

I hope my colleagues will defeat that motion and allow us to continue to debate this proposal and get an up-or-down vote on what will meaningfully address the problems this country faces.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, unlike any Republican in the House or the Senate, I have voted for a balanced budget. We balanced the budget under President Clinton. Not only balanced the budget, started paying down the national debt. He was able to leave hundreds of billions of dollars in surplus to his successor, who determined with Republican votes to go to war in Iraq and pay for the war with a tax cut. That is why we had to borrow the money from China and Saudi Arabia. Not a single Republican voted for a real balanced budget when they had a chance to. In fact, it passed the Senate only because Vice President Gore came and broke the tie.

I was proud to have voted for that balanced budget. Not a gimmick, but a real balanced budget. We had to actually make tough choices. We did it. We balanced it. We had a surplus.

When we talk about amending our Nation's fundamental charter, the Constitution of the United States, it is not something Congress and the American people should feel forced to do in the face of a financial crisis. I take seriously my senatorial oath to support and defend the Constitution.

I know there are a lot of pressure groups demanding that elected representatives sign pledges about what they will and will not do. The pledge I follow, which is the one I was honored to make again at the beginning of this Congress, is to uphold the Constitution. That is what I intend to do as I represent the people of Vermont.

The House-passed bill, H.R. 2560, which the Senate is now considering, claims to impose a balanced budget on future Congresses, but it doesn't even contain the proposed constitutional amendment that supporters are seeking to adopt. Nor did the bill pass with two-thirds of the Republican-controlled House voting in favor.

That threshold is what is required for us to pass a constitutional amendment. The House vote was more than 50 votes short of that necessary number.

The process by which this bill has been brought to the floor of the Senate is an affront to the Constitution that we are sworn to protect and defend. Instead, the House still denies authority needed to meet the Nation's obligations until Congress passes a type of constitutional amendment that will actually make it more difficult for us to reduce our national debt. That kind of

constitutional blackmail has no place in our democracy, no place in our laws.

I wonder whether anyone who respects the Constitution can support such an approach. Here is the convoluted language the House bill includes about an amendment to our Constitution:

H.J. Res. 1 in the form reported on June 23, 2011, S.J. Res 10 in the form introduced on March 31, 2011, or H.J. Res. 56 in the form introduced on April 7, 2011, a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, or a similar amendment if it requires that total outlays not exceed total receipts, that contains a spending limitation as a percentage of GDP, and requires that tax increases be approved by a two-thirds vote in both Houses of Congress.

The Founders didn't include a constitutional requirement for a balanced budget or a prohibition against incurring debt in our Constitution. They knew full well that would have been foolish, dangerous, and self-defeating for the Nation they were seeking to establish.

I respect the wisdom of the Founders and will uphold the Constitution, which has served this Nation so well for the last 223 years. Let's not be so vain as to think we know better than the Founders what the Constitution should prescribe.

I reject the notion that for political reasons we need to rush consideration of an ill-conceived and evolving proposal for a constitutional amendment. I will stand with the Founders. I will defend their work and our Constitution, and I will oppose the proposed series of constitutional amendments, which, incidentally, haven't even had a hearing.

Have we forgotten how the Revolutionary War was financed? Have we forgotten how the national government took on the debt of the states after the Revolutionary War? Have we forgotten that in 1792, just four years after the ratification of the Constitution, the budget deficit was 38 percent of revenues? Have we forgotten how President Jefferson financed the Louisiana Purchase expanding the country westward? Do we not remember what happened during the Civil War, how we emerged from the Great Depression, and won World War II? Do we not even recall that during the administration of the last Democratic President, we had balanced the budget after defeating a proposed constitutional amendment and were reducing the deficit with billions of surpluses?

Amendments to the Constitution of the United States are permanent. They are not bills or resolutions that can be abandoned or fixed. They are not just a bumper sticker or a sound bite. Each word matters to hundreds of millions of Americans and future generations.

I have never seen—and I have been here 37 years—the solemn duty of protecting the Constitution treated in such a cavalier manner. I wish those who so often say they revere the Constitution would show it the respect it deserves rather than treating it like a blog entry.

We have already seen scores of proposed constitutional amendments on budgetary matters. None has been adopted and for good reason. The Senate amendment referenced in the House bill is one of approximately 60 proposed so far this Congress. It remains a moving target, not a finished product worthy of consideration as an addition to our fundamental charter. The House bill itself proposed three different constitutional amendments and a catchall to include some proposal not yet introduced. Last night some members claimed that this catchall somehow allows flexibility. If we are going to limit the authority on the debt ceiling by requiring a constitutional amendment, there should not be ambiguity in what the amendment would actually do to hardworking Americans. This shows the lack of seriousness with which Republicans have approached this entire matter.

These partisan constitutional amendment proposals are inconsistent with the views of our Founding Fathers. George Washington did not want our Constitution to constrain the national government from being able to respond to events as warranted. He led this Nation into being and knew that financial constraints had no place in the Constitution. The Constitution expressly provides for the power "to borrow money on the credit of the United States" and for Congress "to lay and collect taxes" and duties and "to pay the debts and provide for the general welfare of the United States." That is what Congress has been required to do since the outset and that is our responsibility today. We should be acting without further delay to preserve the credit of the United States and to provide for our people.

The proposed amendments are also inconsistent with the views of Alexander Hamilton, a key author of the *Federalist Papers* and the creator of the American financial system that allowed us to become the greatest economic engine in the history of the world. The United States was born in debt, of course, and debt has been needed to fund some of America's greatest chapters. Hamilton even termed national debt at times "a national blessing." The Constitution allows for the Federal Government to borrow money at certain times, for wars, infrastructure building, and economic bad times. That fiscal policy can help drive development and unite the Nation. It should not be turned into a divisive wedge against the least powerful among us.

I am concerned this is another example of how some in recent years have sought to impose their view by unilateral objection to compromise with minority obstruction. That has, at times, seemed to be the rule in the last few years. Some have tried to undermine the legitimacy of President Obama. Filibusters and requirements for supermajorities have become routine. They have stymied congressional action on behalf of the American people.

This year should be a cautionary tale that convinces all Americans that the risks of default and ideological impasses to them, to interest rates, to financial markets, and to our household budgets are too great. We need only recall the game of chicken some played with the government shutdown earlier this year. The threat to push the United States into default on its obligations for the first time in our history is wrong. It is made possible by rules that empower a partisan minority.

I cannot help but think if we don't take the steps we should, we will see our interest rates go up. We will spend hundreds of billions of dollars in extra interest to China, which they can spend on infrastructure, medical research and education, but we won't have it here in the United States. That is what the other side seems to want.

We saw this before, in 1996, when a Government shutdown and a debt limit crisis went on for months as part of a partisan "train wreck" intended to extort President Clinton. It is happening, again, this year as some seek to gain political advantage over President Obama. The creditworthiness of the United States is too important to be sacrificed for partisan political advantage but that is what is being threatened. Indeed, this House-passed bill, with its proposed constitutional amendments, makes that more likely, not less.

Charles Fried, President Reagan's Solicitor General, said a few years ago that supermajority requirements "are against the spirit and genius of our Constitution, which is a charter for democracy; that is, for majority rule." He was right then, when the Senate rejected an earlier constitutional amendment on budgetary matters, and that truth remains the same today.

We have seen the danger that irresponsible brinkmanship promotes. We should guard against building into the Constitution a supermajority requirement for fiscal policy. That invites political blackmail and gridlock. We have seen enough of that already.

I suggest that Congress should not subject our ability to govern to any greater hurdles that would empower the tyranny of the minority on economic policy. Instead of hamstringing Congress with more supermajority requirements, we should be looking for ways to increase our ability to take necessary action to deal with a fast changing and increasingly interdependent global economy.

The source of our budgetary problems does not lie with the Constitution. The Constitution remains sound. What is lacking is the political judgment and the courage to do what is right.

Having again sought to use the debt ceiling to create a political crisis, congressional Republicans refuse to enact a program of shared sacrifice to put us on a better financial path. In fact, Senate Republicans filibustered the debate of a resolution calling for such a plan.

It is telling that the Republican posture is now to require the Constitution to be amended.

The last time we balanced the budget, not a single Republican voted for that balanced budget, and yet it created enormous surpluses. These proposed constitutional amendments will not cut a single dime of debt from the Federal budget. Rather than deal with our problems, some want to require that we deface the Constitution with a measure that will, by its own terms, not be effective for 5 years, if it were to be adopted by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and then ratified by three-fourths of the States. Put another way, that is at least three election cycles from now. They get their bumper stickers today, but kick the can down the road for three election cycles.

Economists have noted that all of the last five Democratic Presidents have reduced public debt as a share of GDP. The last four Republican Presidents did the opposite with the country's indebtedness increasing during their administrations. During President Reagan and Bush's administrations the Federal debt more than tripled. During the Clinton administration, budgets were balanced and we were paying down the debt from the budget surplus being generated. Then, during the administration of George W. Bush the debt nearly doubled again to more than \$10 trillion dollars.

We should not amend our Nation's fundamental charter of liberty to include arbitrary and inflexible requirements in order to look tough on spending, but without regard to the consequences.

A respected Republican Senator from Oregon, Mark Hatfield, had it right 15 years ago when he said that a "balanced budget comes only through leadership and compromise."

In 1992, the Senate and House took the hard votes to enact a budgetary plan that led us to a balanced budget and budget surpluses during President Clinton's time in office. Not a single congressional Republican supported the plan. They favored talking about constitutional amendments then, as well. The balance we achieved was later squandered by the next President, as his policies also wreaked havoc with the financial sector and threatened the entire economy. The near meltdown of the financial markets during the last year of the Bush administration and the resulting recession threatened to drive our economy and that of the world into depression just 3 years ago. President Obama and the Congress responded to pull it back from the brink.

In a recent editorial, *USA Today* put it this way:

[A] funny thing happened after that amendment failed in 1997. Thanks to prior deficit-reduction deals and a strong economy, the federal government ran a surplus in 1998 and for the next three years. Then an economic downturn, huge tax cuts, two unfunded wars and unfunded expansion of Medicare plunged the budget back into the red, where it has been ever since.

The moral is, Congress doesn't need a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. It just needs the will to do it and the willingness to compromise over how. But rather than make the tough decisions about spending cuts and revenue increases, it's always easier to vote for a balanced budget amendment.

I will ask that copies of this and other editorials and opinion pieces from leading newspapers be printed in the RECORD.

The House-passed bill is an end-run around the Constitution's requirements for amendment. It does not have the required support of two-thirds of even the House Chamber. Equally important, it is not necessary. Congress has the power now to take steps to avoid a government default and get us on the path to balancing the budget, just as we did at the end of the Clinton administration. This debate is a distraction from the hard work and hard choices that need to be made.

The good news is that we do not need to amend the Constitution to balance the budget. Never have. Never will.

The proposed constitutional amendments would also perpetuate bad policy. They are intended to enshrine tax breaks for millionaires and wealthy corporations. It is no wonder that Alexander Hamilton described supermajority vote requirements as "poison." We need a balanced approach to fix the deficit problem. We cannot merely cut our way to balance any more than eliminating congressional earmarks will balance the budget. We will need to close the most egregious tax loopholes and everyone will have to sacrifice and contribute their fair share.

There should be no mistake: The proposed amendments to the Constitution are not just unnecessary, they are unwise, unsound, and dangerous. In my view, the House-passed bill and the proposed amendments it requires demeans our Constitution. Never in our history have we amended the Constitution—the work of our Founders—to impose budgetary restrictions or to require supermajorities for passing legislation. Yet now we are saying: Let's do it on a whim. Let's do it without any hearings. Let's do it because we can do it.

It would for the first time enshrine minority rule and undermine our constitutional democracy. It will destabilize the separation of powers among our three branches of Government and put into the hands of bureaucrats and judges the fiscal policy of the United States.

Who is to decide what the "GDP" was for a particular time period, what is to be included and what is not? How often do those estimates and artificial constructs get revised? Since when do economic surveys and extrapolations become embedded in the Constitution? What justifies the constitutional permanence of the number 18, as opposed to 17 or 18.5 or 20? Do we really want judges deciding whether an economics line written into the Constitution has been breached? What remedies could

judges order if they find a breach? Who has standing to bring those challenges? None of these questions has been adequately debated or considered.

Alternatively, we could end up with future Congresses having to slash Social Security or Medicare or Medicaid, unable to respond to natural disasters or national security emergencies. I note that the budget proposed this year by Representative RYAN and the House Republicans with all its draconian cuts and the end of Medicare as we know it would not satisfy this arbitrary limit. Nor would the budgets of President Reagan. Consider whether we could witness future Congresses unable to meet the arbitrary limit and going into violation of that unsound constitutional prescription and the Constitution itself?

At the beginning of our Republic, the national Government took on the debts of the States. These proposed constitutional amendments are a recipe for pushing costs and responsibilities onto the states. And doing so at a time when State governments need our help, not more unmet needs.

The Senate Judiciary Committee has considered several balanced budget amendments over the years. The Senate proposal this year is even more extreme than the version the Senate rejected in 1995 and again in 1997. It is reckless and foolish to rush Senate consideration of such a radical proposal to change our Constitution, without process or consideration.

All Senators swear an oath to "support and defend the Constitution of the United States." That is our duty and responsibility. The pending amendments to the Constitution threaten the constitutional principles that have sustained our democratic form of government for more than 200 years. The Constitution allows America to flourish and adapt to new challenges. We have amended it only 17 times since the Bill of Rights was added.

Our Constitution deserves protection. I stand with the Constitution today and I will support the motion to table this ill-conceived legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the materials to which I referred.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From USA Today]

OUR VIEW: BUDGET AMENDMENT WRONG
VEHICLE FOR RIGHT PRINCIPLE

In 1997, the Senate came within a single vote of passing a constitutional amendment mandating a balanced federal budget. Backers made all the same arguments you'll hear today when the House takes up a new version of the old elixir: An amendment will finally force Congress to balance the budget, we'll never have a balanced budget without one, and so on.

But a funny thing happened after that amendment failed in 1997. Thanks to prior deficit-reduction deals and a strong economy, the federal government ran a surplus in 1998 and for the next three years. Then an economic downturn, huge tax cuts, two un-

funded wars and an unfunded expansion of Medicare plunged the budget back into the red, where it has been ever since.

The moral is, Congress doesn't need a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. It just needs the will to do it and the willingness to compromise over how. But rather than make the tough decisions about spending cuts and revenue increases, it's always easier to vote for a balanced budget amendment.

And not just any balanced budget amendment. Rather than embrace the same legislation that almost passed in 1997 and would surely attract Democratic votes this time around, backers have made the latest version so extreme that it's virtually certain not to pass both chambers of Congress, much less the three-fourths of states required for ratification.

This new version—part of the Republicans' "Cut, Cap and Balance" plan—sets a permanent limit on spending equal to 18% of the economy, a level it hasn't achieved since 1966. (The plan of conservative House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan, R-Wis., would leave spending at around 20% of GDP for the next two decades as Baby Boomers retire.) Raising taxes would require two-thirds of votes by the House and Senate.

Reading between the lines, it's clear that many supporters care less about cutting the deficit than about rewriting the Constitution to embrace an economic theory that shrinks government and makes it almost impossible to raise taxes.

Certainly, balancing the budget is a sound goal. We've been supporting it in this space for more than 20 years. Congress and successive presidents have demonstrated an inability to match revenue and spending. Something has to be done to change the incentives.

But the fatal flaw in virtually any balanced budget amendment is that it ties the government's hands in times of economic distress. When those sorts of crises hit, the government needs to be able to move quickly to rescue major financial institutions and deploy "automatic stabilizers," such as unemployment benefits and food stamps that steady the economy until private-sector forces can create a recovery. Failure to intervene caused the Great Depression of the 1930s, and had a balanced budget amendment been in place when the financial crisis struck in 2008, there's no doubt at all that we'd be living through another one now.

Backers also argue that because states have to balance their budgets, the federal government should, too. But the federal government has responsibilities the states don't, most notably to protect national security. And when state revenues collapse, the federal government serves as a critical lifeline.

Preferable alternatives to a constitutional amendment include pay-as-you-go requirements and firm spending caps that require lawmakers to make choices, rather than run up debt. But why make tough choices now when you can vote for a gimmick that someday, maybe, would address the problem?

[From the New York Times, July 4, 2011]

MORE FOLLY IN THE DEBT LIMIT TALKS

Congressional Republicans have opened a new front in the deficit wars. In addition to demanding trillions of dollars in spending cuts in exchange for raising the nation's debt limit, they are now vowing not to act without first holding votes in each chamber on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

The ploy is more posturing on an issue that has already seen too much grandstanding. But it is posturing with a dangerous purpose: to further distort the

terms of the budget fight, and in the process, to entrench the Republicans' no-new-taxes-ever stance.

It won't be enough for Democrats to merely defeat the amendment when it comes up for a vote. If there is to be any sensible deal to raise the debt limit, they also need to rebut the amendment's false and dangerous premises—not an easy task given the idea's populist appeal.

What could be more prudent than balancing the books every year? In fact, forcibly balancing the federal budget each year would be like telling families they cannot take out a mortgage or a car loan, or do any other borrowing, no matter how sensible the purchase or how creditworthy they may be.

Worse, the balanced budget amendment that Republicans put on the table is far more extreme than just requiring the government to spend no more than it takes in each year in taxes.

The government would be forbidden from borrowing to finance any spending, unless a supermajority agreed to the borrowing. In addition to mandating a yearly balance, both the House and Senate versions would cap the level of federal spending at 18 percent of gross domestic product.

That would amount to a permanent limit on the size of government—at a level last seen in the 1960s, before Medicare and Medicaid, before major environmental legislation like the Clean Water Act, and long before the baby-boom generation was facing retirement. The spending cuts implied by such a cap are so draconian that even the budget recently passed by House Republicans—and condemned by the public for its gutting of Medicare—would not be tough enough.

Under the proposed amendments, the spending cap would apply even if the government collected enough in taxes to spend above the limit, unless two-thirds of lawmakers voted to raise the cap. More likely, antitax lawmakers would vote to disburse the money via tax cuts. Once enacted, tax cuts would be virtually irreversible, since a two-thirds vote in both houses would be required to raise any new tax revenue. It isn't easy to change the Constitution. First, two-thirds of both the Senate and House must approve an amendment, and then at least 38 states must ratify the change.

But expect to hear a lot about the idea in the days ahead and in the 2012 political campaign, with Republicans eagerly attacking Democrats who sensibly voted no.

Democrats, undeniably, have a tougher argument to make. A fair and sustainable budget deal will require politically unpopular choices on programs to cut and taxes to raise. Americans deserve to hear the truth: There is no shortcut, no matter what the Republicans claim. Nor is their urgency to impose deep spending cuts now, while the economy is weak, as Republicans are insisting.

What is needed is enactment of a thoughtful deficit-reduction package, to be implemented as the economy recovers. If politicians respect the voters enough to tell them the truth, the voters may reward them at the polls.

[From the Washington Post, July 14, 2011]

A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT ISN'T THE ANSWER
(Editorial)

Amending the Constitution to require a balanced budget is a bad idea that never dies. It's not surprising that the current avalanche of debt has inspired renewed calls. Given that the political system appears unable to discipline itself not to spend more—trillions more—than it takes in, why not tie lawmakers' hands to prevent them from piling ever more debt on the national credit card?

The answer: The constitutional cure, while superficially tempting, would be worse than the underlying disease. A balanced-budget amendment would deprive policymakers of the flexibility they need to address national security and economic emergencies. It would revise the Constitution in a way that would give dangerous power to a congressional minority.

The latest push from lawmakers advocating the amendment is to couple a vote on the proposal with an agreement to raise the debt ceiling. On the surface, this argument seems benign enough: Why not give states the chance to decide whether the Constitution should mandate a balanced budget? But policymakers have an independent responsibility to assess whether an amendment is wise. This one, especially in its latest incarnation, is not. It would require a two-thirds vote in both houses of Congress to run a deficit in any year. The same supermajority would be needed to enact any tax increase. Compare those hurdles to the version of the amendment that passed the House in 1995, which called for a slightly lower three-fifths vote in each house to pass an unbalanced budget or increase the debt ceiling and a mere majority vote to increase taxes.

Worse yet, the latest version would impose an absolute cap on spending as a share of the economy. It would prevent federal expenditures from exceeding 18 percent of the gross domestic product in any year. Most unfortunately, the amendment lacks a clause letting the government exceed that limit to strengthen a struggling economy. No matter how shaky the state of the union, policymakers would be prevented from adopting emergency spending, such as the extension of unemployment insurance and other countercyclical expenses that have helped cushion the blow of the current economic downturn. The 18 percent cap on spending is so severe that House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan's economic plan would violate its strictures. So would any budget passed under President Ronald Reagan. With health-care costs rising and the number of retiring baby boomers increasing, it would be next to impossible to keep spending to that low share of the economy.

Both houses of Congress are expected to vote on the amendment next week, but a responsible lawmaker's obligation does not end at voting against this version. Even a less draconian rendition—without the spending cap or with lower thresholds for approving tax increases or running deficits—would be the wrong approach. If a balanced-budget amendment had been in place when the economy crashed in 2008, Congress would have been unable to respond with a stimulus package or efforts to stabilize banks and auto manufacturers. Even if you believe that was the wrong policy response, it is important that Congress retain the flexibility to craft the correct one.

The fiscal situation is perilous. It's commendable that members of Congress are trying to right it. The balanced-budget amendment remains a deeply flawed approach to achieving a noble goal.

[From the New York Times, July 17, 1990]
NO TO A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

The balanced budget amendment that the House will vote on today is impractical, unenforceable and wouldn't end Federal deficits. But it would litter the Constitution with a vacuous promise, and invite greater cynicism in budget-making.

Deficits are arbitrarily defined and easily manipulated. Achieving a specific level, like zero, has no special economic significance. And trying to hit that target could play havoc with valuable Federal programs and a

declining economy that might need deficit spending.

Yes, Congress should keep deficits from spiraling upward. But there is no immediate crisis, and the deficit—compared with the size of the economy—has already been cut in half under the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings budget law. More needs to be done. The prudent way is to amend Gramm-Rudman to make it work better, not spoil the precious Constitution in a quixotic search for a quick fix.

The proposed amendment would require a three-fifths vote in both houses to run a deficit. That, say the sponsors, would provide the flexibility to run deficits when they are needed but stymie unnecessary borrowing. But nowhere does the amendment come to grips with political reality. Evasion would be simple. Congress could move programs "off budget," like funds for the savings and loan crisis.

The amendment also would require Congress and the President to agree on revenue and expenditure estimates. But politicians have a common interest in fudging such projections and pretending to pass a balanced budget. The amendment's only safeguard against self-serving projections is the proposed three-fifths vote to raise the debt ceiling. That way legislators eventually would be forced to confront the issue. Yet garnering enough votes would be easy since to vote otherwise would bring the Government to a screeching halt.

As for states that have balanced budget amendments, they also have separate capital accounts. That allows them to borrow money for long-term investments in infrastructure. There is no separate capital account in the Federal budget. So a requirement to balance the budget would create a horrific incentive for Congress to avoid costly investments in railroads, education and research.

Congress has been unable to make the Gramm-Rudman budget law work fully as intended. But amending it to plug loopholes would be far easier, and better, than drafting a skimpily worded constitutional amendment.

[From the Washington Post, July 18, 2011]

WHY A BALANCED-BUDGET AMENDMENT IS TOO RISKY

(By Norman J. Ornstein)

It is no surprise that a constitutional amendment to balance the budget would re-emerge now—there's the symbolism of standing for fiscal rectitude and wrapping that position in the cloak of the Constitution. And nearly all states have constitutional provisions to balance their budgets, so why should the federal government be different?

But the answer to that question is a key reason a constitutional amendment to balance the federal budget would be disastrous.

A sagging economy requires what we call countercyclical policy, stimulus to counter a downturn and provide a boost. The need for countercyclical policy became apparent in the 1930s, after the opposite response to economic trouble caused a dizzying collapse; its application early in Franklin Roosevelt's presidency succeeded in pulling the United States out of the Depression (until a premature tightening in 1937-38 pulled us back down into it).

Countercyclical policy is what every industrialized country in the world employed when the credit shock hit in late 2008, to avoid a global disaster far more serious than the one we faced. Under a balanced-budget amendment, however, no countercyclical policy could emanate from Washington. Spending could not grow to combat the slump. And while the Obama stimulus did not jump-start a robust economic recovery,

any objective analysis would find that absent the \$800 billion stimulus, the economy would have spiraled down much further.

State balanced-budget requirements make the option of a federal balanced-budget amendment dangerous. When state revenue declines during economic downturns, state spending on unemployment and Medicaid increases. To balance their budgets, states have to raise taxes and/or cut spending, the opposite of what is needed to emerge from a fiscal funk. This is the economic equivalent of the medieval practice of bleeding to cure any ailment, including anemia. In 2009, the fiscal drag from the states amounted to roughly \$800 billion; in effect, the stimulus from Washington merely replaced the blood lost by the state-level bleeding.

Even balanced-budget amendments that have a waiver for recessions are a risk because there is often a lag between a recession itself and when it is recognized. That lag could produce more inopportune bleeding.

The amendment under consideration has its own deep flaws. The Republican proposal would cap spending each year at 18 percent of gross domestic product. Because the formula is based on a previous year's economy, it would mean, according to Republican economist Don Marron, a cap of more like 16.7 percent of GDP. This in turn means that the House-passed budget proposed by Rep. Paul Ryan, which calls for draconian cuts in Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid and discretionary domestic programs, would not be nearly draconian enough. Accounting for population changes, the 16.7 percent limit would mean slashing Social Security and Medicare well below the levels contemplated by the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles fiscal commission, and cutting discretionary spending by half or more. It is hard to make the case that decapitating food inspection, air traffic control, scientific research, Head Start, childhood nutrition programs and more, as the amendment would almost certainly require, would lead to a healthier economy, itself a necessity to solve the debt problem.

To be fair, the amendment has a safety valve—a two-thirds vote of both chambers can authorize a deficit. But imagine the chances of securing a two-thirds vote in this Congress. Similarly, its requirement that 60 percent of both houses vote to increase taxes or the debt limit would result in political gridlock and opportunities for legislative blackmail.

That this amendment has been endorsed by all 47 Republicans in the Senate, and that a dozen Republicans have pledged not to increase the debt limit without the amendment, are sad commentaries on our politics. But the effects should this amendment be adopted would be frightening.

Norman Ornstein is a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute and co-author of "The Broken Branch: How Congress Is Failing America and How to Get It Back on Track."

[From the News Leader, July 17, 2011]

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT UNWISE

Instead of making a good faith effort to work toward a compromise and actually do something good for the country, Republicans in Congress once again are bandying about a feel-good piece of legislation that could only further hogtie the government.

The balanced budget amendment is a flag conservatives love to run up the pole when they think they can get the American public to hate free-spending Democrats a little bit more. It's disingenuous at best. Congress should not require a special rule that says its members use common sense when making vast and expensive decisions. When it comes

to international conflicts, domestic terror threats and economic recessions, the added steps of arguing to get around a balanced budget amendment is not what is needed.

But when it comes to running the government, members of Congress need to use forethought and that not-so-common common sense to avoid unproductive tax cuts, conflicts without reasonable exit strategies and the ability to find solutions when deficits grow too large.

The timing of our own Rep. Bob Goodlatte's amendment might sound quite reasonable to a lot of people right now. But it isn't reasonable. It's another ploy by those who don't want a solution to the real problem, but just a way to make gullible followers believe they've found a solution to our budgetary woes.

A balanced budget amendment does not equal smaller government with less spending. Like any household, the only way to balance a budget is by trimming expenses and adding revenue. Pressed to balance a budget would force Congress to raise taxes, especially if we are to hang on to high-cost government entities like Social Security and Medicare.

It's not a solution. Demanding that a balanced-budget amendment go along with any agreement toward raising the debt ceiling simply will drag the whole thorny mess down even more.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, how much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 5½ minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would appreciate the Chair letting me know when 4 minutes has expired.

Let us put this debate in context. In 2010, we had a major election in the country. The people who were elected in the House made promises to their constituents: If you send me to Congress, I will try to change the system and deal with the fact our Nation is being run into the ground.

We have more debt than any future generation can ever pay off, with 40 cents of every dollar we spend being borrowed money. If you are born today, you inherit about \$48,000 of debt. We are spending more on Social Security payments than we collect in taxes. Medicare is underfunded by \$30-something trillion over the next 75 years. When you add up all entitlement programs, we are about \$50 trillion short of the promises we have made.

Simply put, the House Republicans who were elected, during their campaigns said: I believe Congress is out of control. We are going to become Greece, and I want to do something about it.

What did you expect when they got here? They would say: Okay, I have been taught the real way the Congress works, and it is all okay. They did something about it. Congratulations. Anytime a person running for office fulfills the promises they made to their constituents, they have done a great service to democracy.

Cut, cap, and balance is the House effort to reduce spending not 10 years

from now but this coming year. The problem with all these plans and the very sincere efforts in the past to solve our debt problems—Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, the Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997 between President Clinton and the Republicans—and I was here then when we achieved balance, because we restricted the growth of entitlements such as Medicare, we restricted doctor and hospital payments, and we actually balanced the budget for a year or two, but then we found out how much it was hurting doctors and hospitals. We didn't institute real reform. We began to nickel and dime doctors and hospitals, and guess what. We stopped the program and we spent all the surpluses.

How do you get \$14-trillion-plus in debt? Both parties are working together. This has been a bipartisan effort for about 30 years to run the country into the ground. I want a break. I want to have a bipartisan effort to save the country from becoming Greece, and the only way you can do that is to put ideas on the table.

Please, I say to my Democratic colleagues, let this debate go forward. If this is not worth debating, what would be? How do you save the country from becoming a debtor nation to the point the next generation can't inherit the American dream? If you have a better plan than cut, cap, and balance, please show it to us. We are willing to raise the debt limit, but we are not going to do it without changing the reason we got in debt.

The cut part reduces spending in 2012 by \$100 billion. That will cause some pain, but it is eminently doable. It is about 3 or 4 percent of the Federal budget. I think most people at home believe they can cut their budget 3 or 4 percent. If they had to do it to save their family, they would. We are talking about saving the country.

The cap is an effort to control spending over 10 years to wipe out the \$1.4 trillion deficit. We are going to become Greece because we are going to have 100 percent of debt to GDP in about the next 20 years, and a trillion-plus deficit has to be changed. You can't do it overnight, but you should be able to do it over 10 years.

The centerpiece of the House legislation is the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. What rational person believes that Republicans on this side and Democrats on that side are ever going to find a way to fix our Nation's problems without something new happening?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 4 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Chair.

After 40 years, the evidence is in. The Congress is broken, and unless you change the system fundamentally, we are going to run our Nation into the ground. So I support a balanced budget amendment.

Here is the way it works: You have to get two-thirds in the Senate and the House and three-fourths of the States

have to ratify the balanced budget amendment. Give the people of America a chance to have their say. Let's pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution before we take the country and put it in a situation beyond redemption. The only thing that is ever going to change this body, I am sad to say, is some discipline imposed by the Constitution itself.

I promise my colleagues to work with you where I can. But for the rest of my time in the Senate—and I don't know how long it is going to be—I am going to push a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, because I don't trust the Congress to do the hard work on its own. And when I say that, I mean Republicans too.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the motion to table the motion to proceed to H.R. 2560, the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act of 2011. At this critical juncture in our Nation's history, the Federal Government's record of fiscal recklessness proves we must work to guarantee fiscal responsibility not just for our time, but for all time. In that light, I believe it deserves debate and an open process that would allow for changes and improvements so we can ultimately pass a measure ensuring we are never again confronted with a vote to raise our Nation's debt ceiling. And I am therefore deeply disappointed and troubled that the majority in the Senate is not permitting us to proceed to any further discussion or votes on this bill.

To achieve that goal, an indispensable element of the cut, cap, and balance bill is the balanced budget amendment—and I have been a champion of balanced budget amendments throughout my tenure. And in fact, this legislation before us represents the one and only opportunity we will likely have as we lead up to the debt ceiling deadline to consider and pass just such an amendment. Given our historic \$14.3 trillion national debt, the record \$1.6 trillion deficit for the current fiscal year, and the unrestrained and skyrocketing growth of government programs and services, we have little choice but to seriously and thoroughly debate measures to bring certainty and solutions to our broken budget process. We must commence a process that will force our government to reevaluate priorities and live within its means.

Indeed, this is a threshold moment in our Nation's history to determine precisely what kind of nation we want to be. Will our fiscal future be held hostage to interests overseas, threatening both our national and economic security? Will we cede our destiny to countries like China, which already holds approximately one-fifth of our gross debt? Or will we seize the financial reins, pass a constitutional balanced budget amendment, and reclaim our future?

Given what is at stake and Congress's perpetual disregard for fiscal responsibility, frankly, the burden is squarely upon the opponents of this resolution

to justify how business as usual is sustainable for our Nation. Indeed, last week the President asserted that, "we don't need a constitutional amendment to do our jobs." Well, if that were true, if such an amendment isn't required for us to do our jobs, why then do we find ourselves wallowing in this economic morass? If Congress actually possessed the capacity to forestall skyrocketing debt of its own volition, why are we mired in a major debt crisis?

So let us not be confused as we hear all of the usual diversionary excuses why this amendment shouldn't pass. And having cosponsored a balanced budget amendment 18 times since my very first days in Congress, and having made statements in favor of it 35 times on the Senate and House floor, believe me, I could recite them all by rote—how a balanced budget amendment will be overly restrictive, spending reductions too substantial, and that other measures would be equally effective without changing our Constitution. I recall during a House floor debate in 1992, colleagues asked: What if appropriations exceed estimated revenues? What if the President and Congress underestimate the amount of federal revenues in a fiscal year? What if it requires budgetary adjustments as a result of a contracting economy, or inaccurate estimates?

And my response then was the same as it is now—welcome to the real world! That is what families, businesses and frankly, 49 States that have adopted balanced budget requirements confront day in and day out. State governors and legislators cannot leave their Capitols if their budgets aren't balanced and the U.S. Congress should be no different.

Instead, we have not only a fiscal gap in Washington but a shameful imbalance between the trust the American people have placed in us, and the responsibilities we must carry out if we are to demonstrate worthiness of that trust. The demonstrable reality is that, absent a permanent mechanism that forces the Federal Government to set and fulfill its fiscal priorities, Congress will blithely continue its wayward practices. Indeed, the reason many lawmakers don't want a balanced budget amendment is the exact reason why it's essential—and that is to permanently end the types of legislative trickery that have brought our country to the edge of a fiscal chasm.

The facts speak for themselves. On March 4, 1997, when the balanced budget amendment failed to pass in the Senate by one vote, our gross debt was \$5.36 trillion, a number we rightly all found staggering! But apparently it wasn't staggering enough, as the abysmal track record following 1997 dramatically demonstrates.

In 1999, just 2 years after that fateful vote in which the balanced budget amendment failed to pass, the debt rose to \$5.6 trillion. By 2002—it was \$6 trillion. In 2004—\$7 trillion. In 2006—\$8 trillion. By 2009—it rose to \$11 trillion,

and last year to \$13.5 trillion. The bottom line is that from 1997 to 2011, the national debt has almost tripled. Tripled—to an unprecedented \$14.3 trillion. And now we are asked to raise the ceiling again to \$16.5 trillion.

Our government has balanced its budget only five times in half a century. Five times. Our 1997 deficit was \$22 billion; this year's is projected to be 73 times as high, at \$1.6 trillion. Does anyone know any families out there in America who are voluntarily spending 73 times what they spent in 1997? Families across the country have been paying down their credit cards. They are facing reality, while Congress continues to binge-spend, unabated.

In 1992, I said on the House floor that, "we have no way of knowing how bad things might get if we continue without the balanced budget amendment." Well, regrettably, now we do know, and the situation is dire as our outstanding debt now projected to reach 100 percent of GDP this year—which some economists have labeled an "economic danger zone." In fact, economists report that gross debt levels above 90 percent of GDP slow economic growth by 1 percent per year, resulting in approximately 1 million jobs lost. So I defy anyone to explain how we could have amassed these mind-numbing levels of debt relative to our GDP, and yet a balanced budget amendment is not a necessity.

We have tried every statutory structure possible yet nothing we have implemented has withstood the test of time, circumvention, or clever gimmickry to successfully and consistently bind both the House and the Senate to provide continuity from Congress to Congress, to act in a fiscally responsible manner. Nothing. And no one can disavow the consequences of this lack of self-imposed accountability, which has engendered shockingly deficient oversight and review of our spending and Federal programs, both those already existing, and those proposed. As a result, we continue to pile on program after program with impunity.

We have witnessed the positive effects of statutory limits with past budget enforcement mechanisms such as the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act, the 1990 Budget Enforcement Act, and the 1997 Balanced Budget Act that saved upward of \$700 billion, and those measures led to 4 years of surpluses. But we allowed them to lapse, to wither on the legislative vine, and that has led us directly to the "wild west" mentality of today in which our entire budget and appropriations processes have virtually disintegrated.

Congress is required by law to adopt a budget resolution by April 15, yet in the past 36 years Congress has met that deadline just six times. Throughout the last 10 years, Congress has approved a budget resolution on only six occasions. Congress failed to complete action on a budget resolution for 5 fiscal years—1999, 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2011—

that all ended with large, spendthrift, omnibus appropriations measures or continuing resolutions.

Last year, no budget and no appropriations bills passed for the first time since the current budget rules were put into place in 1974, almost resulting in a shutdown of the Federal Government in April 2011. We have had 87 continuing resolutions in the past 14 fiscal years and passed not even a single one of the 12 individual appropriations bills for the current fiscal year. This tacit acceptance of dysfunction in our budget and appropriations processes has only exacerbated the trend-line of unbridled federal spending, and it is symptomatic of the miniscule value Congress has assigned to averting economically corrosive deficits and debt.

It is certainly not as though we lack the time to fulfill our legal requirement to complete budgets by April 15—and just ask the American people if they aren't required to meet their tax filing deadline on April 15! In fact, the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service reports that from January 5, 2011, through July 1, 2011, the Senate has been in session for 541 Hours, 243 hours of which have been spent in Morning Business—that is 45 percent of our time spent in nonlegislative activity. We couldn't have voted on a budget resolution? No wonder only 18 percent of the country believes Congress is doing its job, which only makes me wonder—who exactly are those 18 percent?

Even when we had the historic opportunity of 4 consecutive years of Federal surpluses beginning in 1998, we squandered it with a deplorable lack of foresight. In 2001, the last year of surpluses when our debt was \$5.8 trillion, I introduced a legislative trigger mechanism to link long-term Federal budget surplus reductions with actual budgetary outcomes and later led a bipartisan, bicameral group with Senator Bayh to offer a subsequent amendment, recognizing that federal surplus projections were merely that—projections. Yet both measures were dismissed and derided.

And what has been the result? Since 2002, the Nation has run a deficit each and every year and our gross debt has increased from \$6.2 trillion to almost \$15 trillion. Over the past 5 years alone, government has managed to increase spending by a remarkable 40 percent, contributing to the largest budget deficits in our history over the last three consecutive years. We are now borrowing roughly 40 cents of every dollar we spend.

The reality could not be more stark—the balanced budget amendment is the only vehicle before us that will guarantee that a balanced budget will be the rule, rather than the exception—because it will compel Congress, through the ultimate authority of the Constitution—to return to the regimentation and discipline of the budget and appropriations processes, and thereby force the government to estab-

lish priorities and abide by those priorities.

To paraphrase a statement I made during one particular balanced budget debate in the House, the Constitution is not for window dressing. It is not to score political points for any particular party. It is not for more games and gimmicks—and in fact, as I have stated many times, if it were a gimmick Congress would have passed it long ago! Rather, the purpose is to protect current and future generations from the crushing weight of ever-escalating debt that threatens America's security and our very way of life.

There should be no mistake—debt and deficits are always a dangerous combination, and especially at a time when we are experiencing an unprecedented period of long-term unemployment with more than 22 million Americans unemployed or underemployed, and another 2.2 million who want a job, but are so discouraged they stopped looking for work altogether. Consider that, in the 29 months since President Obama took office, unemployment has dipped below 9 percent for only 5 months, and actually increased to 9.2 percent in June. And yet at a moment when every dollar government spends should be wisely dedicated to job creation to return us on the path to prosperity, we are forced to commit an astounding \$200 billion per year just to service our debt.

The cost of net interest alone will more than triple in the next 10 years to reach nearly \$1 trillion per year in 2021. In fact, the CBO's most recent long-term outlook states that by 2035 interest costs on our Nation's debt would reach 9 percent of GDP, more than the U.S. currently spends on Social Security or Medicare! And if interest rates were just one percentage point higher per year, over ten years the deficit would balloon by \$1.3 trillion from increased costs.

Ironically, the conversations in Washington are about how the markets will react if we do not raise the debt ceiling, but the markets are already reacting. Standard & Poor's recently downgraded the Nation's outlook from "stable" to "negative," Moody's warned that our "AAA" rating could be lost if we do not reduce deficit spending, and large funds like PIMCO are divesting holdings of U.S. bonds.

And let's be perfectly clear—it is not only our economy that may suffer should we dive into the fiscal abyss. When ADM Mike Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, identifies the national debt as the single biggest threat to our national security—that ought to compel us to stand up and take notice. Yet in the absence of a balanced budget amendment, any fiscal foothold we may gain with measures implemented in this Congress could be summarily reversed by subsequent Congresses—whereas, a balanced budget amendment would establish an indissoluble contract with future generations that would cement fiscal responsibility in perpetuity.

So let us be unambiguous what this debate is about. It is a fundamental disagreement between those who are concerned about our future economic standards, and those who are willing to erode the economic opportunities that have become the very hallmark of the American dream. You see, the dirty little secret is that those who oppose a balanced budget amendment don't want their hands tied . . . they don't want the fiscal restraints. Well, to them I say, this is America—can't we do better?

Well, we can do better, and we must—and therefore, I will vote to proceed with this legislation. Critically, it contains a provision that exempts Medicare, Social Security, and veterans benefits from the spending caps. At the same time, I recognize it is not a perfect bill. In fact, again I believe there should be a full and open debate during which members can offer amendments to improve this legislation and I regret that the majority here in the Senate will preclude that possibility.

I can foresee a number of improvements I would propose, including the addition of a "pay-for" title in the legislation that would provide for additional, mandatory savings including eliminating ethanol subsidies and direct agricultural payments to high-income farmers, and rescinding unspent stimulus and TARP funds, that could be better utilized within Medicare and Medicaid. And we must also enact straightforward budget policy reforms so that Congress no longer relies on accounting gimmicks. These are but a number of the improvements that would save billions of dollars and put our nation on a path toward fiscal responsibility.

Again, the central question before us is as old as the founding of our great republic—and that is, what kind of nation do we want to be? That was the same question that historian David McCullough addressed years ago before group of legislators when he discussed the milestones achieved by Congress when leaders worked together.

"Think what your institution has achieved," he observed. "It was Congress that created the Homestead Act. It was Congress that ended slavery. It was Congress that ended child labor. It was Congress that built the Panama Canal, the railroads and the Interstate System. It was Congress that created Social Security. It was Congress that passed the Voting Rights Act. It was Congress that sent Lewis and Clark to the West, and sent us on voyages to the moon." And some acts of Congress, he pointed out, like the Marshall plan and lend lease, were achieved under crisis conditions.

I honestly believe that this spirit of accomplishment can be re-captured—and what could be a more fundamental place to start than with the future fiscal health of our Nation? We can either bring disrepute upon ourselves by continuing to mortgage our future to

cover the fiscal offenses of today or we can rise to the occasion, meet our moral responsibility, and bequeath the generations to come a nation unencumbered by the shackles of perpetual debt. The choice is ours, and history awaits our answer.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the path to deficit reduction is difficult, but some of the essentials are clear for all to see. We must cut spending, which will require real sacrifice on the part of American families. We must also add revenue, which has plunged so dramatically thanks to Bush-era tax cuts that flow primarily to the wealthiest among us. And we must avoid proposals that would see the most vulnerable among us pay the highest price for deficit reduction.

That is the path a broad array of budget experts, Democratic and Republican, tell us is the only way to relieve our debt problem. And it is the path the American people tell us they understand that we need to take. In survey after survey, poll after poll, Americans voice their support for a balanced approach to deficit reduction, one in which we cut spending, yes, but also address revenues by closing tax loopholes and asking the wealthiest among us to share in the sacrifices that are required to bring down the deficit. And they tell us, unequivocally, that they do not want us to fall short of our commitment to the most vulnerable, especially those who depend on Social Security and Medicare for a secure retirement.

So this is the true path to deficit reduction: targeted and sometimes painful spending cuts; closing tax loopholes, asking wealthy taxpayers to join in the sacrifices we must make; and protecting the social safety net on which our most vulnerable citizens depend.

We can choose that path, difficult though it may be. Or we could take a path like the one laid out in this legislation—a path leading straight off a cliff. The American public has made it clear to the Republicans in the House of Representatives that its budget objectives, as laid out in the draconian budget plan they sent to us earlier this year, are unacceptable. Rather than heeding that message, Republicans have sent us a plan that's even worse than the first.

The budget championed by House Republicans this year would have added more than \$6,000 a year to the typical senior's medical bills. The plan before us today tacks another \$2,500 or more onto that bill.

The budget plan from House Republicans this year cut billions from Medicare to clear the way for billions in tax cuts for the wealthy. The plan before us today would enshrine protection for those tax cuts in the Constitution by requiring two-thirds majorities in both Houses to enact any revenue increase, making it virtually impossible for future Congresses to reverse such disastrous policies, or to remove tax loop-

holes for oil companies or tax incentives for companies that ship jobs overseas.

The budget plan from House Republicans this year would cost an estimated 700,000 jobs by removing support from an already weakened economy. The economy has, if anything, become more worrisome since that budget came to us, but the legislation before us today follows the same destructive path.

Let us be clear: What Republicans have proposed is to abandon our commitments to the safety, security and prosperity of the American people. They would slash Medicare and Social Security, and leave the rest of the budget so threadbare that it could not cover our important priorities. The American people want us to reduce waste and redundancy in Federal spending. But they do not want us to stop protecting the air we breathe and the water we drink, stop inspecting our food supply, stop patrolling our streets or borders or educating our young people or ensuring safe air travel or any of the things that help keep them safe and healthy and secure. And yet there is no doubt that under this plan, we would stop doing some or all of those things. We would have no choice.

It is especially disturbing that many of the same people arguing for these destructive policies are responsible for the policies that brought on our deficit to begin with. Republicans are quick to blame President Obama's policies for the deficit, but the vast majority of our current woes stem from policies adopted during the previous administration by Republican majorities in Congress. Republicans pushed for massive tax cuts, tax cuts that weren't paid for and that flowed overwhelmingly to the wealthy. Republicans pushed for a war of choice in Iraq that was not paid for.

Our Republican colleagues like to compare the Federal Government to a family. Families have to balance their budgets, they say; why can't the government? Well, the Federal "family" had a balanced budget under Democrats. Republicans wrecked our fiscal discipline with the Bush tax cuts and wars that were not paid for, and now they want middle-class and vulnerable Americans to pay the price. If the government is a family, then Republicans are the guy who gets a big raise, blows the whole raise plus the family savings on a hot rod, gets fired from his job, loses his income, and decides to stop paying the kids' tuition so he can keep the hot rod.

That is the path they propose, in this legislation. We can't follow that path. The better path is difficult, but it is clear. I hope our Republican colleagues will abandon the path of ruin, reject this destructive bill and join us in making the hard choices that the people we serve need us to make, and soon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak of one of my gravest concerns, which is our Nation's fiscal future.

All of us—Democrats, Republicans, liberals, moderates, conservatives—face a choice about whether we will seize the moment before us and confront our great fiscal nightmare or whether we will let this moment pass us by. Clearly, we face tough and difficult decisions. The decision we make as Members of Congress must be the right and responsible ones or our beloved Nation and our hard-working families will needlessly suffer.

In my State, when I became Governor, we faced challenging times—growing debts and tough budget choices. When I was first elected in November of 2004, the first thing I did afterwards was go to New York and talk to the rating agencies—the people who knew our State best—to find out what our gravest challenges were. I went back home and we started making changes.

I did not blame anyone—any past administration, Republican or Democrat or any other body. I was elected to fix things, not to put blame on people. As West Virginians, not as Democrats or Republicans, we set about fixing the problems of our State. We didn't raise tax rates. People came to me and said we needed to do that, but I couldn't look people in the eye and do that without trying to run our State more efficiently.

The difference between what we did back home and what is happening here in Washington is that we faced these choices together. We worked across party lines in a responsible way to address our fiscal challenges. In doing so, we set our State on the right fiscal path and—let me stress again without sacrificing our moral responsibility or obligations to our seniors, our veterans, and the people most challenged in our society. We did that without raising their tax rates.

Right now, because we made the right choices, our State is doing well. Even in these most difficult, challenging financial times, we have had record surpluses every year—6 years in a row. For the last 3 years, we have been one of the few States in the Nation that has an increase in our rating from Standard & Poor's, Moody's and Fitch, the rating agencies. We did this by living within our means. It is the reason why I am such a strong supporter of a balanced budget amendment. It makes you put in place your priorities based on what your values are. I truly believe most Americans support a balanced budget. Every family I know in my State and in this Nation works off of some sort of a budget. Nearly all our State governments operate on a balanced budget. I have never seen another place, except here in our Nation's Capitol—our government in Washington—that puts a budget together based on what they want to spend, not on how much they have to spend.

But how we balance our budget is critically important. We have a moral responsibility and an obligation to our seniors, our families, and those who are the most fragile in our challenged society. That is why I cannot support the cut, cap, and balance plan passed in the House, which we will be voting on shortly. As a moderate Democrat who is also a proud fiscal conservative, I agree with the bill's goal of a balanced budget. However, I cannot support the path it takes.

The cut, cap, and balance plan does not reflect who we are or what we want to be as Americans. I believe we need to cut but not so deeply and without regard for our seniors and the most vulnerable. I believe we need a cap on our spending but not at a level that could destroy the most important and vital programs we have in our society. I strongly believe we need a balanced budget amendment but only one that takes a responsible and reasonable approach.

Clearly, we can all agree it is time for us to make the difficult choice that will get our financial house in order, but we must do so with the right plan in a responsible manner—one that keeps our promises to our seniors, our veterans and, most importantly, our children. And like it or not, neither Democrats nor Republicans can tackle this enormous challenge on their own. This is not a political problem, this is an American problem, one we all face. We should put politics aside and truly put our country first.

Earlier this week, I saw that spirit at its finest. On Tuesday of this past week, the Presiding Officer, along with 49 of our other colleagues, came together to listen to the Gang of 6, who worked so hard on ideas based on the President's fiscal debt commission. Democrats and Republicans rolled out the first bipartisan proposal to address the Nation's fiscal nightmare. At that meeting, 50 Senators from both parties—evenly split—came together to listen to the hard work of the Senators who spanned the ideological spectrum. At that moment, the Gang of 6 turned into what we affectionately called the "Mob of 50."

And for the first time in these negotiations about our fiscal future, we had a bipartisan plan with momentum that was putting our country first.

We should not waste this moment. We must work together to cut spending and attack waste, fraud, and abuse in every sector of our country, every department, every program that needlessly costs our Nation hundreds of billions of dollars every year.

We must work together to reform our Tax Code, not to raise tax rates but to make fairness a priority. It is simply unfair that hard-working middle-class families in West Virginia and all around this great country would pay more in taxes than a Fortune 500 company such as GE, which didn't pay a cent, or billionaires such as Warren Buffett who pays a lower effective tax

rate than his secretary. Democrats and Republicans must work together to remove unnecessary loopholes, subsidies, and tax credits we simply cannot afford in light of our ballooning debt.

It is time to end the three wars we have that we are spending so much on and the resources we can't afford and the lives we can't spare.

I say to all this is a time for us to come together as Americans, to put our politics aside, and do what is right for all of the future of this generation and for this country.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I want to say to my friend from West Virginia, he has been a great addition to the Senate. We of course know he replaced the great, the legendary Robert Byrd. The people of West Virginia should be very happy with the performance of JOE MANCHIN and his executive experience as the Governor of the State of West Virginia, which had an impeccable record with surpluses every year he was there. He has brought this talent to Washington, and it has been very helpful to us all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 5 months ago, President Obama unveiled the only concrete statement he has made to date on our Nation's budget crisis, a 10-year budget plan so preposterous, so unequal to the moment that it was rejected in the Senate by a vote of 97-0. The President's response to this crisis was to pretend it didn't exist.

Two months later, the President doubled down on his vision for a future of debt by demanding that Congress raise the debt limit, without any cuts to spending or a plan to rein it in. It was a total abdication of leadership and it wasn't sustainable.

So over the past several weeks, the President has been doing his best impersonation of a fiscal moderate. He has talked about balance and left it to others to fill in the blanks.

Here is what Democrats in Congress have proposed as a solution: more spending and higher taxes to a debt crisis.

Yesterday, with the clock ticking, we heard reports of a volcanic eruption among Democrats at the suggestion that we should solve this crisis by focusing on reducing Washington spending.

The solution to this crisis is not complicated. If you are spending more money than you are taking in, you need to spend less money. This isn't rocket science. We could solve this problem this morning if Democrats would let us vote on cut, cap, and balance and join us in backing this legislation that Republicans support.

But the first step in solving a problem is to admit you have one, and too many Democrats refuse to admit that Washington has a spending problem. That is why Republicans have insisted that we focus on spending in this debate.

The reason we have a \$14 trillion debt is because no matter how much money Washington has, it always spends more; and the only way to cure the problem is to stop enabling it. Americans get it, and I want to thank every American who has spoken out in favor of cut, cap, and balance. Today, the American people will know where we stand.

A vote to table this bill is a vote to ignore this crisis even longer. A vote to get on this bill is a vote for getting our house in order.

I urge my Democratic colleagues one more time to reconsider their position. Join us in support of a future we can afford.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to all my friends, and new Senators, welcome to the United States.

This is a vote on the piece of legislation that was described by my friend, the chairman of the Judiciary, as well as anyone else: It is violative of our Constitution.

This is a vote on this matter, and we are going to dispose of this legislation as it needs to be so President Obama and the Speaker can move forward on a matter that will have some revenue in it and send it over here, and we can move forward to complete our work to make sure we don't default on our debt.

As a result of our conversation here, I move to table the motion to proceed to H.R. 2560 and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 116 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Akaka	Feinstein	Menendez
Baucus	Franken	Merkley
Begich	Hagan	Mikulski
Bennet	Harkin	Murray
Bingaman	Inouye	Nelson (NE)
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Klobuchar	Pryor
Brown (OH)	Kohl	Reed
Cantwell	Landrieu	Reid
Cardin	Lautenberg	Rockefeller
Carper	Leahy	Sanders
Casey	Levin	Schumer
Conrad	Lieberman	Shaheen
Coons	Manchin	Stabenow
Durbin	McCaskill	Tester

Udall (CO)	Warner	Whitehouse
Udall (NM)	Webb	Wyden

NAYS—46

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Graham	Murkowski
Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Blunt	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heller	Risch
Brown (MA)	Hoeven	Roberts
Burr	Hutchison	Rubio
Chambliss	Inhofe	Sessions
Coats	Isakson	Shelby
Coburn	Johanns	Snowe
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Collins	Kirk	Toomey
Corker	Kyl	Vitter
Cornyn	Lee	Wicker
Crapo	Lugar	
DeMint	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—3

Gillibrand	Kerry	McCain
------------	-------	--------

The motion was agreed to.

• **Mr. KERRY.** Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for the vote on the motion to table the motion to proceed to the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act, H.R. 2560. If I were able to attend today's session, I would have supported the motion to table the motion to proceed to the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act, H.R. 2560.●

• **Mr. MCCAIN.** Mr. President, I regret that due to my attendance at a dear friend's funeral this morning, I was not in the Senate to cast my vote for the cut, cap and balance legislation. I fully support cut, cap and balance and I am proud that Republicans put forward a concrete proposal to cut spending, balance the budget, reign in the spiraling debt that imperils our children's future and ensures that our Nation continues to meet its obligations.

The Democratic leadership has failed to put forward any meaningful proposal to break this impasse, but instead continues to set up procedural road blocks to keep Republican plans from passing and force votes on non-binding legislation that will do nothing to solve our problems. The Democrats, led by President Obama, continue to insist that our fiscal difficulties can be fixed by raising taxes on individuals and small businesses—the exact policies that will deepen our economic woes, not fix them.

Both parties must now find a reasonable, responsible path forward to address head-on our debt crisis, end the mortgaging of our children's future and make certain that our Nation meets its debt obligations, as we Americans always have. If Speaker Tip O'Neill and President Ronald Regan could find agreement on such matters, we can too. We must put politics aside and do what is right for our Nation.●

• **Mrs. GILLIBRAND.** Mr. President, no one disputes that we must act now to reduce our growing debt. The interest we pay on our debt costs us dearly in lost opportunity to invest in America. We spend millions of dollars a year paying interest to countries, like China, that we should be investing here in America to create jobs and get our economy moving again. At the same time, it is essential that we do not, for the first time in history, fail to pay our obligations and default on our debt.

Doing so will only make our economic and debt challenges more difficult, and could make it almost impossible to turn our economy around.

Unfortunately, I think this legislation is shortsighted and mistaken. It neither guarantees that the United States will not default on its obligations, nor does it provide a balanced blueprint to addressing our long-term budget obligations. Instead, it would constitutionally protect tax breaks for millionaires and special interest while forcing benefit cuts to Social Security and Medicare beyond those proposed in the House Republican budget.

This legislation also distracts from making the hard choices we need to make to reduce the deficit and at the same time create jobs and grow our economy. The legislation makes it almost impossible to increase revenues, even on the millionaires and billionaires who are doing just fine in this economy. It also fails to reduce Pentagon spending, which accounts for more than half of our discretionary spending budget, forcing more pain on families, seniors and other hard-working Americans.

We must address our budget challenges, but we cannot do so on the backs of our seniors and working families. For these reasons, I am opposed to this legislation, and while I was ill and could not vote, I would like the record to show that I would have voted to table the motion to proceed on HR 2560, the Cut, Cap and Balance Act. I am strongly opposed to this legislation.●

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until 2 p.m. today, with Senators permitted to speak during that time for up to 10 minutes each.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there will be no further rollcall votes this week. The next vote will be on Monday at approximately 5:30 p.m. I will give a scheduling update later after I confer with the Republican leader.

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. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

MOVING FORWARD

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senate just conducted a very important vote. We have now demonstrated that the

House Republicans' cut, cap, and balance bill is over, done, and dead. This was a necessary step, and this step now allows the process to move forward.

Let me take a moment to discuss where we go from here.

Earlier this week, the Republican leader and I were working together on a path to avert insolvency. It was a fallback plan. It was the second choice for everyone, including me, and the Republican leader I am sure. But earlier this week, it looked as though we needed to go to that fallback plan as soon as possible. Thus, earlier this week, it looked as though the Senate would have to originate that legislation, perhaps as soon as today, to avoid default.

During the course of the week, however, circumstances have changed. The Speaker and the President have been working diligently together to reach an agreement on a major deficit-reduction measure. As I said earlier this morning, I wish them both very well. That is very important to our country.

The product on which they are working would address, I understand, both taxes and spending. Under the Constitution, the House of Representatives must originate all revenue measures. Therefore, the path to avert default now runs first through the House of Representatives—that is what the Constitution demands—and we in the Senate must wait for them. Therefore, the Senate does not need to originate legislation today.

Earlier this week, I had announced the Senate would need to be in session this weekend. But based on these changed circumstances—and they change fairly rapidly—that is no longer the case.

So at the close of business today, the Senate will be out until Monday. Over the weekend, of course, there will be all kinds of meetings going on, and I will do my best to monitor closely the talks between the President and the Speaker, and I will await word of their hoped-for success.

We will be back on Monday. The Senate will have at least one vote Monday evening, and the Senate will wait anxiously for the House of Representatives to send us their work product so we can later next week pass legislation to prevent a default in our great country.

I am going to consider moving other legislation in case that does not work in the House of Representatives. I received a letter from Senators today as to some suggestions they have. There is a meeting that is going to take place at 11 o'clock today with the Gang of 6. The Republican leader and I will be in on that meeting. We are doing our very best to keep all Senators, Democrats and Republicans, on top of what is going on. But, frankly, in fairness to the Republican leader and to me, a lot of what is going on we don't know. So we are, because of the negotiations—at least I am speaking for myself; I can't speak for the Republican leader, but I have not been in the day-to-day negotiations as to what is going on between the President and the Speaker.

For the third time today, I say as sincerely as I can, I wish them well. It is extremely important we address the debt, and it is extremely important we understand we are no longer talking about credit ratings. We are talking about the default of our debt. I hope this weekend brings good sense and common sense and vitality to the work being done between the President and the House of Representatives.

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. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECURE FISCAL PATH

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, Abraham Lincoln once said:

I am a firm believer in the people. If given the truth, they can be depended upon to meet any national crisis. The great point is to bring them the real facts.

I think that is where we are today. I think we need to bring the people the facts about our Nation's debt. People in my State see through the games being played in Washington. They want solutions, courage, and leadership—the kind that puts us on a more secure fiscal path for the future.

Mr. Bryant of Hot Springs Village, AR, writes:

We know we have to increase the debt ceiling, so let's get serious about finding a solution. . . . Why is this a problem for our politicians? The public expects responsible leadership not the demagoguery we are getting from both sides of the aisle.

That is the sentiment I hear around my State, and I am certain many of my colleagues are hearing this around the Nation.

So here are the facts: For over 230 years, the U.S. Government has honored its obligations. Even in the face of the Civil War, two World Wars, and the Depression, America has paid its bills. Yet now we stand on the brink of tarnishing the full faith and credit of the United States. We stand here because Congress has failed to bring the American people the real facts.

The easiest thing for politicians to do is say they are for lower taxes and for increased spending. This mindset has rung up a \$14.2 trillion national debt. We now borrow 41 cents of every dollar we spend.

Under this debt, combined with the theatrics playing out in the House and the Senate, the unthinkable could happen. The 80 million bills the Federal Government pays could come to a screeching halt. That means millions of seniors may not receive their Social Security checks in the mail, troops may not receive paychecks, Medicare patients could be denied care, and the stock market could significantly drop.

Moreover, credit rating agencies have warned us that we will likely lose our

AAA credit rating without immediate action. Interest rates would permanently rise, piling on additional costs for families. The costs of owning a home, buying food, filling a gas tank, sending kids to college, and buying a car will become even more expensive.

There is one more real fact I wish to highlight. A default adds heavily to our debt. For every 1-percent increase in the interest rates we pay, it adds \$1.3 trillion to the debt. It is no wonder last summer the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said, "Our national debt is our biggest national security threat."

The Gang of 6 offers an alternative—a comprehensive roadmap that allows us to tackle the debt in a reasonable, responsible, and fair manner. I applaud MARK WARNER, SAXBY CHAMBLISS, KENT CONRAD, TOM COBURN, MIKE CRAPO, and DICK DURBIN on this bipartisan effort. By leaving out political agendas, these Senators—these statesmen—produced a plan to slash deficits by \$3.7 trillion over 10 years. This plan follows the blueprint put forth by the fiscal commission following a year's worth of study and collaboration.

In addition to an immediate \$500 billion downpayment, the plan puts everything on the table. It balances the need to reduce spending, adjusts entitlement programs, and reforms our Tax Code. While I may not agree with every provision, I do like that it falls on every citizen to contribute to debt reduction. It allows us to achieve measurable results without jeopardizing safety net programs meant to protect the most vulnerable among us.

Furthermore, it avoids gimmicks such as a constitutional amendment or cut, cap, and balance, which offer a nice sound bite but falls short.

I am hopeful a gang of 60 will embrace this plan and that we can include it as part of the final debt ceiling solution.

Congress has created this cliffhanger moment. Americans and leaders all over the world are now watching. The question for Congress remains: Will we rise to the occasion or will we fail?

Mr. President, 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. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GROWING THE ECONOMY

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I am disappointed by the outcome of the vote today in which a proposal I believe had the most merit for moving us in the right direction in regard to raising the debt ceiling and moving us toward the direction of a balanced budget failed in the Senate.

I have spoken this week several times about the importance of cut, cap,

and balance. It is the plan that has passed the House of Representatives and was the path we could take here, and I have encouraged my colleagues throughout the week to come together to try to make this cut, cap, and balance plan the framework by which we resolve this issue of the impending necessity of raising the debt ceiling.

I have said on every occasion it would be irresponsible not to raise the debt ceiling. I do not know exactly what the consequences are and at what point in time those consequences occur, but I do know it would be damaging to the economy. I also believe it would be equally, if not more, irresponsible to simply raise the debt ceiling without taking the necessary steps to put our country on the right path toward a balanced budget in the future.

I thought cut, cap, and balance really did present that opportunity in which we cut spending back to previous years' levels, we cap that spending so it is not more than a certain percentage of our gross national product, our country's economy, and, finally, that we pass a balanced budget amendment, something I have supported since I came to Congress each and every year. I believe we do not have the necessary discipline and courage, the necessity we need to make the decisions to put us on the path toward balancing the budget. Of course, if we approved a balanced budget amendment in the House and the Senate, it still would be considered by the American people through the State legislatures.

So I speak this morning with disappointment that on a straight party-line vote, this issue, this legislation was tabled. But I have also said throughout my conversations about the debt ceiling and about getting our country back on the right path that I believe there is a fourth component to cut, cap, and balance.

In my view, that fourth component is grow—cut, cap, balance, and grow the economy. Certainly, in my view, the Federal Government does not create jobs. But we have millions of Americans across our country who are looking for work, looking for better work, looking for full-time work, and we have way too many people who are discouraged, who have looked for a long time with no success.

In my view, the primary message of the November elections of last year was this insistence that Congress get it right in order to help Americans find employment. It is important. These two things are related in regard to how our country progresses.

As I have indicated, the last time our budget was balanced was at the end of President Clinton's term in office. Yes, there was some spending restraint. There was an inability of Republicans and Democrats to come together and create new programs and big government spending. But what really was happening, what was the primary reason for a balanced budget back in those days was a growing economy.

So if we want to balance our budget, I am one who says, yes, we need more revenue. But that revenue comes not from tax increases but from a growing economy that puts people to work and generates the revenue that then flows to the Federal Treasury to pay down our debt.

It is actually the most enjoyable aspect of how we could balance the budget. The side benefits beyond an improved fiscal house in Washington, DC, is that Americans would have jobs. We help create an environment in which they can put food on their families' tables, in which they can save for their kids' education, and have the opportunity to save for their own retirement.

So today I once again, in the absence of an agreement between the White House and the House and the Senate—as has been indicated, there are ongoing negotiations about this issue of the debt ceiling. But we ought to be looking also at that opportunity to grow the economy, put people to work, creating those opportunities and raising the revenue necessary to fund, in my view, a much smaller government.

So we ought to be promoting a Tax Code that is fair, that is efficient, is not overly bureaucratic, that is certain. We need a regulatory environment in which every businessperson is not fearful of adding employees or investing in the plant and equipment because they do not know what next government regulation is going to come their way.

I spent much time this year as a member of the Senate Banking Committee where we have heard from bankers across the country, particularly our community banks, where the uncertainty of what next happens under Dodd-Frank determines whether it is desirable to make a loan. What next is the examiner going to say? What next are the regulations going to be?

Access to credit for our small business men and women in Kansas, our farmers and ranchers—the ability to borrow money has a significant role to play in whether we have a growing economy that puts people to work. So we certainly need to have that fair and certain Tax Code. We certainly need to make certain the regulatory environment is totally different than what it is today. And we need to make certain there is no doubt about the ability—due to regulations—that a bank can make a loan to a creditworthy borrower.

We also desperately need a policy in place that encourages domestic production of oil and gas, that helps us reduce the cost of energy. I do not know how we have a booming economy if energy prices are going to continue to escalate at the rates they are. The more that cost of gasoline reduces the spending power of American families, the less likely we are going to have any opportunity to see a growing economy.

Certainly, we have challenges in our housing market that need attention,

and it is difficult for many of us to make decisions about spending more money if we do not have the sense of security that comes from knowing there is value in our homes.

Finally, I want to point out—and the issue I want to focus on for a moment because of what appears to be coming from the Obama administration in regard to trade—there is an indication that, once again, the ability for Congress to consider the trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea is being delayed. Much of our country's economy—and certainly in my home State of Kansas—is dependent, and many people by the millions work in the United States because of things we manufacture and agricultural commodities we grow that are exported abroad.

The last three trade agreements that have been negotiated have been pending now for a very long time. The consequences of those trade agreements are significant. I certainly know this as a Kansan. We manufacture airplanes and general aviation. We grow lots of agricultural commodities: wheat, cattle, corn. Much of that is exported, and these countries present opportunities for us to grow our economy and put more people to work.

The South Korea Free Trade Agreement, for example, if approved, is estimated to create 70,000 new jobs. It is estimated that it would be an increase in U.S. exports of \$9.7 billion, and our gross domestic product would increase by over \$10 billion. Yet the framework by which we can begin to increase our exports to those three countries is once again stalled.

The White House announced this week those trade agreements will not be presented to Congress before the August recess. In my view, that is a terrible mistake, and it is particularly a problem because, as we speak, other countries are assuming the role of exporting to those countries, assuming the role that the United States has historically played, and we are being left out in the market.

A free-trade agreement just recently took effect between South Korea and the European Union. Colombia and Canada have an agreement that comes into force on August 15. The more time we delay in approving the opportunity for Americans to export to those countries, the more likely it is that the markets are going to be taken by exporters from other countries.

So while we continue to work to see that an agreement is reached in regard to this issue of the debt ceiling, let's not take any steps back in regard to this issue of growing the economy. Let's continue to work in regard to that Tax Code, in regard to that regulatory environment that so hinders the ability of business to expand, in regard to an energy policy that returns those jobs back home and creates greater stability in the price and cost of energy. We also need to make certain we have access to credit.

But, finally, today, let me again ask the administration to reconsider their position, and let's put these trade opportunities—the ability to increase exports—back on the table so Congress can adequately address the terms of those agreements and get them in place before we lose more market opportunity around the globe.

This is not about taking care of big business. This is about making certain that business has the opportunity to sell goods and agricultural commodities to those countries, so that in the process of their business growing they put more and more Kansans and Americans to work.

So we have our agenda, and it is an important one for America. Yes, fiscal sanity has to return, but let's not forget the fourth component of cut, cap, balance, and grow the economy. If we do these things, America will be a better place today. But, more importantly, every American child will have the opportunity to pursue the American dream.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KIRK. 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. KIRK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SILVER FLEECE AWARD

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, As we continue to debate our economic future I would like to announce July's Silver Fleece Award winner. This month's most wasteful spending project is another example of the egregious Federal spending habits of this government and demonstrates why exactly we need to enact the Cut, Cap and Balance Act.

The Silver Fleece Award for the month of July goes to a \$64 million stimulus award to provide broadband service to Gallatin County, MT. According to an analysis conducted by Navigant Consulting, 93 percent of the households in the project's proposed service area were already served by five or more broadband providers. The fact that tens of millions of taxpayer dollars were spent to subsidize broadband service in an area with already strong private sector representation is reprehensible. Perhaps even more staggering, though, is the taxpayer cost of these services per unserved household.

According to the program's own definition of "unserved household," this project cost taxpayers more than \$340,000 per unserved household.

However, many of these so-called unserved households have access to 3G

wireless broadband. Not only are 3G speeds approaching or even meeting administration broadband standards, but 3G will soon be replaced with 4G broadband, which will far exceed current standards. Subtracting the number of homes that had existing access to 3G wireless leaves only seven households in the Gallatin County service area unserved by broadband. It cost the U.S. taxpayer an astounding \$7,112,422 per household to provide broadband service to the truly unserved population.

I wish I could say this project is the exception, but I cannot. This funding was provided through the stimulus' \$3.5 billion Rural Utility Service Broadband Initiative Program. On average, this program cost the taxpayer over \$1,000 per household. In the projects analyzed by the Navigant study, 85 percent of the households served already had access to broadband.

Unfortunately, rural broadband subsidization has been long mismanaged by the Rural Utility Service. A 2009 inspector general report found that just 2 percent of Federal broadband buildout funds provided between 2005 and 2008 went toward unserved communities. The same IG report found that funds were also going to areas that were not rural at all. In fact, 148 of the communities provided with subsidized broadband between 2005 and 2008 were within 30 miles of cities with at least 200,000 inhabitants. We continued to see this occur in the stimulus funding, where in my home State, Cook County, home of Chicago with a population of 2.79 million, and suburban Will County received funds.

Ensuring connectivity in rural America is a worthy endeavor that will bring much needed economic development to small communities around the country. But as we face budget shortfalls and a crippling debt, we cannot afford to subsidize duplicative broadband service to urban and suburban areas.

Now, during the stimulus debate when the bill was considered by the full Appropriations Committee, I raised concerns with the then chair of the Agriculture Subcommittee, ROSA DE LAURO on this issue. I said it was a waste of money. I said that we should probably redirect the funds. I said that we should not support this legislation.

I was defeated in the House of Representatives and the stimulus bill was put forward. I even wrote a memo highlighting the waste in this rural broadband initiative.

Unfortunately now seeing—especially in Gallatin County, where we have now subsidized each recipient of unserved broadband services at a cost of \$7,112,422 per person—we have seen that the remarks that I made in opposition to this funding when I was a member of the House dramatically understated the waste to the U.S. taxpayer.

As we face a future of deficits and debt, we need to highlight the waste of the Rural Broadband Program, which

is why the July Silver Fleece award went to this program in Gallatin County, MT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE ACT

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, you should see the folks back in Montana and across this country as they watch the news and read the papers, shaking their heads. I do not blame them. I am shaking my head too because we just wasted 2 precious days debating a plan that wipes out Medicare and Social Security, a plan that guts veterans' benefits.

Yes, that is exactly what the plan did. That is exactly why I opposed it. It is incredible to me that some folks have no problem turning their back on America's seniors and America's veterans while at the same time preserving tax loopholes that benefit millionaires and Big Oil and Wall Street and corporations that ship our jobs overseas. That is why Montana and folks across this country are shaking their heads. They do not think much of what is going on in Washington, DC, these days.

My friends in the House know full well this bill is no friend of the seniors and it is no friend of the veterans. They know full well it would force deep cuts in Medicare and Social Security. They know this all so very well. So you know what they did. What do career politicians do when they want people to believe their plan to cut Medicare somehow exempts Medicare? They add language saying "exempt Medicare." That is what they did. Montanans deserve better, and Americans deserve better.

Let's look at the whole truth. Let's first talk about the cuts that are in the cut, cap, and balance plan.

This plan locks in cuts proposed by the controversial House budget plan—otherwise known as the Ryan plan in the House—and it locks them in for a full decade. That means you are going to see more than \$111 billion in cuts this year alone. That is 10 percent. Will it be a 10-percent cut to veterans health care or highway or water infrastructure or education? They will not tell us how they plan to make those cuts. Maybe they will take a little less out of our veterans but at the expense of the police and firefighters. Maybe they will take a few less dollars out of agricultural research but then kick a few more kids out of Head Start.

Now let's talk about the "cap." The plan caps Federal spending at 18 percent of gross domestic product, requiring even further spending cuts. Now, 18 percent brings us to a level this country has not seen since 1966, about the same time Medicare was created. Even Ronald Reagan advocated for a higher rate than 18 percent.

Here is the kicker: The small print you will not hear from the people who already voted for this bill is that the

annual interest on our debt and the very things this bill claims to exempt—Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, veterans' benefits—will cost more than what is allowed under the cap. That means there is to be nothing left to spend on any other program—nothing. That includes the military, our infrastructure, homeland security, and just about everything else. So how is that going to work so that this bill protects Social Security and Medicaid? It will not unless you invent your own math. What are the lawmakers going to do? Do they really intend to close down the Pentagon? I doubt it. But that means they are going to have to go back and cut Medicare and Social Security. Under this bill, it is their only choice. The numbers simply do not add up.

The fact is, we were wasting time even giving it daylight in the Senate, and it is exactly why the folks back home are shaking their heads. They expect us to get a job done responsibly, using common sense in a way that does not dismantle Medicare, Social Security, or hurt our veterans.

I look forward to debating a bipartisan plan to responsibly cut the debt and cut spending. There is one being worked on right now. But the bill the Senate just voted on was not responsible. The Senate rejected it, and rightfully so. Now we need to move to a bipartisan plan that comes out of the middle, not from the partisan extremes.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, occasionally, political people say things they probably wish they hadn't said because they are quite foolish.

It is with great disappointment that I focus on something our President recently said. I do so not out of disrespect for him but because what was said is so fundamentally wrong that it deserves to be put out into the public for discussion and, frankly, to get some response from the President if he wishes to do that.

According to the National Journal, an article by Rebecca Kaplan, from July 21, the President said this:

I think what's absolutely true is that core commitments that we make to the most vulnerable have to be maintained. A lot of the spending cuts that we are making should be around areas like defense spending, as opposed to food stamps.

We are in a great debate about how we should figure out a way to end our deficit spending, get our debt under control. We have to raise the debt ceiling here in a few days. We have had a

lot of discussion about the best way to do that. Most people approach the problem by saying: What are the core functions of government, the most important things that are critical to America? You build a budget from that point up. As every family does, you finally get to some things that are good to have, if you can, but sometimes you cannot afford them or not in the same way you have been paying—maybe not going to a movie or going out to dinner.

I think most people would believe that when we all take our oath of office to defend the country, probably the first obligation the Federal Government has is to defend the people, provide for our national security. If we are not able to provide for our national security, there is not much point in trying to protect anything else. That is why the defense of the United States has always been pretty well supported in a bipartisan way, by people in both political parties, in times of peace and in times of war. That is not to say there haven't been debates about defense spending, and whether defense spending sometimes can be cut but, rather, to at least acknowledge that if any function of the government is a core function or, as the President said, "core commitments," it surely ought to be providing for the defense of the American people.

We have also decided over the years that there are ways in which we can help to take care of American citizens who have trouble meeting their own needs. We start with people who are very sick and infirm, or elderly, and we have programs such as Social Security, Medicare, and the Medicaid Program for those economically less fortunate. Over the years, we have developed programs to provide other benefits to American citizens. We provide some housing benefits. We provide what is called food stamps. There is another name for it in the agriculture budget: "Nutrition assistance." It is known as food stamps for people having trouble making ends meet. The government will actually provide them an ability to buy at the grocery store what they need to eat. That is important.

America got along without food stamps for the first couple centuries of its existence. Certainly a lot of people endured hardship. When a country is wealthy enough to be able to afford to do things for its people, it is certainly an appropriate thing to do. That is certainly the category of food stamps.

But I find it remarkable that the President would conflate the obligations of the government for national security and a program such as the nutritional assistance program the way he has. To describe one as a core commitment of the country—food stamps—and to say the rest of it we can go talk about making cuts that should be around areas of defense spending as opposed to food stamps—I am not trying to pick on food stamps, but the President is the Commander in Chief. He,

among all Americans, is responsible for our national security. And for him to suggest that food stamps is a core mission of the government and that national security is less than that, so that if we need to make cuts we should take them from national defense, I find remarkable.

Are food stamps close to what is the core of the American people? As I said, we got along without food stamps for a long time. Churches and families and others took care of folks. When the government was wealthy enough to be able to help folks with food stamps, we decided to do it. We have all been supporters of programs that provide that kind of assistance. But when you have to begin trimming expenses—and, by the way, I am not suggesting there is a proposal here on the table to trim food stamps. What I am saying is that what you don't do is to say there is one thing we are going to protect above all else, and that is food stamps, and we can, instead, get our savings from the defense budget. We have already effectuated enormous savings from the defense budget over the last 3 years.

I thought it might be useful to quote a few things that our most recent Secretary of Defense said. He is retired now. For the last 3 years, he acted as Secretary of Defense, and now he has been out of that job for the last couple of weeks. But at the end of his term as Secretary of Defense, he gave several speeches, and in each one of those he stressed the commitment of the United States not only to the security of the American people but to peace around the world and reminded us there is evil in the world. There are always those who would do us harm. And unless there is somebody in the world—a country such as the United States—willing to stand up to these despots, these troublemakers, we are likely to end up with trouble on our own shores sooner or later. He cautioned, therefore, against further reductions in defense spending, as the President has said.

On several occasions, Secretary Gates said defense had already had cut as much as was advisable. So the question is, Why should we automatically be assuming it is easy to cut another \$400 billion out of defense, for example; that our key mission here is to protect the core mission, as the President put it, such as food stamps?

I am going to select a few things Secretary Gates has said and then I will ask to have printed in the RECORD a couple of the pieces.

On May 24, Secretary Gates made some remarks to the American Enterprise Institute, and here is a sampling of what he said. In this first quote he is talking about the inventory of military weapons in our arsenal:

The current inventory is getting old and worn down from Iraq and Afghanistan. Some equipment can be refurbished with life-extension programs, but there is no getting around the fact that others must be replaced. When it comes to our military mod-

ernization accounts, the proverbial "low hanging fruit"—those weapons and other programs considered most questionable—have not only been plucked, they have been stomped and crushed. What remains are much-needed capabilities—relating to air superiority and mobility, long-range strike, nuclear deterrence, maritime access, space and cyber warfare, ground forces, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance—that our nation's civilian and military leadership deem absolutely critical.

He gave examples of a new tanker. He noted the ones we have are twice as old as many of the pilots who are flying them. A new generation strike fighter, the F-35. He said we have to build more ships. The size of the Navy has sunk to the lowest number since prior to World War II. The Army and Marines are doing the bulk of our fighting on the ground. Their combat vehicles and helicopters are worn down after a decade of war. He points out that, at some point, we have to replace our aging ballistic missile submarines, and he calls that a program that illustrates the modernization dilemmas we face.

He said this—again at the speech he gave at AEI:

So as we move forward, unless our country's political leadership envisions a dramatically diminished global security war for the United States, it is vitally important to protect the military modernization accounts—in absolute terms, and as a share of the defense budget.

Let me quote once more from his speech at AEI, and then I wish to move to some remarks he made at some commencement addresses.

One thing Secretary Gates noted is that when we decide we want to reduce defense spending, we have to remember our potential enemies always have a vote. We can assume certain things are of a low probability to happen around the globe, but we can't always be sure that some despot isn't going to try to create trouble somewhere. Here is how he concluded this speech to AEI:

If we are going to reduce the resources and the size of the U.S. military, people need to make conscious choices about what the implications are for the security of the country, as well as for the variety of military operations we have around the world if lower priority missions are scaled back or eliminated. They need to understand what it could mean for a smaller pool of troops and their families if America is forced into a protracted land war again—yes, the kind no defense secretary should recommend any time soon, but one we may not be able to avoid. To shirk this discussion of risks and consequences—and the hard decisions that must follow—I would regard as managerial cowardice.

Then he said this:

In closing, while I have spent a good deal of time on programmatic particulars, the tough choices ahead are really about the kind of role the American people—accustomed to unquestioned military dominance for the past two decades—want their country to play in the world.

That is a serious and sobering reminder by the Secretary of Defense that the American people expect the leaders of the country to understand that when we need our military, it is

there, it is capable; that we are being fair with people we have put into harm's way; and that we have given them the very best training and equipment possible.

By the way, my colleague from Arizona, JOHN MCCAIN, has visited Iraq, Afghanistan, and other places where our military men and women have been fighting for many years. One of the thoughts that always strikes me most about his observations when he returns is the quality of our fighting force—the quality of their equipment and their training. They are, clearly, the best military force ever fielded.

We expect that. We have come to expect it. But it doesn't happen automatically. It requires stewardship, and we here in the Congress, as well as the Presidents, are stewards of our national security and all of those who provide it. That is a lesson we can't forget, even in the context of a deficit and debt debate where we are trying desperately to find more ways we can achieve savings.

When Secretary Gates spoke to the Notre Dame graduates on May 22, here are a few of the things he said:

The lessons of history tell us we must not diminish our ability or our determination to deal with the threats and the challenges on the horizon, because ultimately they will need to be confronted. If history—and religion—teach us anything, it is that there will always be evil in the world, people bent on aggression, oppression, satisfying their greed for wealth and power and territory, or determined to impose an ideology based on the subjugation of others and the denial of liberty to men and women.

He continued:

... make no mistake, the ultimate guarantee against the success of aggressors, dictators, and terrorists in the 21st century, as in the 20th, is hard power—the size, strength, and global reach of the United States military.

He also discussed what we are doing around the world, and he said this:

All of these things happen mostly out of sight and out of mind to the average American, and thus are taken for granted. But they all depend on a properly armed, trained and funded American military, which cannot be taken for granted.

He concluded those remarks by saying:

Throughout this process we should keep in mind historian Donald Kagan's observation that the preservation of peace depends upon those states seeking that goal having both the preponderant power and the will to accept the burdens and responsibilities required to achieve it. And we must not forget what Winston Churchill once said, that "the price of greatness is responsibility . . . and the people of the United States cannot escape world responsibility."

Another way of saying this was one of Ronald Reagan's famous sayings—that the best way to preserve peace was to have strength. "Peace through strength." That is, when you become weaker, you tempt the despots around the world to see whether they can gain some territory or some advantage, and to make trouble. You are then playing catchup, having to fight a problem that

could have been avoided, perhaps, if that despot knew you had the strength and will to defeat him if he had made any kind of aggressive move. Having the ability to deter is at least as important as the ability to win if the fight occurs because you can avoid a lot of trouble, expense, casualties, and problems if you deter aggression in the first place.

At North Dakota State University, in another commencement speech on May 14, Secretary Gates said this:

... while I don't foresee a repeat of the Cold War days—when we faced off against another military superpower—I believe there is a growing competition underway for global leadership and influence.

It was part of the same message he had spoken of earlier about the importance to be prepared and why we should not just look to the defense budget for savings; that we had to keep our priorities in mind. One of those priorities was our role and responsibility around the world, confirming again what he said, which was:

If the political leadership of this country decides that it must reduce the investment in defense by hundreds of billions of dollars, then I don't think we can afford to have anything that is off the table.

It would seem to me that would include something such as food stamps. Again, what Secretary Gates said was that "defense had already cut as much as was advisable."

All right. I get back to my original point. Maybe I am making too much of a casual observation of the President here, but when the President of the United States describes a core commitment as food stamps and says that, instead, the cuts we are making should be around areas such as defense spending, it tells me the President has his priorities turned around, that they are wrong. His first responsibility is to the American people as Commander in Chief, and our first responsibility in the Congress is exactly the same—for the security of our country.

We are not going to be a strong country if we are bankrupt. One of the key components to a strong defense is a strong economy so we can generate the wealth we need to produce the kind of military equipment and to field the kind of forces we need to protect our interests. That is why we are focusing so much on the deficit, on spending, and the like. But when we talk about areas that need to be cut, let's remember what the former Secretary of Defense said—defense has been cut enough already. If we are going to keep our commitments around the world, we have to prioritize our spending. I submit that putting food stamps on a higher level of commitment than the national security of the United States is to grossly misplace our priorities. So I hope the President and others within the House and the Senate, in getting about the serious business of finding where we can make cuts—and we surely have to do that—will help to prioritize those things that are abso-

lutely critical and essential to the core of the United States; and those things where, if we have the wealth to do them, we definitely should; and where we can make cuts, we need to; but that the end result of that equation, those tradeoffs, will mean the first priority is the security of the United States.

As we make our decisions here going forward, I will be speaking more about the areas in which we have already slashed defense spending and the areas in which, as Secretary Gates noted, defense spending is going to have to be enhanced if we are going to have the kind of force the American people have come to rely upon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two publications. One is from the Weekly Standard, dated July 18, by Max Boot; and the other is a piece by Jamie Fly, posted on July 8 on National Review Online.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From weeklystandard.com, July 18, 2011]

GRAND OLD DOVES?

(By Max Boot)

Opinion polls consistently show that the U.S. military is the most trusted institution in America. Republicans have benefited indirectly from that hard-won reputation because since the 1970s they have been seen as the strong, hawkish party, while Democrats have had to fight the stigma that they are weak and dovish. Republicans wouldn't throw away that aura—one of their strongest electoral assets—just to reach a budget deal with President Obama. Or would they?

There are persistent and worrisome reports that they might. The Hill newspaper, for instance, claims that Republican budget negotiators have been discussing cutting defense by \$600 billion to \$700 billion—considerably more than the already indefensible \$400 billion in cuts that Obama has said he would like to see over the next decade.

Obama's proposed cuts are bad enough; as former Defense Secretary Robert Gates implicitly warned before leaving office, such deep reductions would seriously impair the military's ability to meet its global commitments. Going beyond what Obama has proposed is simply suicidal—on both substantive and political grounds.

Start with substance: The defense budget did experience a rapid increase during the past decade because of the post-9/11 wars. But the budget is already shrinking—down from \$708 billion this fiscal year to \$670 billion in the next fiscal year. That's a \$38 billion cut, and the budget will decline even more as troops leave Iraq and Afghanistan.

Already the military is feeling the strain of maintaining all of its commitments, including a new war in Libya. Those who suggest, with a straight face, paring back a whopping \$700 billion more—even over the course of a number of years—should be forced to explain which missions currently performed by the U.S. armed forces they are willing to sacrifice.

Should we completely pull out of Afghanistan? Even with the overly hasty withdrawal of surge forces ordered by Obama, we still will have 70,000 troops there at the end of next year, costing at least \$70 billion. Pulling out troops even faster risks giving jihadists their biggest victory since 9/11.

Perhaps we should stop fighting pirates off the coast of Africa? Stop fighting in Libya so

that arch-terrorist Muammar Qaddafi can claim a victory over the West? Stop targeting al Qaeda in Pakistan and Yemen and elsewhere? Stop deterring China, North Korea, or Iran? Stop patrolling the Persian Gulf through which much of the world's oil flows? Stop fighting cyberattacks emanating from China and Russia? Stop developing missile defenses to protect the American homeland? Stop supporting Mexico and Colombia in their fights against narcotraffickers? Stop holding military exercises with friendly armed forces from Egypt to the Philippines—exercises that allow us to exert soft power at low cost?

Maybe advocates of budget cuts think we should continue performing all, or most, of those missions with less resources. But that's a cop-out. It's a recipe for stinting on training and personnel, thus creating a "hollow force" of the kind that we last saw in the late 1970s.

The reality is that there is no way the armed forces can perform all, or even most, of their current missions with less money. In fact, despite the growing spending of the past decade for contingency operations, the military has already cancelled a number of important procurement programs. These include the Army's Future Combat System and the Air Force's F-22, the best-in-the-world stealth fighter that was canceled just before China unveiled its own stealth fighter.

For the most part, the armed forces remain reliant on weapons systems designed in the 1960s and 1970s and procured in the 1980s: aircraft such as the A-10, F-15, and F-16, helicopters such as the Apache and Black Hawk, warships such as Los Angeles-class submarines and Ticonderoga-class cruisers, and armored vehicles such as Abrams tanks and Bradley Fighting Vehicles. These are all superb weapons, but they are rapidly aging—and are either being overtaken, or soon will be, by competing models produced abroad that are certain to fall into the hands of our enemies.

Moreover, competing powers such as China and Russia are designing weapons such as computer bugs and antisatellite missiles that could render much of our current equipment useless. We will have to develop defenses. And that won't be cheap.

At the same time, the Department of Defense must take care of its people—our most precious asset. There are 1.5 million active-duty military personnel, 750,000 civilian Defense Department employees, and 1.5 million personnel in the Reserves and National Guard. We already spend more on personnel costs (\$157 billion this year) than on weapons procurement (\$151 billion) and the imbalance is likely to grow in future years, thereby making it even harder to increase our power-projection capabilities. Yet Congress rebuffed Gates's attempts to institute modest co-payments for the fiscally unsustainable Tricare medical system. That was deemed too politically sensitive.

This is part of a pattern: Congress finds it difficult or impossible to cut specific defense programs because they all have powerful constituencies. But mandating "top-line" cuts may be politically palatable as part of a budget deal because lawmakers won't have to make tough choices about which programs to eliminate and which areas of the world to leave undefended.

Cutting defense won't solve our budget woes. The "core" defense budget, \$553 billion, is small as a percentage of GDP (3.7 percent) and of the federal budget (15 percent). Nor is it the reason why we are piling up so much debt. To reduce the deficit, lawmakers will have to do something about out-of-control entitlement programs.

If Republicans acquiesce in ruinous cuts to the defense budget, they will cease to be

known as Ronald Reagan's heirs. Instead they will be remembered as the party of William E. Borah, Hamilton Fish III, and Gerald Nye. Remember those GOP giants of the 1930s? They thought a strong defense was unaffordable and unnecessary. But their reputations collapsed on December 7, 1941, when we learned (not for the last time) the price of unreadiness. That is a lesson today's Republicans should remember as they negotiate over the budget.

[From nationalreview.com]

SHORT-SIGHTEDNESS ON DEFENSE CUTS

(By Jamie M. Fly)

As the debt-limit talks enter their final stages, reports are emerging that significant defense cuts may be part of the negotiated package. President Obama, for his part, already proposed cutting \$400 billion in security spending over 12 years in his April 13 speech on fiscal policy. The White House is now apparently trying not just to lock that proposal in, but possibly convince Republicans to even go beyond it via the debt-limit negotiations.

Now that Secretary of Defense Gates—who had warned of the implications of the \$400 billion in cuts—has left the Pentagon, the White House is increasingly highlighting defense as a potential source of significant savings.

On Wednesday, at his "Twitter Town Hall," Obama said, "the nice thing about the defense budget is it's so big, it's so huge, that a one percent reduction is the equivalent of the education budget. Not—I'm exaggerating, but it's so big that you can make relatively modest changes to defense that end up giving you a lot of head room to fund things like basic research or student loans or things like that."

Obama's statement was very misleading. One percent of the president's proposed defense budget for 2012 equals only a fraction of his \$77.4 billion education budget request—that is, 7.1 percent. Also, the Obama administration has significantly increased education funding (by more than 50 percent), over the course of its three budgets, while defense spending increases have barely matched the rate of inflation.

Indeed, defense has been targeted by the White House Office of Management and Budget each year as the administration compiled its budget requests. It has not been spared the axe by the appropriators on Capitol Hill, who have consistently funded defense at levels less than those requested by the president. In fact, projected defense spending over the next ten years in the current House budget resolution is already \$315 billion less than the amounts the Obama administration projected in its FY2011 request.

All of this is despite the fact that the defense budget is not the source of America's current fiscal woes. Unfortunately, it appears that in the debt-limit talks, both Republicans and Democrats are tempted to avoid the difficult choices posed by significant entitlement reform. Instead, they are contemplating going after defense spending, perhaps assuming there is not a constituency to defend the defense budget at a time when the nation is weary of overseas commitments and many Americans want a renewed focus at home.

This short-sightedness is not a surprise coming from the White House. It is, however, sad to see Republicans heading down this path.

Congressional Republicans should ask themselves whether they want to enter 2012 by surrendering the GOP's traditional credibility on national security. If they endorse Obama's ridiculous \$400 billion in defense cuts—or even worse, agree to deeper cuts—

Republicans risk assisting the president's management of American decline, just as the United States enters a very turbulent and uncertain period.

Mr. KYL. 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY PARLIAMENTARIANS OF BRITAIN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we have a group of British parliamentarians meeting with us. I see the distinguished Republican leader on the floor. Senator COCHRAN and I are leading a delegation to meet with them, and I am about to ask to put the Senate in recess subject to the call of the Chair, which will only be a matter of minutes, I assure my colleagues, so we can bring them on the floor.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:03 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 12:13 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, now that we are back in session, I thank my fellow Members, and Senator COCHRAN especially, for their courtesy in letting us go into recess so that we could bring a group of very distinguished British parliamentarians on the floor.

I would note for the Senate that we meet every 2 years, American Senators and British parliamentarians of both the House of Commons and the House of Lords. We will do it once in England, once here. Two years ago we were over there, and this year we are meeting here. Four years ago, as Senator COCHRAN will recall, we met in the State of Vermont. But with changes in the Senate session, we are going to meet here in the Capitol.

I thank you very much for the courtesy.

I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, it is a distinct honor and pleasure to join Senator LEAHY in welcoming our guests from the United Kingdom to the Senate. This is a tradition we have really enjoyed and benefited from—the close opportunity to talk and discuss issues of mutual interest and concerns—and I think we reflect credit on the good relationship of both of our countries in that process. It is an honor

to join him in welcoming them at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. 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. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE DREAM ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it was 10 years ago that my office in Chicago, IL, was contacted by a young woman, Theresa Lee, who is Korean by birth, had been part of something known as the Merit Music Program in Chicago. It is an amazing program. A lady in the later years of her life decided to leave some money to a program that would offer to children in the public schools a musical instrument and instruction. Her belief was that many of these students would take up the offer and that learning a musical instrument could be an important part of their future lives.

She was right. The Merit Music Program, at least as of last year, had a 100-percent placement rating of graduates in college. It turned out that giving a musical instrument to a young person and giving them a chance to develop that skill did a lot more than create music. It created self esteem, confidence, and a belief they could do something with their lives, even for many students who were from poor families.

Ten years ago, the Merit Music Program contacted us and told us about a young woman named Theresa Lee who was one of their star pupils. She had learned piano and had graduated to a level of competence they had seldom seen in their program. In fact, she had played in a concert and now, as she graduated from high school, she was accepted at several of the major music schools around the United States, including Julliard. As she filled out the application to go to school, though, she found out she ran into a problem. They asked on the application for the Julliard School of Music what her nationality or citizenship was.

She turned to her mother and said: What do I put down there?

Her mother said: Theresa, when we brought you to this country you were 2 years old, and I never filed any papers. I don't know what your status is in terms of your nationality.

The mother was an American citizen. Her brother and sister were American citizens. But she had never established her citizenship or claim for citizenship.

At the age of 18, she contacted my office and asked: What should I do?

We took a look at the law, and the law was very clear. Under the law of the United States of America, that

young woman who came here at the age of 2 and had not filed any papers had to leave the United States and go to Brazil, which was the last country her parents traveled through on their way to America, and wait 10 years before she could apply to become legal in America. It did not sound fair to me. Two-year-olds do not have much voice in terms of whether they should file papers.

If anybody made a mistake, it was her parents, and they knew it. They could not correct it, though, and the law did not correct it. The law punished her, ultimately sending her back to Korea, a place she could never remember, with a language she did not speak.

So I introduced the DREAM Act, and the DREAM Act said: If you came to America under the circumstance that if you are brought here as a child, if you grew up in this country and graduated from high school, if you had no serious questions about your moral standing in the community, no serious problems with any criminal activity or background, we would give you a chance—just a chance.

The chance was they could either enlist in our military for at least 2 years or they could complete 2 years of college. If they did that, we would allow them to work toward legal status. All along we would be asking the same questions as the years went by: Have you done anything that would suggest to us that you should not be part of the United States of America? That was the DREAM Act. I introduced the bill 10 years ago.

An interesting story, what happened to Theresa. She went on to school at Julliard, and she did become an accomplished concert pianist. She has played a concert at Carnegie Hall. She has now married an American citizen, and she is legal in the United States. So the story had a happy ending. But for many of these young people it has no happy ending. They end up deported at the age of 18 or 19 because their parents did not file papers or could not file papers on their behalf.

That is why I introduced the DREAM Act, to give these young people a chance. Last month I chaired the first Senate hearing on the DREAM Act. There was compelling testimony from a number of witnesses. The Secretary of the Department of Education, Arne Duncan, testified about the talented students who would be eligible under the DREAM Act: the class valedictorians, the star athletes, honor students, and leaders in ROTC. Their options, however, are limited because they are undocumented. Secretary Duncan explained that the DREAM Act would make America a better and stronger country by giving these young people a chance to fulfill their potential.

Dr. Clifford Stanley testified. He is the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness from the Department of Defense. He testified that the DREAM

Act would strengthen our national security by giving thousands of highly qualified, well-educated young people a chance to enlist in the Armed Forces.

Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano also testified in favor of the DREAM Act and said this law would strengthen our homeland security by allowing immigration agents to focus their time, attention, and resources on those who clearly are a danger in the United States and should be deported rather than on these young people who had never posed any threat to anyone.

LTC Margaret Stock, who taught immigration law at West Point Military Academy, testified about important restrictions included in the DREAM Act to prevent abuse.

The most compelling testimony came from this young woman, Ola Kaso. Ola Kaso was brought to the United States by her mother from Albania in 1998 when she was 5 years old. Last month she graduated from high school in Warren, MI, with a 4.4 grade point average. She has enrolled in the honors program at the University of Michigan as a pre-med student.

Ola has so much to contribute to America, but even today she faces deportation back to Albania, a country she barely remembers, a country she left when she was 5 years old.

She spoke for thousands of people just like her, young people who call themselves now the Dreamers. I often come to the floor of the Senate to tell their stories, and today I want to tell you about three others.

This is Tapiwa and Dominique Nkata. Tapiwa is on the left, Dominique is on the right. Their parents, John and Joan Nkata, brought the family to the United States from Malawi, in Africa, in 1990. At the time, Tapiwa was 4 years old and Dominique was only 11 months old.

The Nkatas came here legally, so they had work permits. John, an ordained Christian minister, worked as a Hospice counselor, his wife Joan worked as an accountant. The Nkatas filed papers to stay here permanently. For years their case was stuck in immigration court. Finally, in 2009 John and Joan Nkata were granted legal permanent residency in the United States, but by this time Tapiwa and Dominique were adults and unable to obtain legal status through their parents. Had the court moved more quickly and the decision made while they were still children, there would be no question about their documented status.

Earlier this year these two young women were placed in deportation proceedings. Dominique sent me a letter, and here is what she said about being deported to Malawi:

The looming fear of having everything I know, including part of my family, here in the United States while I am removed to the other side of the world, is crippling.

And Tapiwa wrote a letter and said:

I can't imagine my life in Africa. I am an American. I know this culture and speak this language. I pledge allegiance to this flag.

The Department of Homeland Security decided to give a 1-year stay in their deportation to Tapiwa and Dominique. I think that was the right thing to do. It would just be wrong to send these young women, who grew up in America and have so much to contribute, back to Malawi, a country they don't even remember.

Tapiwa is now 25. In 2007—listen to this—Tapiwa—on the left here—graduated summa cum laude from the University of Cincinnati with a degree in finance. For the past 2 years she worked at an accounting firm and dreams of being a certified public accountant. She cannot as long as she is undocumented. In her letter to me she said what America means to her:

Quite simply, when you say 'The American Dream' all around the world they know what you are talking about. People who have never been to our shores, eaten our food, or even spoken our language have heard of a prosperous nation that above all else grants freedom and rights to all people.

Dominique, on the right, is now 21. Last month she graduated from the University of Cincinnati with a double degree in chemistry and premedicine. She is now working at University Hospital and the Jewish Hospital in the research department as a clinical studies assistant. Dominique is studying for the MCAT and plans to apply to medical school when her immigration status is resolved.

Dominique told me:

I dream of being a doctor and giving back to a country that has given so much to me.

So would America be better off if Tapiwa and Dominique are deported to Malawi or if they are allowed to continue to stay in the United States realizing their dreams and making us a better nation?

Let me introduce you to another dreamer. This is Jose Magana. He has a big smile on his face. Jose was brought to the United States from Mexico when he was 2 years old. Jose grew up in Arizona. He graduated as the valedictorian of his high school class. He enrolled in Arizona State University, becoming the first member of his family to attend college. Then Arizona passed a law prohibiting public universities from giving financial aid or in-state tuition rates to undocumented students. Hundreds of students were forced to drop out of school. But Jose persevered. He found his calling on the speech and debate team where he ranked fifth in the Nation.

In 2008 Jose Magana graduated summa cum laude from Arizona State University with a major in business management. Jose couldn't work because of his legal status, so he went to law school. Next year Jose will graduate from Baylor University Law School in Waco, TX.

Despite his potential to give to this country, Jose will not be able to work as a lawyer because of his undocumented status. Jose sent me a letter, and here is what he said:

The worst part of being undocumented is the fact that legally the United States is not

considered my home. I have not been to Mexico since I left when I was 2 years old. I don't have any friends or close family in Mexico. If I were to be deported, it would literally be like being thrown into a foreign country with a different language and culture. The United States is my home. I want to give back to this country I love.

Could we use someone with Jose's talent in America? Of course we could. For the last 10 years I have been working on the DREAM Act. There has been one constant: I have had the support not only of my colleagues in the Senate, but I have also had the support of the legislators across the United States. The faith community supports the DREAM Act because it is based on a fundamental moral principle that is shared by every religious tradition, and it is this: It is wrong to punish children for the actions of their parents.

Earlier this month I held a press conference to announce DREAM Sabbath. The DREAM Sabbath will take place this fall on Friday, September 23; Saturday, the 24th; and Sunday, the 25th. On the DREAM Sabbath, churches, synagogues, mosques, and temples around the country will be asked to dedicate time during their regular weekly worship service to have a conversation about the DREAM Act. When I announced the DREAM Sabbath, I was joined by religious leaders from a variety of faith traditions. One of my real heroes and friends, Cardinal Theodore McCarrick, a good friend, who has been in the fight for social justice for years; Bishop Minerva Carcano, the first Hispanic woman to be elected bishop in the Methodist Church; Rev. Samuel Rodriguez, the president of the Nation's largest Hispanic Christian organization, with more than 30,000 member churches; Rev. Derrick Harkins, pastor of one of the most prominent African-American churches in our Nation's Capital; Rabbi Lisa Grushcow, representing the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society; and Imam Mohamed Magid, the head of the Nation's largest Muslim organization.

Mr. President, I want to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statements of two religious leaders who participated in that DREAM Sabbath announcement: Sister Simone Campbell, executive director of NETWORK of the Catholic Social Justice Organization; and Bishop Richard Graham of the Lutheran Church.

I ask unanimous consent that those two statements be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DURBIN. In her statement, Sister Campbell quotes the prophet Joel, who spoke of our sons and daughters as prophets. Sister Campbell said:

Our sons and daughters are prophesying to us. They are telling us of a way that our nation should go in order to be whole, to be creative, to lead into the twenty-first century. We, the older generation, need to listen and act. Congress needs to enact the DREAM Act.

At the DREAM Act Sabbath announcement, we were joined by Gaby Pacheco. Gaby has become a great friend of mine. She is a wonderful young lady. She is one of the leaders of the DREAM Act students. Her parents brought her to America from Ecuador when she was 7 years old. She was the highest ranking Junior ROTC student in her high school. The Air Force tried to recruit Gaby. She was unable to enlist because she does not have legal status in the United States. She was brought here as a child. She is working on her bachelor's degree in special education and wants to teach autistic children.

I met her last year after she and three other DREAM Act students literally walked 1,500 miles from Miami, FL, to Washington, DC, to raise awareness of the DREAM Act. Along the way these four students were joined by hundreds of supporters who came out to welcome them. They called their trip the Trail of Dreams.

The goal of the DREAM Sabbath is to put a human face on the plight of the undocumented students, like Gaby, and educate America about the DREAM Act and, of course, the ultimate goal is to build up support to pass the DREAM Act. DREAM Act students need more than our prayers; they need our help. They need our help to pass the DREAM Act. Dreamers like Tapiwa and Dominique Nkata, Jose Magana, Ola Kaso, and Gaby Pacheco are Americans in their hearts. They have stood every day in the classrooms across America, pledging allegiance to our flag and singing the only National Anthem they know to the only country they know, a country that they love.

They are willing to serve in our military. They are willing to pursue an education to add to a better America. All they need is the permission slip of Congress to give them that chance. I ask my colleagues to support the DREAM Act. It is the right thing to do. It will make America stronger.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Network, July 12, 2011]

STATEMENT BY SISTER SIMONE CAMPBELL,
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

I have worried that the DREAM Act has been mis-named. Calling something a DREAM indicates that it is not real, has no substance, is far beyond reality. That has led me to wonder if it is actually making getting the legislation passed more difficult because everyone thinks dreams don't really come true.

Then I met students who would qualify for an earned path to citizenship if the bill passes. I found out that their dreams are rooted in the daily reality of their lives. They work to learn, support their families, encourage siblings and friends. They strive for better lives for themselves, their families and their communities. They work daily to make dreams come true.

This brought me to the realization that perhaps it is just in Washington where the American dream has become fantasy. The American dream has been built on the imagination and toil of immigrants. Our nation has prospered because of the innovation and creativity of all of the people who have come

to create something new. In Washington it is tempting to forget the vision in exchange for partisan wrangling. This is wrong. We must step away from cynicism that second guesses every action and embrace the founding spirit of our nation.

As a person of faith I hold to the prophet Joel echoed in the Acts of the Apostles trusting that the day will come when "Your sons and daughters will prophesy, your young men will see visions, your old men will dream dreams." Our sons and daughters are prophesying to us. They are telling us of a way that our nation should go in order to be whole, to be creative, to lead into the twenty-first century. It is now time for the "old men" (and women) of Congress to dream their dream and take this first step toward comprehensive immigration reform. We the older generation need to listen and act. Congress needs to enact the DREAM Act this year.

STATEMENT OF THE REV. RICHARD GRAHAM,
BISHOP OF THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON,
DC SYNOD OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN
CHURCH IN AMERICA

As the bishop of the Metropolitan Washington, DC Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, ELCA, I strongly support the Development, Relief and Education for Alien Minors, DREAM Act. The DREAM Act is critical legislation that would provide lawful permanent residency to undocumented youth who attend college or serve in the U.S. military for two years. DREAM Act supporters include President Obama, a number of former President George W. Bush administration officials, and the ELCA Presiding Bishop, the Rev. Mark S. Hanson.

Last year I joined Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service and Lutheran leaders to urge Congress to pass the DREAM Act. Although I was disappointed that the Senate failed to pass the bill, I stand committed to working with congregations in my synod to advance just and humane solutions for these ambitious and talented young people.

The DREAM Act is envisioned to bear fruit for young people who came to this country as children. They are Americans in every way except that they are not U.S. citizens. The DREAM Act would provide a path to U.S. citizenship for children who arrived in the United States before the age of 16, graduate high school or receive a GED, go to college or serve in the military and demonstrate that they are of good moral character. These young people should be allowed a path to become U.S. citizens because they have already proven that they are Americans and they should not be deported back to a country they do not know.

This issue is important to Lutherans in the United States. Lutherans and Lutheran congregations have strong immigrant roots. Almost all Lutherans can remember back a generation or two to when their grandparents or great grandparents struggled as new immigrants in this country. It is this immigrant tradition and our commitment to welcoming the stranger, regardless of immigration status, that compels the ELCA to support and call for the immediate passage of the DREAM Act.

TRIBUTE TO DOUG AURAND

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to thank a friend of mine who is leaving public service soon after more than four decades of service in Winnebago County, IL. Doug Aurand won his first political race in 1970 when he was elected Winnebago County

treasurer. Truth be told, he wasn't supposed to win that race. The voters of Winnebago County had not elected a Democrat to a countywide position in 138 years. Apparently, nobody told Doug. He ran as a write-in candidate and campaigned in his first election like it was the most important race he could possibly run.

He filled out the campaign schedule every day by knocking on every door and talking to every voter he could find. When the votes were counted on election night, Doug Aurand made history by becoming the first Democratic treasurer in Winnebago County, IL. He was reelected seven times.

Doug Aurand was born in Dixon, IL, hometown of Ronald Reagan, and he was every bit as proud to be a Democrat as President Reagan was to be a Republican. But Doug never allowed his political affiliation to influence the way he treated his constituents. When you walked into the county treasurer's office in Rockford, you weren't Republican or Democrat; you were a taxpayer who deserved straight answers, good service, and respect. That is how Doug saw it, and that is why voters reelected him to the treasurer's office many times.

Two stories will tell you what kind of treasurer he was. One of the first actions Doug took as county treasurer was to put the local banks on notice that they would have to bid for Winnebago County's bank business. No more awarding the county's banking business on the basis of friendship and political connections. Whichever bank offered the highest interest rates would get the job. Competitive investing brought tens of millions of dollars and higher interest payments to the county, a real savings for taxpayers.

Doug also whittled down his staff. When he came in there were 30 people. By the time he left, they were down to 9, and their service never suffered.

Another example of the sort of treasurer Doug was, in the late 1970s an elderly man came in the office to pay his tax bill, and he pulled out a big bag of coins. He was literally counting his coins to pay his tax bill. Doug went up to say hello to him, and he noticed that the coins were all silver—mercury dollars and silver dollars—valuable collector's items.

Doug told the man his coins were worth more than face value, and he didn't just stop there. He arranged for a professional appraisal of the coins. In the end, not only was the elderly man able to pay his tax bill, but he also took home a nest egg. That is the kind of conscientious public servant Doug Aurand is.

In 1999 Doug announced he was stepping down after 28½ years as county treasurer. At that time he was in a life-and-death struggle with smoking-related cancer and his prognosis was not good. He defied the odds, beat cancer, resumed his political career, winning election as Harlem Township supervisor and a Winnebago County board member.

After 10 years, he lost his reelection bid to the county board last November, and he will step down from the Harlem Township board next month. It will be shortly after his 70th birthday, leaving behind 40 years and 8 months of public service.

Doug Aurand grew up on a farm in rural Winnebago County. He was one of six kids, including three foster children. His family raised miniature horses. Doug's dad also worked in the factory. Doug served in the Air Force during the Vietnam war, came home and started working as a mail carrier. That is when he got the political bug.

Federal law prohibits public employees from running for office, so Doug gave up the security of the Postal Service job for the insecurity of public life.

He is a passionate supporter of ordinary working people and the American labor movement, and he considers himself a fiscal conservative when it comes to saving taxpayers money. Ask Doug's friend who his political hero is in life, and he will tell you one name: Hubert Horatio Humphrey. Doug is a happy warrior. He loves politics, shaking hands, talking to voters, and debating the issues.

The high point of his year was at the Winnebago County Fair where he spent hours and hours talking to every one of the visitors at the fair.

Doug gives back to the community in ways other than politics. Only 2 percent of the boys who enter the Boy Scouts ever make it to Eagle Scout. I was in the other 98 percent, Doug was one of those in the 2 percent. He was an Eagle Scout leader for more than 30 years. He has been a leader and friend to hundreds of Eagle Scouts. Doug and his wife Julie have attended scores of graduations and weddings of Doug's former Eagle Scouts.

He also speaks frequently to young people about the health dangers of smoking, which he learned through his own life experience. Cancer cost Doug Aurand a small part of his tongue. That would have been a loss for any of us who fancy ourselves to be public speakers, and for Doug it presented some special challenges. But Doug's problem wasn't in his expression and diction; it was in his mastery of malapropisms. Everyone who knows him has a favorite example of Doug's creative way with words. One common "Dougism: In speaking about events that are over and done and can't be changed, he often refers to "water over the bridge" or "water under the dam." Another friend says his favorite is the way Doug pronounces the word "protege." He calls it "proto-joy."

Because of Doug's decades of service as a public officeholder, Eagle Scout leader and friend to so many, Doug Aurand does indeed have "proto-joys" all across Winnebago County and beyond.

Doug and his wife Julie are going to retire in Florida, but their influence will continue to be felt in Illinois for

years to come. Julie's famous donkey cookies—and she always had a box waiting for me when I got up to Rockford—are certainly going to be missed by this Senator.

In closing, I wish Doug a happy 70th birthday and happy retirement. I thank Julie, the Aurand children, David and Christine, and the grandchildren, Bill and Tom, for sharing their husband, father, and grandfather with the people of Illinois and Winnebago County. Doug Aurand's service to America has made a real difference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

HONORING THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 237 which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the title of the resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 237) expressing the sense of the Senate regarding coming together as a Nation and ceasing all work or other activity for a moment of remembrance beginning at 1:00 PM Eastern Daylight Time on September 11, 2011, in honor of the 10th anniversary of the terrorist attacks committed against the United States on September 11, 2001.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the measure.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating to the measure be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 237) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 237

Whereas at 8:46 AM, on September 11, 2001, hijacked American Airlines Flight 11 crashed into the upper portion of the North Tower of the World Trade Center in New York City, New York;

Whereas 17 minutes later, at 9:03 AM, hijacked United Airlines Flight 175 crashed into the South Tower of the World Trade Center;

Whereas at 9:37 AM, the west wall of the Pentagon was hit by hijacked American Airlines Flight 77, the impact of which caused immediate and catastrophic damage to the headquarters of the Department of Defense;

Whereas at approximately 10:00 AM, the passengers and crew of hijacked United Airlines Flight 93 acted heroically to retake control of the airplane and thwart the taking of additional American lives by crashing the airliner in Shanksville, Pennsylvania, and, in doing so, gave their lives to save countless others;

Whereas nearly 3,000 innocent civilians were killed in the heinous attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas tens of thousands of individuals narrowly escaped the attacks at the Pentagon and World Trade Center and, as witnesses to this tragedy, are forever changed;

Whereas countless fire departments, police departments, first responders, governmental officials, workers, emergency medical personnel, and volunteers responded immediately and heroically to those horrific events;

Whereas the Fire Department of New York suffered 343 fatalities on September 11, 2001, the largest loss of life of any emergency response agency in United States history;

Whereas the Port Authority Police Department suffered 37 fatalities in the attacks, the largest loss of life of any police force in United States history in a single day;

Whereas the New York Police Department suffered 23 fatalities as a result of the terrorist attacks;

Whereas the impact of that day on public health continues through 2011, as nearly 90,000 people are at risk of or suffering from negative health effects as a result of the events of September 11, 2001, including 14,000 workers and 2,400 community residents who are sick, and tens of thousands of others whose health is being monitored;

Whereas 10 years later, the people of the United States and people around the world continue to mourn the tremendous loss of innocent life on that fateful day;

Whereas 10 years later, thousands of men and women in the United States Armed Forces remain in harm's way defending the United States against those who seek to threaten the United States;

Whereas on the 10th anniversary of this tragic day, the thoughts of the people of the United States are with all of the victims of the events of September 11, 2001, and their families;

Whereas the lives of Americans were changed forever on September 11, 2001, when events threatened the American way of life;

Whereas in December 2001, Congress and the President joined together to designate September 11 as Patriot Day (Public Law 107-89);

Whereas in September 2002, and each September thereafter through September 2008, President Bush issued Proclamations 7590, 7702, 7812, 7929, 8047, 8174, and 8286 (67 Fed. Reg. 57125; 68 Fed. Reg. 53013; 69 Fed. Reg. 55717; 70 Fed. Reg. 54467; 71 Fed. Reg. 53959; 72 Fed. Reg. 51553; 73 Fed. Reg. 52773) proclaiming September 11 of that year, respectively, as Patriot Day;

Whereas in 2009, Congress and the President joined together to designate September 11 as a National Day of Service and Remembrance under the Serve America Act (Public Law 111-13; 123 Stat. 1460);

Whereas in September 2009 and 2010, President Obama issued Proclamation 8413 (74 Fed. Reg. 47045) and Proclamation 8559 (75 Fed. Reg. 56463) proclaiming September 11, 2009, and September 11, 2010, respectively, as Patriot Day and National Day of Service and Remembrance; and

Whereas September 11 will never, and should never, be just another day in the hearts and minds of all people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes September 11, 2011, as a day of solemn commemoration of the events of September 11, 2001, and a day to come together as a Nation;

(2) offers its deepest and most sincere condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones of the innocent victims of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks;

(3) honors the heroic service, actions, and sacrifices of first responders, law enforcement personnel, State and local officials, volunteers, and countless others who aided

the innocent victims of those attacks and, in doing so, bravely risked and often gave their own lives;

(4) recognizes the valiant service, actions, and sacrifices of United States personnel, including members of the United States Armed Forces, the United States intelligence agencies, the United States diplomatic service, homeland security and law enforcement personnel, and their families, who have given so much, including their lives and well-being, to support the cause of freedom and defend the security of the United States;

(5) reaffirms that the people of the United States will never forget the challenges our country endured on and since September 11, 2001, and will work tirelessly to defeat those who attacked the United States; and

(6) on the 10th anniversary of this tragic day in United States history—

(A) calls upon all of the people and institutions of the United States to observe a moment of remembrance on September 11, 2011, including—

- (i) media outlets;
- (ii) houses of worship;
- (iii) military organizations;
- (iv) veterans organizations;
- (v) airlines;
- (vi) airports;
- (vii) railroads;
- (viii) sports teams;
- (ix) the Federal Government;
- (x) State and local governments;
- (xi) police, fire, and other public institutions;
- (xii) educational institutions;
- (xiii) businesses; and
- (xiv) other public and private institutions; and

(B) encourages the observance of the moment of remembrance or prayer to last for 1 minute beginning at 1:00 PM Eastern Daylight Time by, to the maximum extent practicable—

- (i) ceasing all work or other activity; and
- (ii) marking the moment in an appropriate manner, including by ringing bells, blowing whistles, or sounding sirens.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, there are so many things here we can disagree about, but I wish to say thank you to all of my colleagues. One hundred of us have joined together in overwhelming numbers to support this historic legislation which creates a national moment of remembrance to commemorate the tragedy of 9/11.

Few events, if any, have done more to change the course of American history as much as the horrifying terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001—nearly 10 years ago. It was one of the worst days in American history on our soil—a day that placed a permanent cloud over America and the free world. Few, if any, Americans can forget where they were that fateful Tuesday morning when our country was gripped with shock and disbelief and it felt as though our world had turned upside down.

I was traveling at the time. I was in the Middle East. When the news came that an airplane struck the trade towers, the first conclusion I came to was it was a stray airplane from a nearby airfield, and that was it. But the news

kept coming, and people in the streets of the city I was in were tearing at the terrible news about what happened to America.

Almost 3,000 people, including more than 700 people from my own State of New Jersey, were brutally massacred in that attack. That is more American lives lost than on D-day when thousands of Americans stormed Normandy.

Many of the victims were hard at work. On a typical weekday, 50,000 people worked in the Twin Towers, with another 200,000 passing through as visitors. It is impossible to believe that these towering facilities, with their huge infrastructure, could be burned, melted, and brought to the ground. Many of the people who lost their lives lost them saving others, including 343 firefighters, 60 police officers, and other first responders, as they answered the call of others who desperately needed their help. Some became heroes that day, such as those on United Flight 93, who took on the hijackers who were in the aisles to try and bring that airplane to its target. But the people stood up and fought against them—heroes, brave and courageous—to prevent that airplane from reaching its intended target.

Tragically, a decade after the Twin Towers fell, the toll of 9/11 is still climbing. More than 85,000 first responders, cleanup workers, and community residents are dealing with the aftermath of this tragedy. There are victims who are being monitored or receiving medical treatment after breathing the toxic fumes and the dust at Ground Zero.

As we all know, the wounds that came from 9/11 are not just physical. Witnesses of the tragedy saw people jumping from high stories of the buildings because they could no longer stand the heat, the smoke. The witnesses of the tragedy, the thousands of survivors who narrowly escaped the attacks, and the families of the victims who will never see their loved ones again still bear the scars of that awful day.

Life changed in countless ways for all Americans on September 11, affecting every move we make. All of us are reminded of 9/11's legacy almost every day as we wait in line to present our ID when we travel, go to work, or when we hear news of further attempts on the lives of Americans.

There are approximately 50,000 baggage checkers and screeners working every day to keep us safe at airports across the country. In fact, the Federal Department of Homeland Security—created in the wake of 9/11—has more than 230,000 employees and spends more than \$40 billion each year protecting us from similar onslaughts.

As is Pearl Harbor, 9/11 can be described as a day that will live in infamy. With Pearl Harbor, with all of its pain and sacrifice, an end to that conflict finally came and normalcy was restored to our country after some years.

But our enemy today continues its search for ways to bring pain and suffering to Americans. They keep searching for technology and weapons, and 10 years later we are still fighting them.

As we near the 10th anniversary of 9/11, it is important for us to remember what brought us to this point. That is why I am so proud and grateful to see the Senate unanimously approve this legislation, which—as we approach the 10th anniversary of 9/11—calls on our country to pause on September 11 for a moment of remembrance. What is planned is that at 1 p.m. eastern time that day, all Americans will be called upon to cease all work and activity and spend a moment in silence reflecting on what happened on 9/11, 2001. Our local, State, and national institutions—from sports teams and railroads to broadcasters and places of worship—will be called upon to mark this minute with church bells or sirens to recall the honor of those victims. This will be a striking symbol of American solidarity, signaling to the world that we remain united against those who threaten our freedom. It will also be a powerful nationwide expression of America's patriotic spirit and our refusal to forget the thousands of innocent lives we lost in the destruction of 9/11.

Many of us recall the love of country we experienced in the days and weeks and months after the attacks in 2001. During that period, it seemed as though everywhere we turned, we saw an American flag. As a nation, we were willing to set aside our differences to mourn our losses and mourn the losses of friends and acquaintances and neighbors, and we decided to work together to defeat those who threaten our way of life. I believe the national moment of remembrance can help us recapture that spirit of unity and remind everyone how strong we are when we stand together.

I thank my colleagues for the outpouring of support for this legislation and hope they will be able to encourage their constituents to participate in this moment of remembrance. Every Member of the Senate joined together as cosponsors to create this moment of remembrance, representing all political views in every corner of this great Nation. We want everybody to participate, including State and local governments, the military, veterans organizations, the news media, houses of worship, and sports teams.

The 9/11 Moment of Remembrance will be a way to pay tribute to the lives lost and forever changed by the events in Pennsylvania, the Pentagon, and at Ground Zero. Let there be no doubt: 9/11 changed our country forever, and a tragedy of this magnitude demands memory and vigilance. As a nation, we must keep alive the memories of the many courageous Americans we lost that day. We must be vigilant on behalf of the thousands of families who suffered incalculable losses—losses that must never be forgotten. During the

past decade, through our pain and sorrow has come the realization that this vigilance must be maintained so nothing like that can happen again.

So once again I say thank you to my colleagues for supporting this measure. It will send a powerful signal to the rest of the world and remind us how strong America is when we all stand together.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor, and note 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.

CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the American people deserve an accounting of what happened on the floor this morning. The citizens of Utah, whom I am honored to represent, and citizens all over this country thought the Senate would be voting on the cut, cap, and balance bill later this week. I am an original cosponsor of this bill in the Senate. I have signed the cut, cap, and balance pledge. I have always supported a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

This year, it is one of my proudest achievements to have introduced S. J. Res. 10, a balanced budget amendment in this body for the first time in all the balanced budget amendments brought to this floor. It is the strongest balanced budget amendment ever written—one that fundamentally deals with our spending crisis. I am honored to have worked with my colleague and friend from Utah, Senator LEE, in crafting this amendment. We worked with Senator CORNYN and 44 other Republicans as well. I am honored to be working with old and new friends, such as Senators CORNYN, KYL, PAUL, TOOMEY, RUBIO, and many other Republicans in pursuing this constitutional amendment for the American people.

The cut, cap, balance legislation the Senate tabled today culminates in a balanced budget amendment, but also includes the short-term deficit reduction that families and markets are demanding.

Cut, cap, balance provides meaningful deficit reduction for the next year and spending caps for the years that follow. It sets us on a path toward a balanced budget. It addresses the gross overspending of the Federal Government in the short term, taking on the deficits and debt that are holding back economic growth and permanently burdening American families and businesses.

Most importantly, cut, cap, balance would fix the problem of government overspending permanently. It would

eliminate the bias in Washington for ever more spending by requiring Congress to send a balanced budget constitutional amendment to the States for ratification prior to any increase in the debt ceiling.

The more the American people hear about this plan, the more they like it. They know the President has no plan. They know the markets are done with promises to cut spending down the road. They know raising taxes is not the solution to a government spending problem. The President and congressional Democrats know the people know this. That is why they have pulled out all the stops to kill this bill's momentum.

The President threatened to veto cut, cap, balance. But that did not do the trick. So after the House passed cut, cap, balance, the President all of a sudden supported the so-called Gang of 6 proposal. His advisers knew they had a problem. All of his clever talk about raising taxes on oil companies and corporate jets and yachts was not distracting the American people from a simple fact: My friends on the other side of the aisle have no credible plan for balancing the budget. The President has no credible plan for balancing the budget. He has not offered anything that would help us get to a balanced budget, nor do I believe he ever will offer anything. They have speeches and executive summaries of bills that will be written down the road; they have plans and proposals for future spending cuts that remain a mystery to everyone; they have budget frameworks; but they have no plan.

The chairman of the Senate Budget Committee has a budget outline. But here is the Senate Democratic caucus budget proposal. Let me refer to this goose egg up here on the chart. That is the Democratic caucus budget proposal—a big goose egg.

As meager as this is, I have to hand it to them, it beats the President's budget proposal. The President has offered us nothing, and we have a big goose egg here in the Senate.

The American people are done with this. The people of Utah know the same people who brought you the stimulus—the policy equivalent of taking \$1 trillion in taxpayer dollars and throwing it into the Potomac River—the same people who brought you \$2.6 trillion in new spending and \$½ trillion in new taxes with Obamacare, are not credible when they now boast of their commitment to deficit reduction and balanced budgets.

The most recent proposal is from the Gang of 6. We are still looking at this proposal. I will not condemn anyone who makes a good-faith effort to get to the bottom of our serious problems. Their efforts might be on the side of the angels, but the devil is in the details, and many of us have real questions about this proposal. Specifically, we want to know what the revenue impact will be, because by some accounts it will raise taxes by between \$2 trillion and \$3 trillion.

At the very least, the American people understand that the President's desperate embrace of this plan is to avoid, once again, dealing with the deficit. Whatever its substantive merits or demerits, this proposal is a commitment to dealing with deficit reduction later. But later is too late. We need to deal with deficit reduction now. The people of this Nation are telling us this over and over. They are lighting up the Capitol switchboard. I am confident that my colleagues on the other side are hearing the message loudly and clearly: Balance the budget now. Get spending under control now. A last minute op-ed from the President telling us to "go big" on a debt deal is a little too late. We are facing our third straight year of trillion dollar deficits. Our debt is now over \$14.3 trillion.

The President has shown no serious signs of getting this fiscal crisis under control. He offered up a dead-on-arrival budget in February. When even his friends in the mainstream media panned his budget for its total lack of attention to our looming debt crisis, he offered his budget mulligan with a much ballyhooed speech on deficit reduction. But a speech is not a plan. Meanwhile, it has been over 800 days since Senate Democrats have produced a budget, thus abdicating their most basic of duties.

The American people are finished with this dithering. They know what the solution is. The President and the majority leader no doubt saw the polling yesterday on the cut, cap, balance plan.

Here is the bottom line: Nearly two-thirds of the American people support it. But that is only half the story. Here is the rest: Everyone likes cut, cap, balance—not just Republicans, not just Democrats. It makes sense.

American families want deficit reduction, and with this plan they get it. No vague platitudes or speeches or rallies about reducing the deficit. This plan reduces the deficit and it fixes the underlying problem, which is Washington's predisposition toward more spending.

The President frequently demands that Congress put partisanship aside and come to a deficit reduction agreement. But the American people are one step ahead of them. The cut, cap, balance plan, along with the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, wins support across the board. Sixty-three percent of Democrats back cut, cap, balance. Fifty-three percent of those who oppose the tea party support it.

Democrats threw everything they had at this bill. They absurdly called it the "cut, cap, and destroy Medicare plan." What bull. The left is becoming a caricature of itself when it comes to demagoguery on the issue of Medicare. I think the American people have caught on that liberals claim that when the Republicans turn on the lights in the morning, they are working to destroy Medicare. Bull. These

claims no longer have credibility. The left is out of talking points. Their constituents are telling them to pass cut, cap, balance. They know it won't destroy anything. It will save this country.

So instead of having a vote on it, Democrats decided to pull the plug on the vote. Ordinarily, it is not a good idea to actively undermine the will of the people.

But in this case, there is a method to their madness. The President and his hard-left supporters are in a real pickle. They refuse any structural reforms to our biggest spending programs—the programs that are driving our country toward a fiscal collapse—but they know they cannot come clean with the American people about the tax increases that will hit squarely on the middle class if these structural reforms fail to occur. So they do nothing. Unable to talk straight with citizens who are demanding a balanced budget, they do nothing. They focus on \$21 billion in tax benefits that go to energy companies over 10 years when we have a \$1.5 trillion deficit this year—this year.

This is how Peter Roff at U.S. News and World Report put it:

The president and congressional Democratic leaders are still dug in, trying to pull a rabbit out of their hat that will get them what the political coalition behind them demands: new taxes, new spending, and no real cuts.

This is not going to happen. So unable to thread the needle between the President's hard-left base that refuses spending reductions and the majority of taxpayers demanding deficit reduction, what do they do? They punt.

Today, they managed to avoid a vote on the bipartisan cut, cap, and balance plan. There was a great deal of bluster surrounding this dodge. To distract the American people from the fact that they were running from a fight, the rhetoric was laid on pretty thick. This is what we heard about this bill. According to my friends on the other side, cut, cap, and balance is "as weak and senseless as anything that has ever come on this Senate floor." It is "anathema to what our country is all about." This is "some of the worst legislation in the history of this country." Now, let's be clear what they are talking about. They are smearing a bill that would balance the budget. They are trashing a bill that requires a balanced budget constitutional amendment.

I personally am glad to know where the other side stands, but they do not stand with the American people. They certainly don't stand with my home State of Utah. The American people think balancing the budget is precisely what America is all about. Reining in spending, restoring the Constitution, and securing the liberty and prosperity of America's families is exactly what Congress should be doing.

I am disappointed in what happened here today, but I am also confident this fight is not over. The left might be able

to hide from a vote on balancing the budget by a simple motion to table—which they are hoping obscures their desire to not balance the budget—but they cannot hide from the markets and the legacy of debt President Obama has given this country because that is a real threat to our credit rating.

Yesterday, Standard & Poor's made clear that avoiding the default was only one variable in their rating of U.S. credit. This is what Standard & Poor's said:

We have previously stated our belief that there is a material risk that efforts to reduce future budget deficits will fall short of the target set by Congressional leaders and the administration. In this light, we see at least a one-in-two likelihood that we could lower the long-term rating by one or more notches on the U.S. within the next three months and potentially as soon as early August . . . if we conclude that Washington hasn't reached what we consider to be a credible agreement to address future budget deficits.

Now, after years of reckless spending by President Obama and his Democratic allies, the chickens are coming home to roost. We face an imminent debt crisis, and a failure to take it on will impose a crushing burden on America's families and businesses. Our economy is stagnant, and the failure of the President to lead on deficit reduction now threatens higher interest rates and will slow it even further.

This is Standard & Poor's analysis of the impact of a debt downgrade due to a failure of deficit reduction:

We assume that under this scenario we would see a moderate rise in long-term interest rates (25–50 basis points), despite an accommodative Fed, due to an ebbing of market confidence, as well as some slowing of economic growth (25–50 basis points on GDP growth) amid an increase in consumer and business caution.

For an economy that is slogging along with anemic growth and job creation, this warning should wake people up. It should make the President and the left get serious about deficit reduction. But, instead, the President is still casting about for a plan.

It is important to remind people that we have a plan. It is called cut, cap, and balance. It culminates in a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, and it is supported broadly by the American people. Some folks on the other side claim to be for a balanced budget. They claim to stand with the people. But on a party-line vote they voted to table this proposal today.

When America's Founders came together in the summer of 1787 to draft our Constitution, they faced many challenges. But at heart they had a respect for republican government, they had a respect for the sovereign power of the American people, and they understood that the fundamental principle of popular sovereignty gave the Constitution its legitimacy. For that reason, the Constitution they wrote was clear that the voice of the people should be loudest on the most pressing issues.

The provisions for amending the Constitution provided that on the most im-

portant issues, the people rule directly. The Constitution belongs to the people. It only became law because it was ratified by the people, and it can only be changed by the people.

Our Nation is deeply in debt, and this debt now threatens the very liberty of our families and the vitality of our economy. It is a threat to current and future prosperity. Most importantly, it is a threat to limited constitutional government. The people know this. They know it in their guts. They know the problem here is spending. Our problem is too much spending, not too little taxation, and they know what the solution is: cut, cap, balance, and a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

There will be talk now about moving on, but I am not moving on. Democrats want to write the obituary on this bill and turn to some new plan or framework this President produces one way or the other, I guess. But no plan this President produces will get us to balance. Cut, cap, and balance does.

I am not so sure what my friends on the other side are afraid of. The founder of their party, Thomas Jefferson, had a deep respect for the democratic process and the sovereignty of the people. What are they so afraid of? Why not pass cut, cap, and balance? Why not send a balanced budget amendment to the States for ratification? If liberals have a better argument, they can lead a fight against the amendment in the States. All they need is 13 States to defeat the balanced budget amendment. Why not let the people decide?

During the last Presidential campaign, the President frequently told his admirers: Yes, we can. Well, now the American people are saying it back to him. They are telling him they want to balance the budget and that we can balance the budget. We can and we should pass cut, cap, and balance and send a balanced budget constitutional amendment to the States for ratification.

I will just repeat it: If the Democrats so hate the idea of a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, all they have to do is get 13 States to vote against ratification. We have to get 38 States to vote for ratification. That may seem like an overwhelming job, but I don't think so. I think the amendment would be ratified so quickly, Democratic heads would be spinning and, I might add, maybe even some Republican heads as well.

All I can say is this country is in trouble. This country is on the way down to self-destruction unless we get it under control, and I don't see one program from the other side that even comes close to showing how we get this under control—except more taxes and more spending. I guarantee, if we raise taxes, they would spend every stinking dime of it. That has been the history of my 35 years in the Senate, as the most senior Republican. All I can say is we are not going to let them get away with it anymore. We are a minority

now, but I believe we can get back in the majority.

I think the Democrats would do themselves a great favor if they would vote for cut, cap, and balance and a constitutional amendment and let the people—let the people—decide. Let them make this decision. Come on, Democrats, all you need to do is get 13 States. What are you so afraid of? I think what is so fearful is that this waltz that has been going on of big spending all these years is going to come to an end.

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. 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.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:16 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 2:21 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MANCHIN).

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, yesterday the space shuttle *Atlantis* came back in the early morning darkness with those xenon lights illuminating that 3-mile-long runway at the Kennedy Space Center. That is a location that a century ago a set of grandparents of mine had homesteaded under the old Homestead Act, worked the land for the required 4 years. I have a copy of the deed signed by Woodrow Wilson in 1917 to my grandparents. Over three-quarters of a century later, the thought was not lost on me, when we went in that early morning darkness to the launchpad, that my grandparents would have never, ever believed that, so many years later, a grandson was going to literally leave the face of the Earth from almost the old homestead where they had to swat mosquitoes and fight off rattlesnakes and alligators as they eked a living out of that Florida soil.

That was the location *Atlantis* came back to yesterday morning after a 13-day flawless mission after having been launched by the finest launch team in the world. That launch team is now having to disperse in part because we are shutting down the space shuttle program after 30 glorious years. It is an incredible flying machine, with 135

very successful missions that allowed us to do incredible work in space with human beings interacting and, of course, 2 tragic missions—the destruction of *Challenger* on ascent 25 years ago and the destruction of *Columbia* on reentry just a few years ago, in the early part of this last decade.

There would not be as much angst in the space community if the new rockets were ready. The problem is that the rockets are being designed, and in some cases being built, but they then have to be human-rated; that is, all the redundancies for safety as well as the escape systems have to be designed and developed for the new rockets. One of those new rockets is going to fly this fall. It will launch and rendezvous with the International Space Station and will deliver cargo, but it is going to take a few years to rate that for humans. That all the more adds to the angst, the angst of people who have lost their jobs and now do not see the American rocket that is ready to fly immediately upon the shutdown of the space shuttle program.

I have been surprised that we have a lot of people in America who think the space program is being shut down. We have an International Space Station up there at about 225 miles. This thing is huge. It is 120 yards long. From one end zone to another of a football field, that is how big it is. There are six human beings up there doing research right now.

We have trials in the Food and Drug Administration on drugs that have been developed on that International Space Station. The first one that is in trials right now is a vaccine for salmonella. Another one that is getting ready to start trials is a vaccine for MRSA, the highly infectious bacterial disease in hospitals that we find so difficult to control because you cannot get an antibiotic that will control it.

I wanted to say for America's space team, "a job well done." A number of us, including Senator HUTCHISON and myself, had introduced and we passed last week the resolution commemorating the men and women of NASA. Indeed, their congratulations and commendations are certainly in order on a job well done.

The space program lives. The space program will go to greater heights. We will go to Mars, and we will see Americans venture out into the cosmos for even greater discoveries.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS— H.R. 2553

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we are facing a deadline tonight. At midnight, the current reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration expires. That expiration will mean that no funds can be collected or paid out of the airport and airway trust fund starting tomorrow, July 23. The trust fund provides the primary source of funding for the Federal Aviation Administration through excise taxes imposed on airline tickets, aviation fuel, and air cargo shipments.

We asked the Federal Aviation Administration and the Secretary of Transportation what would happen if the extension is not passed today in the Senate, and he said as follows: There will be a partial shutdown of Federal Aviation Administration operations. Approximately 4,000 non-essential FAA staff will be furloughed. Mr. President, 143 of these employees, incidentally, work in my State, mostly in Chicago.

The Airport Improvement Program, which provides construction project grants to airports, will be shut down and unable to obligate grants for projects. Projects already obligated will be able to continue—for example, the O'Hare Airport, Quad City's runways in Illinois—but obligating funds for new projects will be suspended. If the extension continues for a period of time, there may be reimbursement issues with projects that are underway.

There is an unresolved question as to whether this failure to extend the FAA authorization will have an impact on the fees we collect, the aviation taxes and fees we collect from airlines for their operations. It is not clear yet whether we will lose that revenue or whether we can capture it if we reach an agreement at a later time.

Majority Leader REID and Chairman JAY ROCKEFELLER have told House leaders that a shutdown is likely unless a clean extension can be passed. The Senate is hotlining a clean extension today, which I will go to next. There are no objections to this clean extension on the Democratic side, but we do expect an objection from the Republican side.

I want to tell you the request I make for this extension, this clean extension, is in the name of chairman JAY ROCKEFELLER from your State of West Virginia. This is a sad commentary on the political state of affairs in Congress today. This is the 21st extension of this authorization. How could we possibly explain to America that we have been unable so many times to extend this authorization for something so critical to our commerce and our economy? But now we are facing the most serious challenge we ever had when it comes to this extension, and that is the expiration of it this evening. It will have a direct impact on the people who work for the FAA and a direct impact on their operations.

Now, I might add, very quickly, to give peace of mind to people, this will

not have an impact on air traffic control or the safety of our airlines. Not at all. But the orderly operation of the FAA is at risk.

What is this all about? It is a battle over a program called Essential Air Service. Essential Air Service, if I am not mistaken, was initiated by your predecessor, Senator Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia. At the time of deregulation of airlines a decision was made that the smaller communities across America needed a helping hand to maintain air service. We have it in Illinois. Over the years we have reconsidered it, amended it, changed it. It is a shadow of what it started out to be. It is a very small program by standards of the original program.

There is a battle going on between the House and the Senate now, between Republicans in the House and the Democratic leadership in the Senate, about the future of this program. I just want to say in all fairness and all honesty, for goodness' sake, to both sides, save that battle for another day. Let us not jeopardize the operations of the Federal Aviation Administration because of a squabble over an important but relatively small program, and that is what is going to happen. What we are going to hear after I make this request is an objection on the Republican side to extending this authorization of the Aviation Administration with a clean extension, making no statement about changing policy. It just says don't jeopardize the operations of the FAA. Let's keep them in business. Let's fight this out next week or the week after on the Essential Air Service issue, but let's move forward and let the FAA do its business with a clean bill that does not take sides over who is right and who is wrong on Essential Air Service.

What I am offering is neutrality, political neutrality, a clean extension, but I am afraid what I will get back is an insistence if you don't take the House Republican proposal, we will shut it down. I don't think that is a good choice for America. Let us, as politicians, do our battles. Let's never do them at the expense of ordinary people across America who are trying to do good work to improve our airports and make sure we have the safest runways and safest air operations in the world. That should be our highest priority.

So I am going to make this request for a clean extension without getting into this political squabble at all. I hope the Republicans will not object. I hope we can extend this authorization for the Federal Aviation Administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 109, H.R. 2553, that a Rockefeller-Hutchison substitute amendment which is at the desk be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HATCH. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes to explain my objection to the legislation just offered by my esteemed colleague. I want to make it absolutely clear that a long-term FAA reauthorization is a priority for this country and a priority for myself, and I have said as much repeatedly. The consent request just offered by my colleague, even if accepted, would not prevent a lapse of current law. As my colleagues are likely aware, the House has completed legislative business for the week, so the only way to prevent a disruption to FAA funding is to pass Chairman MICA's bill the House passed earlier this week. I worked with Finance Committee Chairman BAUCUS to report a tax title from the Finance Committee to the bill that passed the Senate earlier this year.

However, since then progress on a long-term reauthorization has been slow. I share House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman MICA's frustration that favors to organized labor have overshadowed the prospects for long-term FAA reauthorization.

Last year the National Mediation Board changed the rules under which employees of airlines and railroads are able to unionize. For decades the standard has been that a majority of employees would have to agree in an election to form a union. However, the new National Mediation Board rules changed that standard so that all it takes to unionize is a majority of employees voting. This means that the NMB wants to count an employee who doesn't vote as voting for big labor. Somehow, organized labor is able to claim that it is democratic to appropriate someone else's vote without that person's input and participation. The FAA reauthorization bill that passed the House earlier this year will undo this heavyhanded rule and lets airline employees decide for themselves how to use their own votes. The House bill would merely undo a big partisan favor done at the behest of big labor, and put efforts to unionize airline workforces on the same footing they have been on for years. The House bill does not create a new hurdle for unionization; instead it restores the longstanding ability of airline employees to make decisions for themselves.

As I said, it is unfortunate that kowtowing to big labor has effectively grounded efforts to get a long-term FAA reauthorization off the ground. The lack of a long-term bill is bad for airports all across the country because they don't have the funding stability to plan and complete projects. Kicking the can further down the road is not a viable alternative to actually doing what is in the best interest of passengers, commercial users of air trans-

portation, and our airlines and airports.

As a Senate conferee to the FAA bill, I stand ready to do everything I can to break the cycle of short-term extensions, and to do something that hasn't been done around here for more than 7½ years, and get FAA reauthorization off the ground.

So, Mr. President, having said all of that, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2553, which was received from the House; that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, the Senator from Utah is my friend. We have worked on many issues together and in this particular moment in time we are in disagreement. What he has presented to you is one side of a story, one side of a debate and said unless you accept the House Republican position, which has not been resolved, we are going to lay off 4,000 people at midnight tonight. Do you think that means anything to them?

What I offered was a clean extension of which I didn't get into the merits, which said let's put this debate aside and that debate aside and keep the agency working, the Federal Aviation Administration. He said, no, either take the Republican approach or else, and, incidentally, he told me at the outset the House Republicans have gone home. They are gone. They sent this over and said take it or leave it or close it down. That is not a very sound choice for our country. I am sorry if the Senator from Utah objected to a clean extension so we can keep up these operations. I object because I don't believe it is a fair approach.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am getting a little tired of the National Labor Relations Board usurping the power of the Congress of the United States and enacting labor laws by fiat of the Board that are hardly going to be upheld by the courts, but nevertheless it will take years to reduce them and take them away. In this particular case the National Mediation Board has changed the longstanding rule when you vote to unionize, it is the vote of all employees. This means that you could have a vote, and this is what I think the House is trying to stop and to change. That means you can have a vote with less than half of the employees and it would be the majority of those who vote. Now, that has never been the law, it has never been the case, and it is clearly a heavyhanded approach towards the FAA, and I think that is one reason why the House has taken this very strong position.

I understand my friend on the other side, and we are friends and we have

worked together on some of the issues, and I have a tremendous amount of admiration for him and his ability to lead and express himself. He is one of the best people of expression in the history of the Senate, and I have great respect for him. But that is one of the main reasons why the House is up in arms and I have to say our side is up in arms as well.

We have to stop this changing laws without the consent of Congress just by the fiat of those on the National Labor Relations Board and the National Mediation Board. It is not right and upturns hundreds of years of labor law, and, frankly, it is wrong and I am on the side of the House in this matter because of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, perhaps if I were as persuasive as my colleague just said, he would not have objected. Having said that, when we speak about heavy hands, we don't have to worry about the heavy hand of the House on this issue because they went home. They took off. They left, which means that 4,000 people would be furloughed this evening.

TRIBUTE TO DR. PAUL SMITH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Dr. Paul Smith, a physician whose story has been chosen to be recorded as part of the London, KY, "Living Treasures" project.

Dr. Smith's career path began when he graduated pre-med from Cumberland College in 1949 at age 19. After attending the University of Kentucky, where he hitchhiked to class every day, Dr. Smith was accepted into the University of Louisville medical school. Unable to obtain a rural scholarship through traditional channels, Dr. Smith received a scholarship from the Tri-County Women's Club in Knox, Whitley, and Laurel counties. The only condition was that he return to one of the counties and practice medicine there for 4 years.

Before being called up for service in the U.S. Air Force, Dr. Smith worked for a doctor in Cumberland, where he met his wife. After a year of dating, Dr. Smith and his wife of 53 years, Ann, were married and moved together to the Lake Charles Air Force base in Louisiana. Their daughter Jan was born on base as Smith trained and served as a doctor.

After completing his service with the Air Force, Dr. Smith moved to London and opened up his own practice. He routinely made dozens of house calls to London residents—both in the city and out in the country. Dr. Smith also offered OB services and often worked in the emergency room of nearby Marymount Hospital when other doctors were too busy.

After 38 years of dedicated service to the London community, Dr. Smith retired in 1998. Even in his retirement,

Dr. Smith volunteers at the free medical clinic run at the Community Christian Church.

The State of Kentucky is lucky to have individuals like Dr. Paul Smith, who dedicate their lives to better those of others. As he has shown us all, Dr. Smith is truly a great Kentuckian.

Mr. President, the Laurel County-area newspaper the Sentinel Echo recently published a detailed interview with Dr. Smith and his wife in which they discuss Dr. Smith's accomplishments and contributions. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sentinel-Echo, May 25, 2011]

LONDON'S LIVING TREASURES: PART 2

Following is the second installment of the Living Treasures Project. It is the story of Dr. Paul Smith, who served Laurel County as a family physician for 38 years. Dr. Smith shared fascinating details about his life as a medical student and doctor, which meant hitchhiking to class, making house calls and working with the nuns at Marymount Hospital. During his interview, Dr. Smith was joined by his wife of 53 years, Ann.

"I used to go to the library when I was in high school and read all the books I could about family physicians, some of them from Kentucky and otherwise, just the real stories of rural physicians. I took pre-med at Williamsburg's Cumberland College, graduated with a diploma after two years, in 1949. I was 19.

WORKING STUDENT

After I finished Williamsburg, I needed funds to go on to the University of Kentucky. I ended up getting an emergency certificate to teach at Henderson Settlement in Frakes, Ky., for one year and saved up enough. I had an aunt who worked there, and I had room and board pretty much for free except I'm sure my parents gave them a lot of vegetables. I saved all my money and went to University of Kentucky in 1950.

Those years were very lean and, unfortunately with no car or transportation, I hitchhiked every day back and forth to the university. I went to work at the narcotic hospital out at Leestown Pike in Lexington usually at 4 p.m. After classes, I'd have to scurry over to Leestown Pike and put my thumb out and just barely make it to work, usually.

Before I finished my degree, the Korean War started. I had applied for medical school, but I hadn't heard anything. I had already been called up for the draft, passed my physical for the Army. They would defer you a semester at a time but by then they were getting hard up to give deferrals to everybody, so there was a good possibility I was going to have to go to the service.

When I was home for Christmas vacation, I got my letter of acceptance to the medical school at the University of Louisville, the only one I could afford even though the tuition was just \$800 a year. It felt great because that's what I wanted. When I got accepted, my father went to the bank in Pineville to try to borrow money and the banker said, "No, not on a medical student, too many of them flunk out."

I got deferred and finished the year and went on to Louisville.

When I went back to medical school my sophomore year, I got a job as an extern at Baptist. We'd do histories and physicals of patients and, every third night, I was on call for the lab.

When I finished medical school, there was still a doctor's draft. You had to do two years in the service unless you were over 35 or unless you were in the service before. That was looming over me when I finished medical school, but I still had my internship to complete, which I did at Good Samaritan Hospital in Lexington in 1957.

When I finished, I joined the Air Force. I knew I'd be called in six to 12 months, so I had to look for a job. Finally, one of the surgeons told me that he knew this surgeon in Lynch and Cumberland that could use a doctor. I signed on with him and that's the best thing I did in my life because that's where I met my wife.

MARRIAGE MATERIAL

How'd we meet? Her mother had to have her gallbladder out and she can tell it better than I can.

ANN: I went back home to teach school, but they put me in first grade. I did everything to try to do a crash course on elementary. I was cutting paper dolls for my students, preparing for the next day. Paul walked in and when he walked out, I said, "Mother, I think I'm going to marry that guy." She said, "Just hush." He's the only person I ever pursued.

DR. SMITH: I was real impressed with her, but I was a little leery. I rented a room in Cumberland. I'd usually go to the drive-in at night and eat. Well, she and another girl started showing up there about every night. I got suspicious, but my impression was good all along.

I was in Cumberland almost a year to the day. I was called into the service on the 5th of July. In the meantime, though, we dated and got married June 14, 1958, Flag Day. It was a nice wedding. Like most people, I thought we were going to have a little wedding and when I went in, the church was full.

ANN: It was a small church. And my mother had decorated it with a lot of mountain flowers.

DR. SMITH: We went together to the service and we went to basic training. I had to go four weeks in Montgomery, Ala. That was an awakening too because neither one of us liked the racism. I didn't like that at all.

In training, doctors had to go out and shoot one time. I can't say I hit a thing. I'd shot a BB gun before and a .22, but they put a .45 in my hand for the first time. I aimed perfectly at the target and when I pulled it, it went up like that. I shot my however-many rounds I had to shoot. I only went to the rifle range once but we marched and flew in airplanes a lot.

In October '58, I was assigned to Lakes Charles, La. It was a small base, the hospital was constructed during the war so it was not very fancy, but it was a nice base. That's where we had our first daughter, Jan.

Now, I've got to go back and fill in before I went to medical school, because that's important. I'd applied for a rural scholarship and I was sure with my grades I would get one. But it seemed they'd given all of them out. At that time, I was going to have to hold up medical school for a year to earn what I needed, but one of the students ahead of me knew the Tri-County Women's Club from Knox, Whitley and Laurel had raised money for a rural scholarship and, to their knowledge, it had never been filled. I interviewed and they were in favor of me getting it. With the scholarship, I agreed I would go back to practice in Knox, Whitley or Laurel for four years.

That was one reason I didn't even consider staying in the service because I had that obligation, and I felt it was a deep obligation.

LAUREL COUNTY-BOUND

I found out Dr. Robert Pennington in London might need a doctor. I came over here

and it was a Wednesday afternoon and Dr. Pennington was off on Wednesday afternoon and he showed me all around town.

I didn't have an office, but it turns out that Dr. Pennington and his brother had an office built up over the old fire department on Broad Street. It had a space for a lab and space for three examining rooms and a waiting room, already plumbed and wired. So that looked good and the rent looked good, \$65 a month.

Then the next day, Dr. Pennington located me a house I could rent. It was up on Falls Road. We unloaded on July 5, 1983 and I got busy getting my office together because, see, I had no equipment. Marymount Hospital was nice to me, they loaned me one or two of the bedside tables. My brother was doing a residency in surgery in Lexington and they wanted to get rid of an old surgical table. Owner of The Sentinel, Martin Dyche, through him, I got a Cole metal desk, a filing cabinet and a chair.

Next to my office, there was the taxi park and they had five or six taxis there. They were busy all the time. They had a ringer out there on the telephone pole so you could hear it ring all the time.

London was a rural town, everything closed on Wednesday at noon except me. I decided, since most of the doctors took off on Wednesday afternoon that I was going to work and I'd take off on Thursday afternoon.

We had three drug stores, the original Begley's, Robert Dyche had Dyche Drug Store and then there was City Drug Store, it was down near where the theatre is now, where the old Hob Nob used to be. Of course London Bucket was here, which handled plumbing, Hoskin's Five and Ten, and then the department stores, you had Hackney's, Daniel's, and several others. Where Weaver's is now was their pool hall and women were not allowed in the pool hall. If Ann or somebody wanted their hotdog, they had a window up there and they'd sell you the hotdog out the window. It was a bustling little Main Street, but don't expect anything after 5 o'clock.

I opened my practice about July 15, and I averaged four to five patients a day the first year and I couldn't have paid my rent with that because an office visit was \$3 and a house call was \$5 in the city and \$10 outside in the county. But I made a lot of house calls, some I got paid for, some I didn't.

ANN: We ate well. In those first years I learned to can beans, freeze corn, I learned to do so much. They brought not just a bushel of beans, but two or three. It was overwhelming, by then I had three little kids to take care of—Jan, Elizabeth and Paul Ray—but I felt like it was a sin not to use that food. But anyway, we did know it would be slow for the first couple of years, so we planned ahead.

DR. SMITH: We didn't want to go in debt and we didn't. I probably made most of my money in the E.R. The other doctors were all so busy they didn't care about leaving their office full of patients and running to the emergency room. So I got called all the time to the E.R. and that's how I picked up a lot of patients, because they had to be healthy to climb two floors of steps up to my office.

In 1961, in March or April, Dr. D.D. Turner decided he was going to quit general practice and go into the health department in western Kentucky. He came to see me about taking over his practice. I was happy because then I'd be on a ground floor, they wouldn't have to climb those steps. Then things started picking up.

Our days were 24-7. Five of us physicians did OBs. When I came here, three of the doctors were still delivering at home. I told them up front I wasn't going to do home deliveries. I told them I was charging \$50 for

delivery, \$10 for a circumcision. I tell you, you didn't make any money back then if you were in medicine. Not here. Many of a time I would leave at 7 in the morning and make rounds and I'd come home for dinner, maybe, but I'd go out again and make house calls. I would make 10 or 12 house calls a day.

A year after I started, we moved from the house on Falls Street.

ANN: But then Dr. Pennington, he was always finding stuff for us. He knew this house on Ninth Street was going on the market. He said don't tell a soul.

DR. SMITH: So we moved here. Dr. Pennington decided for us. For one thing, look how close it is to the hospital. I could go over there and be in the delivery room in three or four minutes.

Marymount was run by the Sisters. It was great to work with them, I never could remember all their names, I was bad about that, I'd call them all "Sister." We had eight or 10 of them up here. They were great to work with, they were very good nurses.

CHANGES IN MEDICINE

When I first came here, polio was dying down because the first vaccine had come out. But measles was the big thing. We didn't have any measles vaccinations, and it wouldn't be unusual to go out to a house and see a kid with 104, 105 temperature with measles and two or three other siblings with measles. The only thing you could do is advise them how to bathe them, how to cool them off.

Mumps, had a lot of mumps. And, of course, pneumonias and a lot of hepatitis. One year, just in my practice, I had two or three kids from the high schools where they still had outdoor toilets. They would come in with jaundice and they had hepatitis, and of course we didn't have any vaccines.

A lot of changes have occurred. Technology is one of the biggest changes and it's good and bad. It's good because we can now do a better job with some things. In the 1960s, we didn't have any Echocardiograms. CT or MRI hadn't been heard of. The part that I don't like that's changed is doctors no longer sit and do history and physicals and talk to people. When I was externing during medical school, each history and physical, you'd spend 30 to 40 minutes. None of this five-minute stuff.

I quit OB in '85 because we were getting some OB doctors in and also malpractice had gotten so bad. When we got more lawyers, that's when things changed, that's it, that's what changed it. I want to say around early '70s.

Medicine changed so. The insurance companies would fight you constantly in your office and you had to fight constantly to get people in the hospital. You'd be arguing with some nurse up in Chicago or somewhere. That's when my blood pressure started going up, honestly.

I closed my office in 1998, but I've worked some since then, I'd work some now if I didn't have back trouble. I loved being a doctor, listen, I still do. I help with the free clinic now at the Community Christian Church. I liked that you could see people from the time they were born until they died. And you followed them all the way through. I loved all of it, really, just taking care of the families, getting to know the people."

CAMPUS SEXUAL VIOLENCE ELIMINATION ACT

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about legislation I have introduced, the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act, or Campus

SaVE Act, and to urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I want to start by sharing some deeply disturbing statistics with you:

Between 20 and 25 percent of all female undergraduates in America are victims of sexual assault or attempted sexual assault each year.

Most cases of sexual assault occur between acquaintances—between 85 and 90 percent of reported sexual assaults on college women are perpetrated by someone they know, and nearly half of such sexual assaults occur on a date.

Young adults age 18 and 19 experience the highest rates of stalking among any age group.

As the father of four daughters, one of whom who just graduated from college and another who is in college now, these statistics are terrifying. But I was even more distressed to learn that many of these victims never come forward. Those who do often do not get the support and the assistance they need to heal and to be able to continue their education safely and successfully.

The Campus SaVE Act will address many of these issues by setting out a clear framework to promote transparency and accountability. The legislation consolidates existing policies under both the Jeanne Clery Act and title IX to ensure that institutions of higher education have comprehensive procedures in place to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking.

Institutions of higher education are already required to report certain crime statistics as a result of the Clery Act, a law championed by our former colleague, Senator Specter, after Jeanne Clery was raped and murdered in her college dorm room in 1989.

But only one-third of U.S. colleges correctly report their crime statistics, leading to misclassification and underrepresentation of attempted and completed instances of sexual assault. They are not currently required to break down their data on different types of sex offenses, leading to confusion and unclear data about reports of domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

The Campus SaVE Act will also address the need for education and awareness in the entire campus community. Currently, less than half of all colleges and universities offer any sexual assault prevention training; the Campus SaVE Act will require that these institutions provide prevention and awareness programs for all incoming students and new employees.

This education is essential. Many students attending college are away from home for the first time and are still in their teenage years and learning about adult relationships. We cannot assume that they know what dating violence is; we cannot assume that they know what constitutes consent in a sexual relationship.

A victim also may not know what to do when something bad happens: less than 5 percent of rapes or attempted

rapes are reported, and fewer than half of colleges and universities spell out policies for filing criminal charges and campus reports. However, when students know how to report victimization and how their school will respond, students are more likely to report instances of sexual assault or attempted sexual assault.

Dickinson College in Carlisle, PA, recently saw students hold a sit-in for 3½ days, displaying their frustration over the college's weak sexual assault policy. One student remarked, "We don't have a consolidated document that runs you through what you should do and also allows you to understand that there are federal laws that protect you."

This is exactly what the Campus SaVE Act would require. It sets standards for institutions so that everyone in the community understands their rights and responsibilities. Fortunately, the administration at Dickinson College later agreed to strengthen its policies relating to sexual assault.

Under the Campus SaVE Act, students will know that if they report being a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, they will receive an explanation of their rights. They need to know they have a right to report these offenses to law enforcement authorities. They need to know that the college or university has an obligation to help them seek a protective order, if they want such an order. They need to know that they will receive contact information for the resources available to them, such as counseling and legal assistance. Finally, they need to know about safety planning such as changing their living arrangements, class schedule, work schedule, and travel options so that they feel safe in their environment.

The bill will also ensure that these incidents are properly reported by making institutions include in their annual security reports statistics on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking that were reported to campus police or local police agencies.

Many colleges and universities are doing this right: they have procedures in place to deal with domestic partner violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; they provide support to victims, and they have prevention programs to educate the community about these terrible acts.

In another case in Pennsylvania this year, a student at Kutztown University told authorities that she had been raped on campus by a male student. After this young woman reported the assault, a second female student came out and said that she had been raped a few weeks earlier. These two instances of young women standing up and reporting their assaults pulled others out of the shadows. Another two female students went to authorities with reports of sexual assault. All four women knew their attackers. In response to

the rape and sexual assault reports, the university put a notice on their Web site and sent e-mails to students, faculty, and staff about the occurrences.

Kutztown University and Dickinson College have taken concrete steps to improve their responses, but much remains to be done. Congress cannot legislate a campus culture, but we can pass legislation to help institute the processes and procedures that will educate students in order to prevent intimate partner violence and provide support for victims who do come forward, which will encourage other victims to speak up and seek help.

Colleges and universities must do everything possible to protect students from violence and provide information about students' rights and the resources available to help them.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act so that our children can go to college without fear and those who violate campus policies relating to intimate partner violence will be held accountable for their actions.

CLEAN WATER ACT JURISDICTIONAL EXPANSION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today to submit for the RECORD an article written by Bobbie Frank, executive director of the Wyoming Association of Conservation Districts and published on July 16, 2011, in the Wyoming Livestock Roundup. The article's title is "Muddy waters: EPA, Army Corps Seek to Define More Jurisdiction as Federal."

I have concluded, just as this article has, that the Clean Water Act, CWA, jurisdictional guidance being proposed by the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, allows the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and EPA to regulate waters now considered entirely under State jurisdiction. This unprecedented exercise of power will allow EPA to trump States rights, and vitiate the authority of State and local governments to make local land and water use decisions. This is particularly troubling when we have seen no evidence that the States are misusing or otherwise failing to meet their responsibilities.

Enormous resources will be needed to expand the CWA Federal regulatory program. Not only will there be a host of landowners and project proponents who will now be subject to the CWA's mandates and costs of obtaining permits, but an increase in the number of permits needed will lead to longer permitting delays. Increased delays in securing permits will impede a host of economic activities in Wyoming and across the United States. Commercial and residential real estate development, agriculture, ranching, electric transmission, transportation, energy development, and mining will all be affected, and thousands of jobs will be lost.

In May of this year, 19 Senators joined me in a letter to EPA expressing

our strong opposition to this guidance. I will continue to fight to protect our States from this Washington power grab.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article to which I referred.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUDDY WATERS: EPA, ARMY CORPS SEEK TO DEFINE MORE JURISDICTION AS FEDERAL
(By Bobbie Frank, Executive Director, Wyoming Association of Conservation Districts)

The conservation districts in this state are definitely committed to watershed health and water quality work, and their commitment is evident through their actions: conservation district employees who are several months pregnant wade streams in the winter to collect water samples, and retired conservation district supervisors volunteer their time to help with water quality monitoring and implementing water quality management practices.

Many landowners, community leaders and homeowners have and continue to volunteer hundreds of hours working on watershed plans, and then they work hard to implement those plans. There is no shortage of dedicated and concerned citizens working to maintain and improve the water quality of this state, and every two years the Wyoming Association of Conservation Districts (WACD) publishes its "Watersheds Progress Report" to show all of the incredible efforts at the local level across Wyoming. The 2009 edition is available on our website.

Highlighting the dedication to water quality is important to recognize, in the context of this discussion, because, inevitably, when one starts debating the issue of regulatory jurisdiction—federal versus state—if one leans toward less federal intervention and regulation, then it is easy for others to try to paint one as anti-clean water. As one district supervisor put it, "The only conservation that matters is that which gets put on the ground."

In April 2011 the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published draft guidance that would replace previous agency guidance issued in 2003 and 2008, detailing modifications to which waters EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) would regulate under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (commonly referred to as the Clean Water Act). Who should have the authority over water quality issues, the federal government or the respective states, continues to be a hot topic of debate. Key Supreme Court decisions have refined the EPA's and the Corps' authority over the regulation of certain types of waters.

In the past several years there have also been attempts in Congress to advance legislation to redefine "waters of the United States." These bills would have resulted in a definition that would have included a number of waters that are currently not subject to federal regulation, or are in a "gray" area. These attempts did not move forward. As a result, that which cannot be done through the appropriate processes, i.e. legislation and/or rules, apparently will be done through the development of "guidance."

The two primary decisions, the Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (SWANCC) and Rapanos v. United States (Rapanos), resulted in restricting federal authority over certain types of waters.

First, the SWANCC decision removed from federal regulation isolated wetlands by nullifying the "migratory bird rule." In a nut-

shell, the agencies, via regulation, exerted jurisdiction over these types of isolated waters by arguing that isolated wetlands will have waterfowl in them that would fly to another state and land in another isolated wetland, hence there was interstate commerce occurring on these waters to render them under federal jurisdiction.

The other suit, Rapanos, resulted in what is argued by the agencies to be a complicated and unmanageable approach to determining jurisdiction. Many lauded the decision as a win for reining in the heavy hand of the agencies. In Rapanos, the court addressed CWA protections for wetlands adjacent to non-navigable tributaries, and issued five opinions with no single opinion commanding a majority of the court. The plurality opinion, authored by Justice Scalia, stated that "waters of the United States" extended beyond traditional navigable waters to include "relatively permanent, standing or flowing bodies of water." There is a lot more detail to this opinion, but suffice it to say, the outcome was additional limitations placed on federal jurisdiction.

A comparison of the December 2008 memorandum issued by EPA and Corps guiding agency personnel on which waters would be jurisdictional and this new proposed guidance, provides for some significant changes in what waters would be regulated. The agencies specifically state in the draft guidance: "However, after careful review of these opinions, the agencies concluded that previous guidance did not make full use of the authority provided by the CWA to include waters within the scope of the Act, as interpreted by the Court."

The 2008 guidance established a "significant nexus" standard, whereby the agency would have to determine on a fact-specific basis whether certain types of waters, such as wetlands, tributaries or traditional navigable waters, fell under federal jurisdiction. This significant nexus standard would contemplate the flow functions of the tributary itself and the functions performed by all wetlands adjacent to the tributary to determine if they significantly affect the chemical, physical and biological integrity of downstream traditional navigable waters. The significant nexus also included consideration of hydrologic and ecologic factors.

This 2011 draft guidance takes the same type of approach, but expands on the significant nexus approach by establishing that waters that are in "close proximity" or "proximate other waters" to traditional navigable waters will also fall under jurisdiction. Basically, the guidance establishes a watershed approach to determining significance. In essence, based on our analysis, most waters in a watershed draining to a "traditional navigable water" or interstate water, would ultimately meet the "significant nexus" test and be subject to federal regulatory oversight.

There is a list of certain types of waters that would "generally" not fall under federal jurisdiction. Note the term "generally." There is a potential that some of the specifically exempt waters, such as reflecting pools, ornamental waters, gullies, etc., could also be jurisdictional.

Also of import is the application of the above as it pertains to the different provisions of the Clean Water Act. The agencies acknowledge in the guidance that "although SWANCC and Rapanos specifically involved section 404 of the CWA and discharges of dredged or fill material, the term 'waters of the United States' must be interpreted consistently for all CWA provisions that use the term. These provisions include the section 402 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program, the section 311 oil spill program, the water quality standards and total maximum daily load

programs under section 303, and the section 401 State water quality certification process.”

This issue is not about whether our water resources should be protected or not, which is often the spin on this issue. It is about whether the authority to regulate certain types of waters should lie with the federal government or should be retained by the states. WACD’s comments reflect the opinion that, on those waters falling outside of the traditional “navigable,” interstate waters’ realm should be regulated by the states. It has been our experience that those closest to the issue are typically most knowledgeable and capable of commonsense, cost effective approaches to resource protection and management.

WACD and the conservation districts have a solid record of projects that do successfully protect water quality in a commonsense, cost effective approach that benefits all water users and the state. The EPA’s 2011 draft guidance document hinders our ability to continue this mission by oftentimes placing districts in a position of reacting to federally driven requirements and priorities versus the highest priority resource issues in our communities.

Thanks to Senator Barrasso for his diligent efforts on this issue. We appreciate his work to ensure that the federal agencies don’t try to evade the appropriate processes and expand their authorities.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING TOM WILLIAMS, JR.

• Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, today I wish to remember a great man and a wonderful friend, Mr. Tom Williams, Jr. Mr. Williams passed away on June 21, 2011, in Scottsdale, AZ, and leaves behind his wife Gloria; son Tom Williams, III; daughter Nicol Williams-Pruitt; son-in-law Jason Pruitt; and grandson Nicolas Pruitt. To Mr. Williams’ family, please accept my condolences for your loss.

Mr. Williams and I met through a shared passion for the advancement of America’s small businesses. In fact, Mr. Williams started his own small business in 1982 in Oakland, CA, an accounting firm called Williams, Adley & Company. In the beginning, Williams and Adley were the only two employees, but over the next few decades, they grew to be a three-office firm with two locations in California and one in Washington, DC. The firm now boasts over 100 employees.

In addition to his professional success, Mr. Williams has been a champion for small business-friendly legislation. He was a leader in changing the size standards for the accounting industry and fought tirelessly to improve access for small accounting firms to government contracts. Similarly, my colleagues in the Senate may remember language in the Small Business Jobs Act mandating annual reviews of the accounting firm size standards, a provision suggested by Mr. Williams.

Mr. Williams was also a pillar in his community. He helped establish the San Francisco Chapter of the National Association of Black Accountants,

NABA, served in a number of NABA positions, including president, and was awarded their Small Business Entrepreneur of the Year Award. He was also an active member of the California Society of Public Accountants.

But perhaps the best description of Mr. Williams comes from the motto of the very company he created: “Good people, doing great things.” Mr. Williams, you were indeed a good person who did great things. I sincerely thank you for all of your contributions. •

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:55 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1315. An act to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, to rescind the unobligated funding for the FHA Refinance Program and to terminate the program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2551. An act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1315. An act to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, to rescind the unobligated funding for the FHA Refinance Program and to terminate the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 2551. An act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2553. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Report to accompany S. 968, a bill to prevent online threats to economic creativity and theft of intellectual property, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 112-39).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 27. A bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market.

By Mrs. BOXER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

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

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 Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1406. A bill to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 510 19th Street, Bakersfield, California, as the Myron Donovan Crocker United States Courthouse; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1407. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish accreditation requirements for suppliers and providers of air ambulance services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1408. A bill to require Federal agencies, and persons engaged in interstate commerce, in possession of data containing sensitive personally identifiable information, to disclose any breach of such information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts):

S. 1409. A bill to intensify efforts to identify, prevent, and recover payment error, waste, fraud, and abuse within Federal spending; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WEBB, Mr. WARNER, Mr. REID, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr.

BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KYL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SNOWE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 237. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding coming together as a Nation and ceasing all work or other activity for a moment of remembrance beginning at 1:00 PM Eastern Daylight Time on September 11, 2011, in honor of the 10th anniversary of the terrorist attacks committed against the United States on September 11, 2011; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 242

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 242, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the roles and responsibilities of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

S. 742

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 742, a bill to amend chapters 83 and 84 of title 5, United States Code, to set the age at which Members of Congress are eligible for an annuity to the same age as the retirement age under the Social Security Act.

S. 745

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 745, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to protect certain veterans who would otherwise be subject to a reduction in educational assistance benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 834

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 834, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve education and prevention related to cam-

pus sexual violence, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

S. 838

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 838, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to clarify the jurisdiction of the Environmental Protection Agency with respect to certain sporting good articles, and to exempt those articles from a definition under that Act.

S. 971

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 971, a bill to promote neutrality, simplicity, and fairness in the taxation of digital goods and digital services.

S. 1025

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1025, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the national defense through empowerment of the National Guard, enhancement of the functions of the National Guard Bureau, and improvement of Federal-State military coordination in domestic emergency response, and for other purposes.

S. 1176

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) 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. 1265

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1265, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the land and water conservation fund to maximize the effectiveness of the fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 1297

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1297, a bill to preserve State and institutional authority relating to State authorization and the definition of credit hour.

S. 1346

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1346, a bill to restrict the use of offshore tax havens and abusive tax shelters to inappropriately avoid Federal taxation, and for other purposes.

S. 1370

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr.

BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1370, a bill to reauthorize 21st century community learning centers, and for other purposes.

S. 1395

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1395, a bill to ensure that all Americans have access to waivers from the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1408. A bill to require Federal agencies, and persons engaged in interstate commerce, in possession of data containing sensitive personally identifiable information, to disclose any breach of such information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am very pleased to introduce today the Data Breach Notification Act of 2011.

This bill would require that consumers be notified when their sensitive personally identifiable information has been exposed in a data breach and also that law enforcement receive notice of major breaches of data security.

In 2003, California was the pioneer in requiring data breach notification. Forty-six States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands now have similar laws.

Consumers in all states deserve to benefit from these protections; businesses should not be subject to 46 different and at times conflicting laws; and Federal law enforcement critically needs to receive information about major breaches occurring across the country.

I have introduced data breach notification legislation in several prior Congresses. During the last Congress, that legislation, called the Data Breach Notification Act, S. 139, passed through the Judiciary Committee and was reported to the Senate floor. Unfortunately, the bill stalled there and went no further.

President Obama included similar data breach notification provisions in his broad cybersecurity proposal, released just last month.

The bill I am introducing today is identical to the bill I have introduced in the past. This legislation is long overdue and should finally be enacted now, during this Congress.

I have 3 points to make about this bill.

First, this bill will protect consumers, who need to know when their sensitive data has been exposed so they can take measures to protect themselves.

According to the Federal Trade Commission, between 8 and 10 million American consumers are victims of identity theft each year.

In April of 2007, a Zogby survey found that an astonishing 91 percent of adult users of the Internet said they were

concerned that their identities might be stolen.

They have good reason to be concerned.

According to the Privacy Rights Clearinghouse, over 500 million records containing sensitive personally identifiable information have been exposed in data breaches since 2005.

Earlier this year, a giant security breach at Epsilon, an online marketing firm, exposed the personal information of millions of American consumers, along with information about stores where they had been customers. The breach raised serious concerns that data thieves would use this personal information to subject consumers to targeted, fraudulent e-mails, used to try to trick people into turning over even more personal information.

Last year, data thieves acquired identity data on roughly 3.3 million student loan borrowers from the Educational Credit Management Corp.—a number that accounts for almost five percent of all Federal student loan recipients. The data included names, addresses, social security numbers, and other personal data, creating the opportunity for identity theft.

In 2009, Federal officials indicted three men on charges of stealing data linked to more than 130 million credit cards by hacking into five major companies' computer systems. The companies were Heartland Payment Systems, 7-Eleven, the Hannaford Brothers supermarket chain, and two other companies not named in the indictment.

The problem is getting worse, not better. Recently, one major breach hit Citibank, exposing information of more than 360,000 bankcard customers. Another massive data breach exposed information about more than 100 million Sony customers.

Nor is the problem limited to businesses. In my home state of California, the state Department of Public Health was hit by its second major data breach in this year alone, affecting thousands of current and former state employees.

It is long past time for Congress to pass a national breach notification standard to ensure that when consumers' information is at risk, they know it and can take the necessary steps to protect themselves.

Second point: what works for consumers here also is a winning proposition for the business community.

Under some estimates, the business community loses as much as 48 billion dollars each year in fraudulent transactions involving stolen identities.

Additionally, under the current legal framework, businesses must comply with 46 different State laws to determine what kind of notice is necessary when a breach occurs. As long as it is not watered down, one Federal standard makes much more sense than 46 different State laws. It would ensure consumers are notified about dangerous breaches and can protect themselves, while also giving companies one clear law to follow.

Third and finally, this bill will help Federal law enforcement officials as they work to protect our cyber security.

Jeffrey Troy, Deputy Assistant Director of the FBI's Cyber Division, urged businesses in 2009 to support Federal breach notification legislation. As he explained, Federal officials need to receive information about data breaches in order to link those attacks to others and potentially stop similar attacks at other organizations. "Connecting the dots" is critical to this effort.

We live in a new world today, where attacks come not only through traditional means but also through cyberspace with hackers breaking into our electrical grid or viruses like the Conficker worm making their way through private computers across the country. It is essential that we give the FBI and other law enforcement agencies the tools they need to identify and eliminate potential cyber-threats.

The Federal Trade Commission, former President George W. Bush's Identity Theft Task Force, and the Business Software Alliance have all called for federal data breach notification legislation. The Data Breach Notification Act also has been supported by the Consumers Union and the Information Technology Association of America.

This bill will protect consumers, cut costs for businesses, and give law enforcement officials additional resources they need.

I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

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. 1408

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 "Data Breach Notification Act of 2011".

SEC. 2. NOTICE TO INDIVIDUALS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Any agency, or business entity engaged in interstate commerce, that uses, accesses, transmits, stores, disposes of or collects sensitive personally identifiable information shall, following the discovery of a security breach of such information notify any resident of the United States whose sensitive personally identifiable information has been, or is reasonably believed to have been, accessed, or acquired.

(b) **OBLIGATION OF OWNER OR LICENSEE.**—

(1) **NOTICE TO OWNER OR LICENSEE.**—Any agency, or business entity engaged in interstate commerce, that uses, accesses, transmits, stores, disposes of, or collects sensitive personally identifiable information that the agency or business entity does not own or license shall notify the owner or licensee of the information following the discovery of a security breach involving such information.

(2) **NOTICE BY OWNER, LICENSEE OR OTHER DESIGNATED THIRD PARTY.**—Nothing in this Act shall prevent or abrogate an agreement between an agency or business entity required to give notice under this section and

a designated third party, including an owner or licensee of the sensitive personally identifiable information subject to the security breach, to provide the notifications required under subsection (a).

(3) **BUSINESS ENTITY RELIEVED FROM GIVING NOTICE.**—A business entity obligated to give notice under subsection (a) shall be relieved of such obligation if an owner or licensee of the sensitive personally identifiable information subject to the security breach, or other designated third party, provides such notification.

(c) **TIMELINESS OF NOTIFICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—All notifications required under this section shall be made without unreasonable delay following the discovery by the agency or business entity of a security breach.

(2) **REASONABLE DELAY.**—Reasonable delay under this subsection may include any time necessary to determine the scope of the security breach, prevent further disclosures, and restore the reasonable integrity of the data system and provide notice to law enforcement when required.

(3) **BURDEN OF PROOF.**—The agency, business entity, owner, or licensee required to provide notification under this section shall have the burden of demonstrating that all notifications were made as required under this Act, including evidence demonstrating the reasons for any delay.

(d) **DELAY OF NOTIFICATION AUTHORIZED FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT PURPOSES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If a Federal law enforcement agency determines that the notification required under this section would impede a criminal investigation, such notification shall be delayed upon written notice from such Federal law enforcement agency to the agency or business entity that experienced the breach.

(2) **EXTENDED DELAY OF NOTIFICATION.**—If the notification required under subsection (a) is delayed pursuant to paragraph (1), an agency or business entity shall give notice 30 days after the day such law enforcement delay was invoked unless a Federal law enforcement agency provides written notification that further delay is necessary.

(3) **LAW ENFORCEMENT IMMUNITY.**—No cause of action shall lie in any court against any law enforcement agency for acts relating to the delay of notification for law enforcement purposes under this Act.

SEC. 3. EXEMPTIONS.

(a) **EXEMPTION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2 shall not apply to an agency or business entity if the agency or business entity certifies, in writing, that notification of the security breach as required by section 2 reasonably could be expected to—

(A) cause damage to the national security; or

(B) hinder a law enforcement investigation or the ability of the agency to conduct law enforcement investigations.

(2) **LIMITS ON CERTIFICATIONS.**—An agency or business entity may not execute a certification under paragraph (1) to—

(A) conceal violations of law, inefficiency, or administrative error;

(B) prevent embarrassment to a business entity, organization, or agency; or

(C) restrain competition.

(3) **NOTICE.**—In every case in which an agency or business entity issues a certification under paragraph (1), the certification, accompanied by a description of the factual basis for the certification, shall be immediately provided to the United States Secret Service.

(4) **SECRET SERVICE REVIEW OF CERTIFICATIONS.**—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The United States Secret Service may review a certification provided by an agency under paragraph (3), and shall review a certification provided by a business entity under paragraph (3), to determine whether an exemption under paragraph (1) is merited. Such review shall be completed not later than 10 business days after the date of receipt of the certification, except as provided in paragraph (5)(C).

(B) NOTICE.—Upon completing a review under subparagraph (A) the United States Secret Service shall immediately notify the agency or business entity, in writing, of its determination of whether an exemption under paragraph (1) is merited.

(C) EXEMPTION.—The exemption under paragraph (1) shall not apply if the United States Secret Service determines under this paragraph that the exemption is not merited.

(5) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY OF THE SECRET SERVICE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In determining under paragraph (4) whether an exemption under paragraph (1) is merited, the United States Secret Service may request additional information from the agency or business entity regarding the basis for the claimed exemption, if such additional information is necessary to determine whether the exemption is merited.

(B) REQUIRED COMPLIANCE.—Any agency or business entity that receives a request for additional information under subparagraph (A) shall cooperate with any such request.

(C) TIMING.—If the United States Secret Service requests additional information under subparagraph (A), the United States Secret Service shall notify the agency or business entity not later than 10 business days after the date of receipt of the additional information whether an exemption under paragraph (1) is merited.

(b) SAFE HARBOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An agency or business entity shall be exempt from the notice requirements under section 2, if—

(A) a risk assessment concludes that there is no significant risk that a security breach has resulted in, or will result in, harm to the individual whose sensitive personally identifiable information was subject to the security breach;

(B) without unreasonable delay, but not later than 45 days after the discovery of a security breach (unless extended by the United States Secret Service), the agency or business entity notifies the United States Secret Service, in writing, of—

(i) the results of the risk assessment; and
(ii) its decision to invoke the risk assessment exemption; and

(C) the United States Secret Service does not indicate, in writing, and not later than 10 business days after the date of receipt of the decision described in subparagraph (B)(ii), that notice should be given.

(2) PRESUMPTIONS.—There shall be a presumption that no significant risk of harm to the individual whose sensitive personally identifiable information was subject to a security breach if such information—

(A) was encrypted; or

(B) was rendered indecipherable through the use of best practices or methods, such as redaction, access controls, or other such mechanisms, that are widely accepted as an effective industry practice, or an effective industry standard.

(c) FINANCIAL FRAUD PREVENTION EXEMPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A business entity will be exempt from the notice requirement under section 2 if the business entity utilizes or participates in a security program that—

(A) is designed to block the use of the sensitive personally identifiable information to

initiate unauthorized financial transactions before they are charged to the account of the individual; and

(B) provides for notice to affected individuals after a security breach that has resulted in fraud or unauthorized transactions.

(2) LIMITATION.—The exemption by this subsection does not apply if—

(A) the information subject to the security breach includes sensitive personally identifiable information, other than a credit card number or credit card security code, of any type; or

(B) the information subject to the security breach includes both the individual's credit card number and the individual's first and last name.

SEC. 4. METHODS OF NOTICE.

An agency, or business entity shall be in compliance with section 2 if it provides both:

(1) INDIVIDUAL NOTICE.—

(A) Written notification to the last known home mailing address of the individual in the records of the agency or business entity;

(B) telephone notice to the individual personally; or

(C) e-mail notice, if the individual has consented to receive such notice and the notice is consistent with the provisions permitting electronic transmission of notices under section 101 of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act (15 U.S.C. 7001).

(2) MEDIA NOTICE.—Notice to major media outlets serving a State or jurisdiction, if the number of residents of such State whose sensitive personally identifiable information was, or is reasonably believed to have been, acquired by an unauthorized person exceeds 5,000.

SEC. 5. CONTENT OF NOTIFICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Regardless of the method by which notice is provided to individuals under section 4, such notice shall include, to the extent possible—

(1) a description of the categories of sensitive personally identifiable information that was, or is reasonably believed to have been, acquired by an unauthorized person;

(2) a toll-free number—

(A) that the individual may use to contact the agency or business entity, or the agent of the agency or business entity; and

(B) from which the individual may learn what types of sensitive personally identifiable information the agency or business entity maintained about that individual; and

(3) the toll-free contact telephone numbers and addresses for the major credit reporting agencies.

(b) ADDITIONAL CONTENT.—Notwithstanding section 10, a State may require that a notice under subsection (a) shall also include information regarding victim protection assistance provided for by that State.

SEC. 6. COORDINATION OF NOTIFICATION WITH CREDIT REPORTING AGENCIES.

If an agency or business entity is required to provide notification to more than 5,000 individuals under section 2(a), the agency or business entity shall also notify all consumer reporting agencies that compile and maintain files on consumers on a nationwide basis (as defined in section 603(p) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a(p)) of the timing and distribution of the notices. Such notice shall be given to the consumer credit reporting agencies without unreasonable delay and, if it will not delay notice to the affected individuals, prior to the distribution of notices to the affected individuals.

SEC. 7. NOTICE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT.

(a) SECRET SERVICE.—Any business entity or agency shall notify the United States Secret Service of the fact that a security breach has occurred if—

(1) the number of individuals whose sensitive personally identifying information was, or is reasonably believed to have been acquired by an unauthorized person exceeds 10,000;

(2) the security breach involves a database, networked or integrated databases, or other data system containing the sensitive personally identifiable information of more than 1,000,000 individuals nationwide;

(3) the security breach involves databases owned by the Federal Government; or

(4) the security breach involves primarily sensitive personally identifiable information of individuals known to the agency or business entity to be employees and contractors of the Federal Government involved in national security or law enforcement.

(b) NOTICE TO OTHER LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.—The United States Secret Service shall be responsible for notifying—

(1) the Federal Bureau of Investigation, if the security breach involves espionage, foreign counterintelligence, information protected against unauthorized disclosure for reasons of national defense or foreign relations, or Restricted Data (as that term is defined in section 11y of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014(y))), except for offenses affecting the duties of the United States Secret Service under section 3056(a) of title 18, United States Code;

(2) the United States Postal Inspection Service, if the security breach involves mail fraud; and

(3) the attorney general of each State affected by the security breach.

(c) TIMING OF NOTICES.—The notices required under this section shall be delivered as follows:

(1) Notice under subsection (a) shall be delivered as promptly as possible, but not later than 14 days after discovery of the events requiring notice.

(2) Notice under subsection (b) shall be delivered not later than 14 days after the United States Secret Service receives notice of a security breach from an agency or business entity.

SEC. 8. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) CIVIL ACTIONS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court against any business entity that engages in conduct constituting a violation of this Act and, upon proof of such conduct by a preponderance of the evidence, such business entity shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than \$1,000 per day per individual whose sensitive personally identifiable information was, or is reasonably believed to have been, accessed or acquired by an unauthorized person, up to a maximum of \$1,000,000 per violation, unless such conduct is found to be willful or intentional.

(b) INJUNCTIVE ACTIONS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If it appears that a business entity has engaged, or is engaged, in any act or practice constituting a violation of this Act, the Attorney General may petition an appropriate district court of the United States for an order—

(A) enjoining such act or practice; or

(B) enforcing compliance with this Act.

(2) ISSUANCE OF ORDER.—A court may issue an order under paragraph (1), if the court finds that the conduct in question constitutes a violation of this Act.

(c) OTHER RIGHTS AND REMEDIES.—The rights and remedies available under this Act are cumulative and shall not affect any other rights and remedies available under law.

(d) FRAUD ALERT.—Section 605A(b)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c-

1(b)(1) is amended by inserting “, or evidence that the consumer has received notice that the consumer’s financial information has or may have been compromised,” after “identity theft report”.

SEC. 9. ENFORCEMENT BY STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) CIVIL ACTIONS.—In any case in which the attorney general of a State or any State or local law enforcement agency authorized by the State attorney general or by State statute to prosecute violations of consumer protection law, has reason to believe that an interest of the residents of that State has been or is threatened or adversely affected by the engagement of a business entity in a practice that is prohibited under this Act, the State or the State or local law enforcement agency on behalf of the residents of the agency’s jurisdiction, may bring a civil action on behalf of the residents of the State or jurisdiction in a district court of the United States of appropriate jurisdiction or any other court of competent jurisdiction, including a State court, to—

(A) enjoin that practice;

(B) enforce compliance with this Act; or

(C) obtain civil penalties of not more than \$1,000 per day per individual whose sensitive personally identifiable information was, or is reasonably believed to have been, accessed or acquired by an unauthorized person, up to a maximum of \$1,000,000 per violation, unless such conduct is found to be willful or intentional.

(2) NOTICE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Before filing an action under paragraph (1), the attorney general of the State involved shall provide to the Attorney General of the United States—

(i) written notice of the action; and

(ii) a copy of the complaint for the action.

(B) EXEMPTION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to the filing of an action by an attorney general of a State under this Act, if the State attorney general determines that it is not feasible to provide the notice described in such subparagraph before the filing of the action.

(ii) NOTIFICATION.—In an action described in clause (i), the attorney general of a State shall provide notice and a copy of the complaint to the Attorney General at the time the State attorney general files the action.

(b) FEDERAL PROCEEDINGS.—Upon receiving notice under subsection (a)(2), the Attorney General shall have the right to—

(1) move to stay the action, pending the final disposition of a pending Federal proceeding or action;

(2) initiate an action in the appropriate United States district court under section 8 and move to consolidate all pending actions, including State actions, in such court;

(3) intervene in an action brought under subsection (a)(2); and

(4) file petitions for appeal.

(c) PENDING PROCEEDINGS.—If the Attorney General has instituted a proceeding or action for a violation of this Act or any regulations thereunder, no attorney general of a State may, during the pendency of such proceeding or action, bring an action under this Act against any defendant named in such criminal proceeding or civil action for any violation that is alleged in that proceeding or action.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of bringing any civil action under subsection (a), nothing in this Act regarding notification shall be construed to prevent an attorney general of a State from exercising the powers conferred on such attorney general by the laws of that State to—

(1) conduct investigations;

(2) administer oaths or affirmations; or

(3) compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary and other evidence.

(e) VENUE; SERVICE OF PROCESS.—

(1) VENUE.—Any action brought under subsection (a) may be brought in—

(A) the district court of the United States that meets applicable requirements relating to venue under section 1391 of title 28, United States Code; or

(B) another court of competent jurisdiction.

(2) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—In an action brought under subsection (a), process may be served in any district in which the defendant—

(A) is an inhabitant; or

(B) may be found.

(f) NO PRIVATE CAUSE OF ACTION.—Nothing in this Act establishes a private cause of action against a business entity for violation of any provision of this Act.

SEC. 10. EFFECT ON FEDERAL AND STATE LAW.

The provisions of this Act shall supersede any other provision of Federal law or any provision of law of any State relating to notification by a business entity engaged in interstate commerce or an agency of a security breach, except as provided in section 5(b).

SEC. 11. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to cover the costs incurred by the United States Secret Service to carry out investigations and risk assessments of security breaches as required under this Act.

SEC. 12. REPORTING ON RISK ASSESSMENT EXEMPTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The United States Secret Service shall report to Congress not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and upon the request by Congress thereafter, on—

(1) the number and nature of the security breaches described in the notices filed by those business entities invoking the risk assessment exemption under section 3(b) of this Act and the response of the United States Secret Service to such notices; and

(2) the number and nature of security breaches subject to the national security and law enforcement exemptions under section 3(a) of this Act.

(b) REPORT.—Any report submitted under subsection (a) shall not disclose the contents of any risk assessment provided to the United States Secret Service under this Act.

SEC. 13. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) AGENCY.—The term “agency” has the same meaning given such term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) AFFILIATE.—The term “affiliate” means persons related by common ownership or by corporate control.

(3) BUSINESS ENTITY.—The term “business entity” means any organization, corporation, trust, partnership, sole proprietorship, unincorporated association, venture established to make a profit, or nonprofit, and any contractor, subcontractor, affiliate, or licensee thereof engaged in interstate commerce.

(4) ENCRYPTED.—The term “encrypted”—

(A) means the protection of data in electronic form, in storage or in transit, using an encryption technology that has been adopted by an established standards setting body which renders such data indecipherable in the absence of associated cryptographic keys necessary to enable decryption of such data; and

(B) includes appropriate management and safeguards of such cryptographic keys so as to protect the integrity of the encryption.

(5) PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.—The term “personally identifiable information” means any information, or compilation of information, in electronic or digital form serving as a means of identification, as defined by section 1028(d)(7) of title 18, United States Code.

(6) SECURITY BREACH.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “security breach” means compromise of the security, confidentiality, or integrity of computerized data through misrepresentation or actions that result in, or there is a reasonable basis to conclude has resulted in, acquisition of or access to sensitive personally identifiable information that is unauthorized or in excess of authorization.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term “security breach” does not include—

(i) a good faith acquisition of sensitive personally identifiable information by a business entity or agency, or an employee or agent of a business entity or agency, if the sensitive personally identifiable information is not subject to further unauthorized disclosure; or

(ii) the release of a public record not otherwise subject to confidentiality or nondisclosure requirements.

(7) SENSITIVE PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.—The term “sensitive personally identifiable information” means any information or compilation of information, in electronic or digital form that includes—

(A) an individual’s first and last name or first initial and last name in combination with any 1 of the following data elements:

(i) A non-truncated social security number, driver’s license number, passport number, or alien registration number.

(ii) Any 2 of the following:

(I) Home address or telephone number.

(II) Mother’s maiden name, if identified as such.

(III) Month, day, and year of birth.

(iii) Unique biometric data such as a finger print, voice print, a retina or iris image, or any other unique physical representation.

(iv) A unique account identifier, electronic identification number, user name, or routing code in combination with any associated security code, access code, or password that is required for an individual to obtain money, goods, services or any other thing of value; or

(B) a financial account number or credit or debit card number in combination with any security code, access code or password that is required for an individual to obtain credit, withdraw funds, or engage in a financial transaction.

SEC. 14. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the expiration of the date which is 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 237—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING COMING TOGETHER AS A NATION AND CEASING ALL WORK OR OTHER ACTIVITY FOR A MOMENT OF REMEMBRANCE BEGINNING AT 1:00 PM EASTERN DAYLIGHT TIME ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2011, IN HONOR OF THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TERRORIST ATTACKS COMMITTED AGAINST THE UNITED STATES ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMER,

Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WEBB, Mr. WARNER, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KYL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SNOWE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 237

Whereas at 8:46 AM, on September 11, 2001, hijacked American Airlines Flight 11 crashed into the upper portion of the North Tower of the World Trade Center in New York City, New York;

Whereas 17 minutes later, at 9:03 AM, hijacked United Airlines Flight 175 crashed into the South Tower of the World Trade Center;

Whereas at 9:37 AM, the west wall of the Pentagon was hit by hijacked American Airlines Flight 77, the impact of which caused immediate and catastrophic damage to the headquarters of the Department of Defense;

Whereas at approximately 10:00 AM, the passengers and crew of hijacked United Airlines Flight 93 acted heroically to retake control of the airplane and thwart the taking of additional American lives by crashing the airliner in Shanksville, Pennsylvania, and, in doing so, gave their lives to save countless others;

Whereas nearly 3,000 innocent civilians were killed in the heinous attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas tens of thousands of individuals narrowly escaped the attacks at the Pentagon and World Trade Center and, as witnesses to this tragedy, are forever changed;

Whereas countless fire departments, police departments, first responders, governmental officials, workers, emergency medical personnel, and volunteers responded immediately and heroically to those horrific events;

Whereas the Fire Department of New York suffered 343 fatalities on September 11, 2001, the largest loss of life of any emergency response agency in United States history;

Whereas the Port Authority Police Department suffered 37 fatalities in the attacks, the

largest loss of life of any police force in United States history in a single day;

Whereas the New York Police Department suffered 23 fatalities as a result of the terrorist attacks;

Whereas the impact of that day on public health continues through 2011, as nearly 90,000 people are at risk of or suffering from negative health effects as a result of the events of September 11, 2001, including 14,000 workers and 2,400 community residents who are sick, and tens of thousands of others whose health is being monitored;

Whereas 10 years later, the people of the United States and people around the world continue to mourn the tremendous loss of innocent life on that fateful day;

Whereas 10 years later, thousands of men and women in the United States Armed Forces remain in harm's way defending the United States against those who seek to threaten the United States;

Whereas on the 10th anniversary of this tragic day, the thoughts of the people of the United States are with all of the victims of the events of September 11, 2001, and their families;

Whereas the lives of Americans were changed forever on September 11, 2001, when events threatened the American way of life;

Whereas in December 2001, Congress and the President joined together to designate September 11 as Patriot Day (Public Law 107-89);

Whereas in September 2002, and each September thereafter through September 2008, President Bush issued Proclamations 7590, 7702, 7812, 7929, 8047, 8174, and 8286 (67 Fed. Reg. 57125; 68 Fed. Reg. 53013; 69 Fed. Reg. 55717; 70 Fed. Reg. 54467; 71 Fed. Reg. 53959; 72 Fed. Reg. 51553; 73 Fed. Reg. 52773) proclaiming September 11 of that year, respectively, as Patriot Day;

Whereas in 2009, Congress and the President joined together to designate September 11 as a National Day of Service and Remembrance under the Serve America Act (Public Law 111-13; 123 Stat. 1460);

Whereas in September 2009 and 2010, President Obama issued Proclamation 8413 (74 Fed. Reg. 47045) and Proclamation 8559 (75 Fed. Reg. 56463) proclaiming September 11, 2009, and September 11, 2010, respectively, as Patriot Day and National Day of Service and Remembrance; and

Whereas September 11 will never, and should never, be just another day in the hearts and minds of all people of the United States; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes September 11, 2011, as a day of solemn commemoration of the events of September 11, 2001, and a day to come together as a Nation;

(2) offers its deepest and most sincere condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones of the innocent victims of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks;

(3) honors the heroic service, actions, and sacrifices of first responders, law enforcement personnel, State and local officials, volunteers, and countless others who aided the innocent victims of those attacks and, in doing so, bravely risked and often gave their own lives;

(4) recognizes the valiant service, actions, and sacrifices of United States personnel, including members of the United States Armed Forces, the United States intelligence agencies, the United States diplomatic service, homeland security and law enforcement personnel, and their families, who have given so much, including their lives and well-being, to support the cause of freedom and defend the security of the United States;

(5) reaffirms that the people of the United States will never forget the challenges our country endured on and since September 11,

2001, and will work tirelessly to defeat those who attacked the United States; and

(6) on the 10th anniversary of this tragic day in United States history—

(A) calls upon all of the people and institutions of the United States to observe a moment of remembrance on September 11, 2011, including—

- (i) media outlets;
- (ii) houses of worship;
- (iii) military organizations;
- (iv) veterans organizations;
- (v) airlines;
- (vi) airports;
- (vii) railroads;
- (viii) sports teams;
- (ix) the Federal Government;
- (x) State and local governments;
- (xi) police, fire, and other public institutions;
- (xii) educational institutions;
- (xiii) businesses; and
- (xiv) other public and private institutions;

and

(B) encourages the observance of the moment of remembrance or prayer to last for 1 minute beginning at 1:00 PM Eastern Daylight Time by, to the maximum extent practicable—

- (i) ceasing all work or other activity; and
- (ii) marking the moment in an appropriate manner, including by ringing bells, blowing whistles, or sounding sirens.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two fellows in Senator BINGAMAN's office, Charlayne Hayling and Sandra Wilkniss, be granted floor privileges during consideration of H.R. 2560.

The ACTING PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT CHARGE CARD ABUSE PREVENTION ACT OF 2011

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 104, S. 300.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 300) to prevent abuse of Government charge cards.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments; as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italic.)

S. 300

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 "Government Charge Card Abuse Prevention Act of 2011".

SEC. 2. MANAGEMENT OF PURCHASE CARDS.

(a) REQUIRED SAFEGUARDS AND INTERNAL CONTROLS.—The head of each executive agency that issues and uses purchase cards and convenience checks shall establish and maintain safeguards and internal controls to ensure the following:

(1) There is a record in each executive agency of each holder of a purchase card issued by the agency for official use, annotated with the limitations on single transactions and total transactions that are applicable to the use of each such card or check by that purchase cardholder.

(2) Each purchase cardholder and individual issued a convenience check is assigned an approving official other than the cardholder with the authority to approve or disapprove transactions.

(3) The holder of a purchase card and each official with authority to authorize expenditures charged to the purchase card are responsible for—

(A) reconciling the charges appearing on each statement of account for that purchase card with receipts and other supporting documentation; and

(B) forwarding such reconciliation to the certifying official in a timely manner to enable the certifying official to ensure that the Federal Government ultimately pays only for valid charges.

(4) Any disputed purchase card charge, and any discrepancy between a receipt and other supporting documentation and the purchase card statement of account, is resolved in the manner prescribed in the applicable governmentwide purchase card contract entered into by the Administrator of General Services and in accordance with all laws and executive agency regulations.

(5) Payments on purchase card accounts are made promptly within prescribed deadlines to avoid interest penalties.

(6) Rebates and refunds based on prompt payment, sales volume, or other actions by the agency on purchase card accounts are reviewed for accuracy and properly recorded as a receipt to the agency that pays the monthly bill.

(7) Records of each purchase card transaction (including records on associated contracts, reports, accounts, and invoices) are retained in accordance with standard Government policies on the disposition of records.

(8) Periodic reviews are performed to determine whether each purchase cardholder has a need for the purchase card.

(9) Appropriate training regarding the proper use of purchase cards is provided to each purchase cardholder in advance of being issued a purchase card and periodically thereafter and to each official with responsibility for overseeing the use of purchase cards issued by an executive agency in advance of assuming such oversight duties and periodically thereafter.

(10) The executive agency has specific policies regarding the number of purchase cards issued by various component organizations and categories of component organizations, the credit limits authorized for various categories of cardholders, and categories of employees eligible to be issued purchase cards, and that those policies are designed to minimize the financial risk to the Federal Government of the issuance of the purchase cards and to ensure the integrity of purchase cardholders.

(11) The executive agency utilizes effective systems, techniques, and technologies to prevent or identify fraudulent purchases.

(12) The executive agency invalidates the purchase card of each employee who—

(A) ceases to be employed by the agency, immediately upon termination of the employment of the employee; or

(B) transfers to another unit of the agency immediately upon the transfer of the employee unless the agency determines that the units are covered by the same purchase card authority.

(13) The executive agency takes steps to recover the cost of any erroneous, improper, or

illegal purchase made with a purchase card or convenience check by an employee, including, as necessary, through salary offsets.

(b) GUIDANCE ON MANAGEMENT OF PURCHASE CARDS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall review the existing guidance and, as necessary, prescribe additional guidance governing the implementation of the safeguards and internal controls required by subsection (a) by executive agencies.

(c) PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of each executive agency shall provide for appropriate adverse personnel actions or other punishment to be imposed in cases in which employees of the agency violate agency policies implementing the guidance required by subsection (b) or make improper, erroneous, or illegal purchases with purchase cards or convenience checks.

(2) DISMISSAL.—Penalties prescribed for employee misuse of purchase cards or convenience checks shall include dismissal of the employee, as appropriate.

(3) REPORTS ON VIOLATIONS.—The guidance prescribed under subsection (b) shall direct each head of an executive agency with more than \$10,000,000 in purchase card spending annually, and each Inspector General of such an executive agency, on a semiannual basis, to submit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget a joint report on violations or other actions covered by paragraph (1) by employees of such executive agency. At a minimum, the report shall set forth the following:

(A) A description of each violation.

(B) A description of any adverse personnel action, punishment, other action taken against the employee for such violation.

(d) RISK ASSESSMENTS AND AUDITS.—The Inspector General of each executive agency shall—

(1) conduct periodic assessments of the agency purchase card or convenience check programs to identify and analyze risks of illegal, improper, or erroneous purchases and payments in order to develop a plan for using such risk assessments to determine the scope, frequency, and number of periodic audits of purchase card or convenience check transactions;

(2) perform analysis or audits, as necessary, of purchase card transactions designed to identify—

(A) potentially illegal, improper, erroneous, and abusive uses of purchase cards;

(B) any patterns of such uses; and

(C) categories of purchases that could be made by means other than purchase cards in order to better aggregate purchases and obtain lower prices (excluding transactions made under card-based strategic sourcing arrangements);

(3) report to the head of the executive agency concerned on the results of such analysis or audits; and

(4) report to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget on the implementation of recommendations made to the head of the executive agency to address findings of any analysis or audit of purchase card and convenience check transactions or programs for compilation and transmission by the Director to Congress and the Comptroller General.

(e) DEFINITION OF EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—In this section, the term “executive agency” has the meaning given such term in section [4(1) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(1))] 133 of title 41, *United States Code*, except as provided under subsection (f)(1).

(f) RELATIONSHIP TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PURCHASE CARD REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The requirements of subsections (a) through (d) shall not apply to the Department of Defense.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2784 of title 10, *United States Code*, is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(11) That each purchase cardholder and individual issued a convenience check is assigned an approving official other than the cardholder with the authority to approve or disapprove transactions.

“(12) That the Department of Defense utilizes effective systems, techniques, and technologies to prevent or identify fraudulent purchases.

“(13) That the Department of Defense takes appropriate steps to invalidate the purchase card of each employee who—

“(A) ceases to be employed by the Department of Defense, immediately upon termination of the employment of the employee; or

“(B) transfers to another unit of the Department of Defense immediately upon the transfer of the employee unless the Secretary of Defense determines that the units are covered by the same purchase card authority.

“(14) That the Department of Defense takes appropriate steps to recover the cost of any erroneous, improper, or illegal purchase made with a purchase card or convenience check by an employee, including, as necessary, through salary offsets.

“(15) That the Inspector General of the Department of Defense conducts periodic assessments of purchase card or convenience check programs to identify and analyze risks of illegal, improper, or erroneous purchases and payments and uses such risk assessments to develop appropriate recommendations for corrective actions.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) SEMIANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense and the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, shall submit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget on a semiannual basis a joint report on illegal, improper, or erroneous purchases and payments made with purchase cards or convenience checks by employees of the Department of Defense. At a minimum, the report shall include the following:

“(1) A description of each violation.

“(2) A description of any adverse personnel action, punishment, or other action taken against the employee for such violation.

“(3) A description of actions taken by the Department of Defense to address recommendations made to address findings arising out of risk assessments and audits conducted pursuant to this section.”.

SEC. 3. MANAGEMENT OF TRAVEL CARDS.

Section 2 of the Travel and Transportation Reform Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-264; 5 U.S.C. 5701 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) MANAGEMENT OF TRAVEL CHARGE CARDS.—

“(1) REQUIRED SAFEGUARDS AND INTERNAL CONTROLS.—The head of each executive agency that has employees that use travel charge cards shall establish and maintain the following internal control activities to ensure the proper, efficient, and effective use of such travel charge cards:

“(A) There is a record in each executive agency of each holder of a travel charge card issued on behalf of the agency for official use, annotated with the limitations on amounts that are applicable to the use of each such card by that travel charge cardholder.

“(B) Rebates and refunds based on prompt payment, sales volume, or other actions by

the agency on travel charge card accounts are monitored for accuracy and properly recorded as a receipt of the agency that employs the cardholder.

“(C) Periodic reviews are performed to determine whether each travel charge cardholder has a need for the travel charge card.

“(D) Appropriate training is provided to each travel charge cardholder and each official with responsibility for overseeing the use of travel charge cards issued by [an] the executive agency.

“(E) Each executive agency has specific policies regarding the number of travel charge cards issued for various component organizations and categories of component organizations, the credit limits authorized for various categories of cardholders, and categories of employees eligible to be issued travel charge cards, and designs those policies to minimize the financial risk to the Federal Government of the issuance of the travel charge cards and to ensure the integrity of travel charge cardholders.

“(F) Each executive agency ensures its contractual arrangement with each servicing travel charge card issuing contractor contains a requirement to evaluate the creditworthiness of an individual before issuing that individual a travel charge card, and that no individual be issued a travel charge card if that individual is found not creditworthy as a result of the evaluation (except that this paragraph shall not preclude issuance of a restricted use travel charge card or pre-paid card when the individual lacks a credit history or has a credit score below the minimum credit score established by the Office of Management and Budget). The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall establish a minimum credit score for determining the creditworthiness of an individual based on rigorous statistical analysis of the population of cardholders and historical behaviors. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, such evaluation shall include an assessment of an individual’s consumer report from a consumer reporting agency as those terms are defined in section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a).

“(G) Each executive agency utilizes effective systems, techniques, and technologies to prevent or identify improper purchases.

“(H) Each executive agency ensures that the travel charge card of each employee who ceases to be employed by the agency is invalidated immediately upon termination of the employment of the employee.

“(I) Each executive agency utilizes, where appropriate, direct payment to the holder of the travel card contract.

“(2) GUIDANCE ON MANAGEMENT OF TRAVEL CHARGE CARDS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Government Charge Card Abuse Prevention Act of 2011, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall review the existing guidance and, as necessary, prescribe additional guidance for executive agencies governing the implementation of the requirements in paragraph (1).

“(3) PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with the guidance prescribed under paragraph (2), each executive agency shall provide for appropriate adverse personnel actions to be imposed in cases in which employees of the executive agency fail to comply with applicable travel charge card terms and conditions or applicable agency regulations or commit fraud with respect to a travel charge card, including removal in appropriate cases.

“(B) REPORTS ON VIOLATIONS.—The guidance prescribed under paragraph (2) shall require each head of an executive agency with more than \$10,000,000 in travel card spending annually, and each inspector general of such

an executive agency, on a semiannual basis, to submit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget a joint report on violations or other actions covered by subparagraph (A) by employees of such executive agency. At a minimum, the report shall set forth the following:

“(i) A description of each violation.

“(ii) A description of any adverse personnel action, punishment, or other action taken against the employee for such violation or other action.

“(4) RISK ASSESSMENTS AND AUDITS.—The inspector general of each executive agency shall—

“(A) conduct periodic assessments of the agency travel charge card program and associated internal controls to identify and analyze risks of illegal, improper, or erroneous travel charges and payments in order to develop a plan for using such risk assessments to determine the scope, frequency, and number of periodic audits of travel charge card transactions;

“(B) perform periodic analysis and audits, as appropriate, of travel charge card transactions designed to identify potentially improper, erroneous, and illegal uses of travel charge cards;

“(C) report to the head of the executive agency concerned on the results of such analysis and audits; and

“(D) report to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget on the implementation of recommendations made to the head of the executive agency to address findings of any analysis or audit of travel charge card transactions or programs for compilation and transmission by the Director to Congress and the Comptroller General.

“(5) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘executive agency’ means an agency as that term is defined in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 5701(1) of title 5, United States Code.

“(B) The term ‘travel charge card’ means any Federal contractor-issued travel charge card that is individually billed to each cardholder.”

SEC. 4. MANAGEMENT OF CENTRALLY BILLED ACCOUNTS.

(a) REQUIRED INTERNAL CONTROLS FOR CENTRALLY BILLED ACCOUNTS.—The head of an executive agency that has employees who use a travel charge card that is billed directly to the United States Government shall establish and maintain the following internal control activities:

(1) Items submitted on an employee’s travel voucher shall be compared with items paid for using a centrally billed account on any related travel to ensure that an employee is not reimbursed for an item already paid for by the United States Government through a centrally billed account.

(2) The executive agency shall dispute unallowable and erroneous charges and track the status of the disputed transactions to ensure appropriate resolution.

(3) The executive agency shall submit requests to servicing airlines for refunds of fully or partially unused tickets, when entitled to such refunds, and track the status of unused tickets to ensure appropriate resolution.

(b) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall review the existing guidance and, as necessary, prescribe additional guidance for executive agencies implementing the requirements of subsection (a).

SEC. 5. CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to excuse the head of an executive agency from the responsibilities set out in section 3512 of title 31, United States Code, or in the Im-

proper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note).

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendments be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements relating to the matter be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill (S. 300), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, July 25, 2011, at 4:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 83 and 84; that there be 1 hour for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on Calendar Nos. 83 and 84 in that order; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 25, 2011

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, July 25; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks the Senate be in a period of morning business until 4:30 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each; further, that at 4:30 p.m., the Senate observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson of the United States Capitol Police who were killed 13 years ago in the line of duty defending this Capitol, the people who work here, and its visitors against an armed intruder; finally, I ask unanimous consent that following morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the first rollcall vote next week will be at approximately 5:30 p.m. on confirmation of the nomination of Paul A. Engelmayer to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
JULY 25, 2011, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. DURBIN. 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 2:44 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 25, 2011, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES

JAMES T. RYAN, OF UTAH, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 7, 2013. VICE JAMES BROADDUS, RESIGNED.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

LARRY W. WALTHER, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2013. VICE J. JOSEPH GRANDMAISON, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MARY B. DEROSA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

FRANK E. LOY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

KENDRICK B. MEEK, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOSEPH E. MARTZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. MICHAEL FERRITER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. ROBERT L. CASLEN, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DAVID G. PERKINS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. BERT K. MIZUSAWA

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. BRIAN R. COPES

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, UNITED STATES NAVY AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5033:

To be admiral

ADM. JONATHAN W. GREENERT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS VICE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, UNITED STATES NAVY AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5035:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. MARK E. FERGUSON III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. HARRY B. HARRIS, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. CECIL E. D. HANEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. SCOTT H. SWIFT

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

STATEMENT ON THE 37TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ILLEGAL TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, this week, once again, we commemorate the tragic anniversary of the 1974 illegal Turkish invasion of Cyprus. Thirty-seven years later, Turkey continues forcibly to occupy more than one-third of Cyprus with more than 43,000 troops. This amounts to almost one Turkish soldier for every two Turkish Cypriots. It is time for Turkey to withdraw its troops from Cyprus so that the island can move forward as one nation.

As co-chair and co-founder of the Congressional Hellenic Caucus, I have worked diligently with my colleagues in the Caucus out of our mutual concern for the continued division and occupation of Cyprus. We have 137 members today, making us one of the largest caucuses in Congress.

My Caucus co-chair, Rep. BILIRAKIS, and I passed a resolution in the House in the last Congress calling for the protection of religious sites and artifacts from and in Turkish-occupied areas of northern Cyprus as well as for general respect for religious freedom. And we continue to work, with the Caucus, to raise awareness of the Cyprus problem and the role the U.S. can play to support the negotiations.

Cyprus is playing a vital role in European affairs while also strengthening relations with the United States. It has joined with us on issues important to our own security, including the fight against terrorism and other international crimes. Ending the island's tragic division will pave the way to prosperity and peace throughout the entire region.

To date, Turkey has repeatedly ignored all U.N. Resolutions pertaining to Cyprus and has continued to occupy the island in complete violation of international law. Turkey has continued to do so despite the fact that it has been a member of the U.N. Security Council since January 2009. Turkey has also refused to abide by the Judgments of the European Court of Human Rights in numerous cases, thereby continuing to violate the basic human rights of the Cypriot people. This is an outrage.

The current negotiations aim at reaching a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem based on a bizonal, bicomunal federation with political equality, as defined in the relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions, with a single sovereignty, single citizenship and single international personality. The solution must reunite the island, its people, its institutions and its economy and safeguard the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all Cypriots and the withdrawal of Turkish occupation forces from Cyprus.

The United States and the international community must continue to provide support to this process. The people of Cyprus deserve

a unified and democratic country, and I remain hopeful that a peaceful settlement will be found so that the division of Cyprus will come to an end.

As Secretary Clinton remarked last year: "The reunification of the island is in the best interests of not only the people of Cyprus, but the region, and it could set an example for the international community as well."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I was unfortunately unable to cast a vote on rollcall 621 on the evening of July 21, 2011.

I strongly support the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and its mandate to protect American consumers and I would have voted NO on passage of H.R. 1315. The CFPB will provide families a level playing field upon which to shop for the full range of financial products.

The CFPB is the most accountable regulatory body in the world. And their work has already begun. Starting today, the CFPB credit card hotline is up and running, fielding complaints from American consumers and beginning to hold companies accountable. Consumers can reach them at 855-411-CFPB or online at consumerfinance.gov.

Families will finally have a cop on the beat looking out for their interests. But American consumers should be forewarned, if you have a complaint, report it now. Because, as we speak, Republicans in Congress are doing all they can to take away your consumer protections.

COMMEMORATING THE 350TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST SETTLEMENT OF STATEN ISLAND

HON. MICHAEL G. GRIMM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 350th Anniversary of the first settlement of Staten Island. Staten Island makes up most of the 13th District of New York and I am proud to call it home, and anyone who has ever lived on Staten Island or visited this unique place knows how wonderful it is. Deep in the heart of Staten Island and all her residents, lives an enthralling history, so rich with the American experience, as to rival the other boroughs of New York City and indeed every community across the nation.

Since before her founding, this island has been for many a place of tolerance, liberty, and justice. It was a new land that promised religious and political freedom more than a

century before the Founding Fathers immortalized those freedoms in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution; the very same declaration that was first revealed to the British Troops in the American Revolution at none other than the Rose and Crown Tavern, which once stood at the corner of what is now Amboy Road and New Dorp Lane. It was here on Staten Island that His Majesty as well as the world first learned of the colonies' fearless declaration of their independence. Even before this, the first European settlers to set foot on this island in 1661 had one essential thing in common: they were all seeking freedom from violent persecution. Dutch, French, and Belgian Protestants, including Peter Billiou, Staten Island's most prominent early settler whose house still stands in Historic Richmondtown, found a haven of hope and peace on this gleaming gem amidst the Narrows. The island also served as a refuge for many other freedom fighters, most notable among them, Giuseppe Garibaldi, the Father of Italian Unification, who used his time as a resident of Rosebank to raise money and support to free the Italian people from imperial oppression.

This has come to be a defining aspect of the legacy of Staten Island. It is this borough that has come to exemplify so proudly the promise emblazoned on that beautiful Lady that lights the way of the Staten Island Ferry and in her younger years first revealed to my grandparents and many of your grandparents that they had finally reached the land where liberty lives and thrives. In the period between and after the two world wars, while much of humanity wallowed under communist and fascist regimes, countless men and women sought refuge here on Staten Island. Waves of immigrants including Italians, Irish, Greeks, Russians, Poles, Liberians, Sri Lankans and many, many more came to these shores in search of a better life for themselves and their families. "Give us your tired, give us your poor, give us your huddled masses yearning to be free" is a call that this island faithfully answered, and it has served us well—the culture of the island has been shaped by the vibrant, rich, and complementing cultures of the many diverse groups of people who proudly call this place home.

Three centuries ago in the early 1700's, a local schoolteacher quoted scripture when she remarked that Staten Island had already become a bustling community full of men and women from "All the nations under heaven." It is a mark of distinction that we continue to proudly display, however today, we consider ourselves all citizens of the greatest nation.

Mr. Speaker, please join me, and Americans from all different origins and backgrounds, in embracing one of the most central and meaningful things we all have in common, and that is the love and pride we have for our hometown of Staten Island. And of course, in wishing her a very happy 350th birthday, may she have many, many more.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

THE PASSING OF JOHN DOWLIN

HON. JEAN SCHMIDT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember former Hamilton County Commissioner John Dowlin, who passed away on July 15th at the age of 81.

After spending 38 years at Procter and Gamble and 28 years as the Mayor of Sharonville, Ohio, John Dowlin served 13 years on the Hamilton County Board of County Commissioners.

Throughout his distinguished career, John became known for his principles, his work ethic, and especially his bow ties.

I had the opportunity to work with Commissioner Dowlin when I was in the state legislature, and I always found him to be honest and fair.

Commissioner Dowlin was the kind of person we should all strive to be, standing up for what he believed was right—even when others believed he was wrong.

He is survived by his loving wife, Sarah, four children, and nine grandchildren.

The world is a better place because of John Dowlin. May he rest in peace.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the life of a true public servant.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, due to family matters, I was unable to vote on consideration of H.R. 1315, the Consumer Financial Protection Safety and Soundness Improvement Act of 2011 on Thursday, July 21, 2011. I was also unable to vote on consideration of H.R. 2551, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2012 on Friday, July 22 2011.

Had I been present, I would have voted to support H.R. 1315. For the Amendments to H.R. 1315, I would have voted to support the Rigell Amendment. I would have voted to oppose the Jackson Lee Amendment #1, the Miller Amendment, the Jackson Lee Amendment #2, the Maloney Amendment, and the Motion to Recommit.

Had I been present, I would have voted to support H.R. 2551. For the amendments to H.R. 2551, I would have voted to support the Hayworth Amendment, the Broun Amendment, and the Stutzman Amendment. I would have voted to oppose the Watt Amendment, the Thompson Amendment, the Holt Amendment, and the Moran Amendment.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF PINNACLE TECHNICAL RESOURCES

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Pinnacle Technical Resources, Inc. on its fifteenth anniversary this year.

Located in Dallas, Texas, Pinnacle was born in a living room and quickly matured into an award-winning information technology staffing company. Under the leadership and vision of Chief Executive Officer Nina Vaca-Humrichouse, Pinnacle expanded nationwide and created over 20,000 jobs, consequently ranking six straight years as one of the fastest growing companies in its industry. In 2009, Pinnacle received the CIO 100 Award for its development of PROGATA, a proprietary industry-leading software tool.

Beyond their financial success, Pinnacle emphasizes social responsibility and actively encourages employees to contribute to the local community. Boy Scouts of America, United Way, Habitat for Humanity, and the Greater Dallas Hispanic Chamber of Commerce Foundation are among the many non-profit organizations Pinnacle supports. This year, Pinnacle also provided scholarships to thirty-two high school students to attend the Dallas Hispanic Youth Institute, a well-regarded summer symposium.

Pinnacle Technical Resources embodies the entrepreneurial spirit of America; a concept with humble beginnings that transformed into a fast-growing and nationally recognized company. Mr. Speaker, I ask my esteemed colleagues to join me in congratulating the staff and leadership of Pinnacle Technical Resources as they celebrate fifteen years of success.

HUDSON RIVER SCHOOL OF PAINTERS

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call my colleagues' attention to the Hudson River School of Painters, the first American school of painters that contributed to an appreciation of the American landscape and conservation of this country's natural beauty. At the time of its operation in the 19th Century, it was a significant achievement in American art and culture that commemorated American landscapes in a manner unseen before by American citizens and others around the world.

Recently, I had the distinct honor to unveil the first of a series of historic bronze markers along the Hudson River. These bronze markers are designed to indicate where painters put their easels in order to create a panorama and vista of the river itself. The historic bronze marker, created by Greg Wyatt, Director of the Academy of Art at the Newington-Cropsey Foundation in Hastings-on-Hudson, New York, honor the sites where painters such as Jasper F. Cropsey, Thomas Cole, Frederic Edwin Church, and Asher Durand stood to create paintings reflecting their unique perspectives on nature. Additional sites are planned this coming year at Hook Mountain State Park and Newburgh, New York.

In light of this occasion, I would like to commend my colleague Representative MAURICE HINCHEY in his long record of support for both the rebirth of study of this first American school of painting, and for his determination to present to Congress and the American people the importance of the Hudson Valley to our cultural heritage.

I also would like to commend the Architect of the Capitol for displaying two paintings purchased by Congress after the Civil War from the famous 19th century Hudson River School painter Albert Bierstadt. They are entitled "Discovery on the Hudson" and "Entrance into Monterey," and are available for viewing in the Capitol Visitors Center. I urge all of my colleagues and their constituents to appreciate these wonderful pieces of art.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

SPEECH OF

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2551) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes:

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to the amendments that would reduce funding appropriated in H.R. 2551, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2012 for the U.S. Botanic Garden.

As you may know, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and James Madison initially had the idea of starting a national botanic garden and helped to establish one on the National Mall in 1820. It is a keystone on our mall and belongs to the American people. The mission of the U.S. Botanic Garden is to demonstrate the aesthetic, cultural, economic, therapeutic and ecological importance of plants to the well-being of humankind. It is a national and global center for learning about how to sustain life on our planet, especially as climate changes and new challenges confront our society's plant life.

According to the Architect of the Capitol, approximately 1 million people visit the U.S. Botanic Garden each year. About 12,000 different plant accessions comprising more than 60,000 plants are displayed for exhibition, study, conservation and exchange with other institutions. The Botanic Garden is America's encyclopedia for sustaining production and life itself.

In addition to displaying some of the world's most rare and endangered plants, the U.S. Botanic Garden provides numerous educational opportunities through its partnerships, workshops, lectures, tours and demonstrations. Some specific education programs include the opportunity to earn a Certification in Botanical Art and Illustration, the Junior Botanist Program and several hands-on activities exploring plant materials. The Gardner instructs the next generation with partnerships across our nation.

Mr. Chair, we are still in the midst of the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression, and a series of odd weather events. The U.S. Department of Agriculture's National Agricultural Statistics Service reports that greenhouse, nursery and floriculture operations account for 2.5 percent of all U.S. farms but employ nearly 5 percent of hired farm workers. This sector has a sales value of \$16.6 Billion. It is a one-of-a-kind endowment America depends on.

From my perspective, it is vitally important that we continue to support institutions such as the U.S. Botanic Garden not only because of its ability to preserve rare and vital plants essential to life but also for its potential to inspire the entrepreneurial spirit. We know its visitors will one day lead to increased economic output and job creation in the agricultural sector of our economy so dependent on innovation and advanced technology.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject any amendment that would reduce funding to the U.S. Botanic Garden.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. HERBERT PARDES

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor, recognize, and celebrate my dear friend, Dr. Herbert Pardes, on his retirement as President and Chief Executive Officer of New York-Presbyterian Hospital.

Dr. Herbert Pardes has dedicated his life to advancing the medical profession and patient care. He received his medical degree from the State University of New York in Brooklyn and completed his residency in psychiatry at Kings County Hospital. He also received additional psychoanalytic training at the New York Psychoanalytic clinic.

Since 1999, Dr. Pardes has been President and CEO of New York-Presbyterian Hospital. Under his guidance the hospital has achieved an incredibly impressive record; it is top-ranked in the New York metropolitan area and is consistently ranked among the best academic medical institutions in the Nation. The Hospital is the largest not-for-profit hospital and one of the most comprehensive hospitals in the world.

Dr. Pardes has always been an active advocate for academic medicine and advancing medical technology. The importance he places on academic medicine has helped to produce a generation of new highly skilled doctors to combat emerging health issues. He participates at the State and local level by supporting legislation that increases the quality of care in hospitals. He is a passionate supporter for achieving the best possible medical care for all who need it.

Dr. Pardes was appointed by Congress and President George W. Bush to serve on the Commission on Systemic Interoperability, which initiated action to develop a national health information technology infrastructure. During the Clinton administration he served on an advisory commission on consumer protection and quality in the health care industry. He is Chairman Emeritus of the eHealth Initiative and serves on the boards of the Macy Foundation and Markle Foundation, which are dedicated to improving quality, safety and efficiency in health care.

Dr. Pardes is devoted to enhancing patient care. He implemented a campaign called We Put Patients First to humanize the hospital experience for patients and their families. He also launched myNYP.org, a website which allows patients and families to access personal health records online. Dr. Pardes has also strived towards fostering close interaction be-

tween the hospital and communities in New York. He initiated the Lang Youth Medical Program, a six-year science education and mentoring program for middle and high school students, and helped start the WIN for Asthma outreach program along with other community health screening events.

I greatly admire the leadership that Dr. Pardes has provided to the medical community. He has demonstrated great care for his patients and has tirelessly worked to improve their experience and the quality of their health care. He is an extraordinary example of the tremendous changes that can be accomplished through the dedication of one individual.

I ask my colleagues and a very grateful Nation to join me in this special Congressional Recognition of Dr. Herbert Pardes.

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF AUDREY RUST ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT FROM PENINSULA OPEN SPACE TRUST

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Audrey Rust, a highly distinguished constituent, a nationally recognized leader of land preservation and a cherished friend on her 24 years as President, CEO and Executive Director of Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST).

Under her exceptional leadership since 1987, Ms. Rust has led POST, the Palo Alto, California based nonprofit land trust and has worked successfully in partnership with public agencies and private landowners to bring permanent protection to thousands of acres of open space lands in San Mateo, Santa Clara and Santa Cruz counties. Recognized across the country as a conservation innovator and champion, she has helped protect local landscapes that are now part of the National Park System, the National Wildlife Refuge System, the California State Parks, as well as county and city parks, regional open space preserves and private farmlands.

Before coming to POST, Ms. Rust worked with the Sierra Club, Yale University and Stanford University. She has served on the boards of numerous local, State and national organizations, primarily in the conservation and housing arena. She has received the Times Mirror-Chevron National Conservationist of the Year Award; the League of California Voters Environmental Leadership Award; the Cynthia Pratt Laughlin Medal; the Garden Club of America's top environmental honor; and the Jacqueline Kennedy Award from JFK University for her achievements in land conservation. Ms. Rust is a graduate of the University of Connecticut at Storrs.

I've been privileged to know and work with Audrey Rust for many years. She has been a friend, a mentor, and an inspiration to me and to thousands more. Audrey is one of the great environmental heroes of our Nation. Her determination and focus have shaped an extraordinary legacy and our entire Nation is grateful to her for leading the way in saving and preserving the world-class beauty and natural integrity of the Peninsula, South Bay and Coastside of California for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very proud to have my Bay Area colleagues—Leader NANCY PELOSI; Representative SAM FARR; Representative MIKE HONDA; Representative ZOE LOFGREN; Representative JERRY MCNERNEY, and Representative JACKIE SPEIER join me in honoring Audrey Rust. I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring and thanking Audrey Rust for her unparalleled record of leadership and wish her a joyful retirement. Audrey Rust is indeed a national treasure and it is a privilege to represent her and call her my friend.

COMMENDING THE U.S. WOMEN'S SOCCER TEAM

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend our U.S. Women's Soccer Team in their thrilling race to the World Cup Final. Although it was ultimately Japan who captured the World Cup Trophy, as a country we could not be more proud of our team, their tremendous effort throughout the Cup, and their grace in accepting defeat. Regardless of the outcome, there is much to be said about how their playing inspired a country. The attention of the world has turned to women's sports, and these women are serving as positive role models to young girls across the globe. It has been a long twelve years since the heroics of the victorious US Women's National Team in the 1999 World Cup, and I want to congratulate the 2011 team for exemplifying champions, win or lose. The image of Brandi Chastain, fists clenched, basking in the glory of a World Cup victory that captivated our spirits all those years ago still hangs on the wall of my office.

As a representative from western New York, I especially want to congratulate the amazing performance of Abby Wambach, a native of my hometown: Rochester, New York. She scored her 100th career international goal in Rochester and she carries with her the support of Rochesterians wherever she goes. She is a four-time winner of the U.S. Soccer Athlete of the Year award, and is currently the fourth all-time leading scorer in international soccer history. She scored the gold-medal-winning goal in the 2004 Olympics and saved the quarterfinal match in this year's cup against Brazil when she scored a gut-wrenching equalizer off her head in the final moments. In the semi final victory over France, she tallied two more scores, including the go-ahead goal against France in the 79th minute. Of the two amazing goals scored by the U.S. in the finals, Abby scored the go-ahead header in extra time, and Alex Morgan, a player for the Western New York Flash, scored the other.

Alex, a 22-year-old phenom, has impressed the world with her quick feet and prominence as a striker, and she is being heralded as the future star of U.S. women's soccer. The entire Upstate New York area is beaming with pride and admiration of these two players as they represented our area so well.

The fervor and enthusiasm for our team was encapsulated in the hero's welcome Abby received when she returned to Rochester, with

several of her teammates in tow. It was “Abby Wambach Day” in Rochester, and she received a key to the city in commendation of her awe-inspiring talents. The regularly scheduled game between magicJack of Boca Raton, FL and the Western New York Flash saw a sellout crowd of 15,404, a record for the 3-year-old league. It is clear that we have all been infused with a love of the game and a respect for our players, and I hope that passion never dies.

The success of the U.S. Women’s National Team is of particular importance because it shows young women and girls that like men, they too can earn the respect and admiration of the world through hard work, teamwork, and perseverance on the athletic field.

Since 2004, I’ve sponsored legislation in the House that would help high schools improve opportunities for girls in sports, and thereby encourage greater participation of both girls and boys in athletics. H.R. 458, the High School Athletics Accountability Act, would require that high schools report basic data on the number of female and male students in their athletic programs and the expenditures made for their sports teams. Without information about how athletic opportunities and benefits are being allocated at the high school level, female students may be deprived of their chance to participate in athletics.

And participation in sports has a multitude of positive effects on young women and girls, both physically and socially. For many young women, sports are often their ticket to higher education through athletic scholarships. I’ve met with so many Olympic gold medalists that told me without Title IX, which gave them access to athletic scholarships; they never would have had the chance to go to college. While we have made significant strides towards equity in athletics—since the 1972 enactment of Title IX the number of women competing in college sports has soared by more than 500 percent while the number of high school girls competing in sports increased by over 1,000 percent—we must continue to monitor our progress and ensure that our nation’s young women have the rights and opportunities they deserve.

This year’s Women’s World Cup was thrilling and is indicative of the amazing talent of our U.S. Women’s National Team. The success of our team has captivated men, women and children who nervously watched as the squad overcame Brazil in the last minute to triumph in penalty kicks, and then swept past France with their athleticism shining as they moved onto the final. I proudly cheered for them as they faced Japan on Sunday in the final, and was filled with admiration for their relentlessness on the field. Their accomplishments as a team are inspiring: two Women’s World Cups, three Olympic Gold Medals, and eight Algarve Cups, earning them a commendation as one of the finest teams in the world. I must also congratulate Japan for their performance and sportsmanship in a game that was watched by millions around the globe, and that kept everyone on the edge of their seats into the final penalty kicks. Though the U.S. team was ultimately unsuccessful in a heartbreaking 3–1 penalty shootout, I cannot imagine a more deserving adversary in Japan, who so recently suffered a devastating earthquake and tsunami. I hope this victory will bring joy to their people, and I know that the Japanese citizens are as proud of their team as we are of ours.

Abby and her teammates have been role models for all with their poise both on and off the field and their dedication to the sport. I could not be more proud of her and her teammates as role models for young women interested in sports. I encourage children of all ages to be as inspired by the success of the U.S. Women’s National team as I am, and to get involved with sports so that everyone can reap the benefits of this highly beneficial activity. Best of luck to the U.S. Women’s National Team in the future; I know this is not the last time we will be cheering for them in the World Cup Finals. With the London 2012 Olympic Games on the horizon, we won’t have to wait long to see them back in action on the world stage. Go USA!

TRIBUTE TO KYLE D. PAGERLY

HON. TIM HOLDEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Berks County Deputy Sheriff Kyle Pagerly for his service and sacrifice to Pennsylvania and the United States. Deputy Kyle Pagerly was killed in the line of duty on June 29, 2011.

Kyle was a 2001 graduate of Wilson High School in West Lawn, Berks County, PA. Following his graduation he served honorably as a U.S. Army Military Police Officer in Kosovo and Iraq. Upon returning home, Kyle pursued a career in law enforcement and graduated from the Reading Police Academy, Federal Prison Academy, and Philadelphia Canine Academy.

Kyle proudly served as a Deputy in the K–9 Unit of the Berks County Sheriff’s Department with his German Shepherd partner, Jynx. He loved to be outdoors, hiking, and enjoying nature. He was an active runner and loved to work out. He ran a marathon in 2010 and completed numerous triathlons.

On June 29, 2011 Deputy Pagerly was part of a fugitive task force dispatched to serve a warrant in Albany Township. When task force members arrived, the suspect fled into the nearby woods. Deputy Pagerly and his partner Jynx pursued him when the suspect opened fire. Once Deputy Pagerly was hit, Jynx attempted to pull him to safety and alerted other officers of the shooter’s presence. Deputy Pagerly was gravely wounded and airlifted to a nearby hospital where he succumbed to his wounds. Had it not been for Deputy Pagerly and his partner’s actions, it is very possible that more lives could have been lost.

Deputy Kyle Pagerly died a hero. He dedicated his life to the protection of his fellow man. He gave life, even through his death, by donating his organs and tissues so that others can live. Kyle’s death has not been forgotten by the community he loved and served. At Deputy Pagerly’s memorial service, Berks County Sheriff Eric Weaknecht retired Kyle’s call number and awarded his partner Jynx the Medal of Honor. Deputy Sheriff Kyle Pagerly was later awarded the same Medal of Honor posthumously.

A memorial fund has been set up in Kyle’s name, numerous benefits have been held in his honor, and thousands of people have joined Facebook pages dedicated to his life

and memory. Kyle Pagerly is survived by his wife, Alecia Anne, as well as his parents, his siblings, and his first child, due in January.

Mr. Speaker and fellow colleagues, please join me in honor and remembrance of a true American hero, Deputy Sheriff Kyle D. Pagerly.

IN TRIBUTE TO THE REVEREND
DR. ROLEN LEWIS WOMACK, JR.
AND REVEREND DR. BETTY
WASHINGTON WOMACK

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Reverend Dr. Rolen Lewis Womack, Jr. and Reverend Dr. Betty Washington Womack, the founding pastor and first lady of Milwaukee’s Progressive Baptist Church. After 23 years of dedicated service to their congregation and the greater Milwaukee community, they are retiring to their native Texas.

While fulfilling his role as pastor/teacher/prophet, Dr. Rolen Womack completed his Doctor of Ministry degree at United Theological Seminary in Dayton, Ohio. He is a native of Houston, Texas and is a graduate of Texas Southern University with an earned Masters of Divinity degree from Northern Baptist Theological Seminary in Lombard, Illinois. Dr. Betty Womack is a native of Galveston, Texas, a graduate of Huston-Tillotson College and an earned Masters of Education degree from Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas. She served as Director of Student Services in the Beaver Dam School District and received her administrative certification at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. She received a Doctorate of Education from Milwaukee’s Cardinal Stritch University.

Dr. Rolen Womack has a social justice activism and community advocacy ministry that features an Afrocentric frame of reference. He is one of the strongest advocates in the community and is a frequent guest on local radio talk shows and local television on issues related to justice and public education. Dr. Rolen Womack has been featured in Education Weekly and other periodicals and has participated in educational forums in many major cities.

The ministry at Progressive Baptist includes a Youth Ministry, Music and Stage Ministry, Discipleship and Men’s Fellowship, Women’s Fellowship, W.I.N.G.S. HIV–AIDS ministry and Custodial and Fiscal Ministries. Dr. Betty Womack has a strong commitment to the development of youth and youth programs at Progressive. She has fostered the Christian development of youth by organizing and administering Vacation Bible School and Youth Outings to historic and scientific sites. Together they actively work with new members in Foundation classes to integrate them into the life of Progressive Church. Dr. Betty Womack is the past president of the W.I.N.G.S. HIV–AIDS ministry.

She is the past President of the Wisconsin Pastor’s Wives Association and the former Executive Board Member of the American Baptist Education Association of Wisconsin. He is the past president of the Wisconsin Baptist Pastors Conference, a director of the Minority Ministers Alliance, past General Secretary of the

Wisconsin General Baptist State Convention, and serves on the boards of various organizations. They are the proud parents of two daughters: Cheray and Brooke.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that I can call them friends. I commend them for their many years of valued service to citizens of the 4th Congressional District. I wish them the very best in their retirement.

TRIBUTE TO THE 2011 BRONX
DOMINICAN DAY PARADE

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to the twenty-second annual Bronx Dominican Parade and Festival which will take place on Sunday, July 24, 2011. This famed event is eagerly anticipated by the Dominican and Bronx communities each year. It is a wonderful celebration of the spirit and richness of Dominican culture.

Under the continued leadership of Felipe Febles and Rosa Ayala, the Bronx Dominican Day Parade, Inc., La Gran Parada Dominicana del Bronx, has grown into an important institution that increases the self-awareness and pride of the Dominican people in order to promote economic development, education, cultural recognition, and advancement.

Dominicans have made invaluable contributions to the city, as well as to the entire nation. Although the highest concentration of Dominican people live in Washington Heights, a significant number have enriched the Bronx with their unique culture and spirit. The Dominican culture is one characterized by, among other things, diverse multi-culturalism, strong family values, distinctive art, amazing music and unique cuisine. We are grateful that so many have chosen to make the Bronx home.

Mr. Speaker, the roots of Dominican New Yorkers lie in a country with a fascinating history and arresting beauty. The Dominican Republic is the home of a number of people from various heritages. As a result, the culture is charged with strong Taino, African, and European influences. One visit to the Dominican Republic will put to rest any questions one might have as to why Dominicans in America retain such a strong sense of pride in their homeland and never stop missing it.

The achievements and contributions made by Dominican-Americans and Dominican residents have spanned the realms of politics, science, the Armed Forces, literature, public service, and the arts, and undoubtedly make them an integral part of American society.

The Bronx Dominican Day Parade and Festival of the Bronx is a great opportunity to celebrate Dominican culture, history, and its bright future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please join me in honoring the Dominican Day Parade and Festival of the Bronx.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARTIN HEINRICH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately missed two votes this evening, which included rollcall votes 601 and 602. If I had been present, I would have voted in favor of rollcall vote No. 601, H.R. 33. If I had been present, I would have voted in favor of rollcall vote No. 602, on Approving the Journal.

TRIBUTE TO COHOCTON
VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the brave men of women of the Cohocton Volunteer Fire Department who have tirelessly served our local and national community for 125 years. As the Cohocton Volunteer Fire Department celebrates its 125th anniversary, I applaud the many ways they have served our community.

From July 22–24, members of the department will hold several events commemorating the service of their valiant volunteers. Historical displays, parades, competitions and dinners will be held. The department will even be publishing a commemorative book on its history to celebrate this milestone.

For the past 125 years, members have selflessly given their time and energy to serve our community throughout periods of emergency and disaster. While the Cohocton Volunteer Fire Department should be commemorated for all of their service to our community, I want to especially highlight their tireless work during the 1972 Flood, the Ice Storm of 1991 and the Blizzard of 1993—three major storms which devastated the Chemung Valley.

Furthermore, the department also aided the national community during the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Under a mutual aid request, the department sent an ambulance and personnel to the Twin Towers Site after the attack. The ambulance was equipped with medical supplies donated by the local community for use by the FDNY.

Members of the Cohocton Volunteer Fire Department have repeatedly risked their lives in order to save our friends and neighbors. I am proud to recognize such a self-sacrificing and courageous organization. I congratulate the Cohocton Volunteer Fire Department and thank them for their 125 years of service.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DIANE BLACK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on amendment rollcall No. 615, No. 616, No. 617, No. 618, No. 619, No. 620 as well as rollcall No. 621 for final passage of H.R. 1315, I am not recorded because I was attending to a family

matter. Had I been present, I would have voted: No—Representative Sheila Jackson Lee Amendment No. 4; no—Representative Brad Miller Amendment; no—Representative Sheila Jackson Lee Amendment No. 3; no—Representative Carolyn Maloney Amendment; yes—Representative Scott Rigel Amendment; no—Democrat Motion to Recommit; and yes—Final Passage of H.R. 2551.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. AUSTIN SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes on July 21, 2011 in order to attend the funeral of one of my staffers. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall votes 612, 613, 614, 619, 621 and “no” on rollcall votes 615, 616, 617, 618, and 620.

CONGRESSWOMAN MAXINE
WATERS' STATEMENT ON THE
LOSS OF HER FRIEND AND COM-
MUNITY ICON, LILLIAN
HARKLESS-MOBLEY

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I am heartbroken that one of my closest and dearest friends, Lillian Mobley, has passed away. I worked with Lillian—known throughout South Los Angeles communities as “Ms. Mobley”—for over 3 decades. We have marched together, participated in protests together, and fought off anyone who attacked our community together. Lillian was my ‘shero.’

Lillian Mobley is without a doubt the most accomplished and successful community activist South Los Angeles has ever had. She helped found numerous community institutions and organizations that include Martin Luther King Jr. Hospital, Charles Drew Medical Center, Los Angeles Southwest College, Black Women's Forum, the Lillian Mobley South Central Multipurpose Senior Citizens Center, Mothers in Action, Grandma's Hands Los Angeles Birthing Project, Watts Towers Community Action Council and others. She is on the Walk of Fame in Watts, has a building named after her at the Maxine Waters Employment Preparation Center, a clinic at Martin Luther King Jr. Hospital that also houses a bust of her image, the Mother of Africa statue at WLCAC was dedicated to her as well as the amphitheater at Watts Towers and a Family Housing Center, and of course the senior center she founded that now carries her name.

She served on the board of over 20 organizations and was highly sought after by politicians hoping to win her endorsement to be elected to office. And it was only if Lillian believed that their election to office would benefit the community and help preserve the very institutions she helped to create like Martin Luther King Jr. Hospital would she support them.

Lillian Mobley is one of the icons of South Central and the Watts communities of Los Angeles that has helped to educate the city and

the country about the problems of poor people and working folks and the struggles that they encounter on a daily basis. She was the voice that articulated their pain, their challenges, their hopes and dreams. Lillian has joined the legendary African American women who have passed on but clearly left their marks on the hearts and souls of the people they fought for. Women like Mary Henry, Caffie Greene, Jonnie Tillman, Margaret Wright, Edna Aliwine and Opal Jones.

We spent countless hours in meetings on issues related to health, seniors, youth, and education. Lillian was not only concerned with these issues, she tackled them with vigor. She was all about doing the work, even the 'grunt work' as she liked to call it, to bring resources to help families and youth in South Central Los Angeles and Watts. She did all of this while battling with her own health issues. If Lillian was not at an important meeting it was only because she couldn't attend either due to her grueling dialysis schedule or because she was hospitalized. Lillian was a woman before her time who maintained her empathy and concern for the young and old. She was truly humble in her work and never asked or expected any recognition form of recognition from others.

One of the greatest experiences we had together was taking 80 African American women on a trip to Africa. Lillian was so happy and proud to travel to the motherland and said it was one of the most enjoyable moments of her life. I will hold on to this and other fond memories I have of Lillian to help come to grips with this devastating loss.

I join with other elected officials, community leaders, and the residents of South Central, Watts and South Los Angeles in paying homage to our queen, Lillian Mobley.

IN HONOR OF SUE POPP

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I rise to honor the life of my good friend, Sue Popp, who passed away on July 11, 2011, in Sacramento, California. Sue was not only a close friend of mine, and someone I knew for almost 40 years, but she was a friend to Sacramento—someone who spent her life dedicated to public service, providing for others, and championing causes for the less fortunate.

Born in 1938 to a prominent Sacramento family, Sue spared no expense to help provide for those she cared for. Her entire life was dedicated to her friends and the people she loved. If she saw the good in you, you had a friend and defender for life.

Sue was a dedicated humanitarian as well as a trusted friend. She spent a lifetime chairing many of Sacramento's non-profit boards, raising money for her favorite charities, and serving her community. No effort was more important to her than the plight of Sacramento's youth. She developed a close bond to the children of Sacramento early in her philanthropic life. This spirit of generosity carried with her as she served in the Stanford Home for Children, Junior League, Fairytale Town, Capitol Public Radio, the Crocker Art

Museum, and the Sacramento Country Day School Auction, where I had the distinct honor to serve with Sue as her co-chair.

Without a doubt, Sue was one of the most dynamic women I have ever had the privilege to know. Her passing leaves a tremendous void in Sacramento, both in terms of her unwavering dedication to improve the lives of those she touched, but also in terms of her sheer presence. The warmth and generosity Sue exuded to friend and stranger alike is seldom seen in today's world. We will be hard-pressed to replace it. She was truly a friend to Sacramento—one that will be dearly missed by all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Sue Popp—someone who dedicated her life to doing what was right, and serving others. She leaves a legacy of boundless generosity, charisma, energy, and class. We should each aspire to follow her example in our own lives, both professionally and personally. I will miss her dearly, and pray that her son, Curtis, his wife, Susan, and her grandchildren, Fletcher and Olivia, will find comfort in the fact that Sue provided so much love and kindness to those of us who had the honor to share in her life.

COMMEMORATING THE 37TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 37th anniversary of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus and to remember this tragic event for the Greek Cypriot people.

The commemoration of the 1974 Turkish military invasion of the island of Cyprus serves as a solemn reminder for all freedom-loving people to mourn those who lost their lives in the invasion and to condemn the ongoing Turkish occupation. For the past 37 years, Cyprus has endured the illegal military occupation of over one third of its territory by the Turkish armed forces, an occupation which stands in violation of more than 75 U.N. Security Council resolutions calling for the withdrawal of Turkish troops. Despite this unjust infringement upon Cyprus, both the United States and the Cypriot governments remain committed to achieving a peaceful resolution of this dispute through diplomatic negotiations.

The strong relationship between the United States and Cyprus is not based solely on a shared interest in ending the Turkish occupation of Cyprus, but also on the fact that both countries share a deep and abiding commitment to upholding the ideals of freedom, democracy, justice, human rights, and the international rule of law. The United States and the rest of the international community have a moral obligation to stand with Cypriots as they work to reunify their island and end the Turkish military occupation.

As a friend of Cyprus, I will continue to work with my colleagues to realize a reunification of the island as a bi-communal and bi-zonal federation that will protect the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all Cypriots. However, any solution must include a prompt with-

drawal of Turkish occupation forces. Cypriot President Demetris Christofias remains committed to negotiating a just, viable solution to this problem in accordance with the many U.N. Security Council Resolutions adopted on this issue since 1974, with the High Level Agreements of 1977 and 1979, and on the basis of the ideals and principles upon which the European Union was founded.

Mr. Speaker, today I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the 37th anniversary of this violent invasion that brutally divided the island nation of Cyprus, and to encourage Turkish Cypriot leaders to negotiate in good faith with their Greek Cypriot counterparts to settle this dispute and to develop a plan for reunification that addresses the serious concerns of all Cypriots. The reunification of Cyprus must remain a priority for this Congress and for the international community. On this important anniversary, we mourn the deaths of those killed in the invasion and the lost opportunities for reunification over the years, but we look forward to a future of a reunited and peaceful Cyprus.

CELEBRATING THE REVIVAL OF
"THE RICKEY"

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to join me in celebrating the revival of "The Rickey," a cocktail of Presidents and Members of Congress who, in the 1880s, frequented Shoemaker's Bar, which today is the home of the J.W. Marriott Hotel, near the White House.

The invention of The Rickey, made with a combination of gin or bourbon, half a lime, ice, and sparkling water, is attributed to Colonel Joe Rickey. The cocktail became well known nationally, appears in cocktail books, and was recently named the District of Columbia's native cocktail in a resolution introduced by D.C. Council member Jack Evans and approved by the D.C. Council.

This week at the J.W. Marriott, D.C. residents celebrated The Rickey as I unveiled a plaque commemorating it as a part of the city's rich history. Much of the energy for the revival of The Rickey as D.C.'s cocktail was driven by Garrett Peck, author of "Prohibition in Washington, DC: How Dry We Weren't," and Bob Madigan, who acted as emcee at the celebration.

As Congress tries to reach a sensible compromise on the debt limit, we would do well to remember The Rickey, the drink dejour at a time when Presidents, Members of Congress, and members of the press on "Newspaper Row," as that part of 14th Street was known, drank together and enjoyed good relations. Let us take the spirit of The Rickey to heart this week and settle our debt-limit differences. Having a Rickey might even help.

I ask the House to join me in commending the J.W. Marriott for their recognition of the political history of the city, especially to a part of Washington's history that will humanize politicians.

HONORING DAN AGUILAR

HON. THOMAS J. ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2011

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise to pay tribute to a true American hero, Dan Aguilar of Palm City, Florida. Dan has been awarded the Silver Plaque International Alpine Solidarity Award, given to individuals who have risked their lives to save others in dangerous mountain accidents. Dan is a well-known mountain rescuer who deserves both the admiration and praise of this body.

Dan grew up in Dallas, Texas, where he resided for 18 years. After graduating from Crozier Tech High School, he served in the U.S. Army for four years. Upon returning to the United States, he moved to Vail where he began his renowned career in mountain res-

cue. Dan's love for the mountains has seen him travel the globe and conquer the most dangerous alpine trails in the world. What's more, his mountain climbing adventures have taken him to Mexico, Ecuador, Alaska and Argentina. But it is not his accomplishments as a climber or mountain hiker that have earned him this prestigious award, but rather it is his courage as a mountain rescuer.

In the early 1980s Dan suffered the crushing loss of a dear friend that completely changed his view of climbing. For some time he was unable to even fathom climbing again, but this experience eventually drove him to the line of work that has made him a living legend. Through his dedication and perseverance he became a valuable member of the Vail Mountain Rescue Group for nearly 2 decades.

For Dan, saving the life of another seemed to come naturally. In fact, the Silver Plaque International Alpine Solidarity Award is not the first time he has received recognition for his devotion to helping others. He has also been

awarded the Mountain Rescue Association's Outstanding Individual Service Award. In all, it is estimated that Dan has been involved in around 500 different rescue missions, since his involvement with Mountain Rescue. His advanced rescue skills have also been utilized in rescues on Mt. Rainier in Washington, the Pamirs in Russia, and the Aconcogua in South America.

Dan's commitment and incredible compassion to help others have earned him a legendary reputation and the admiration of people around the world. According to Tim Cochrane, a fellow member of Mountain Rescue, "Aguilar is the first volunteer rescuer in North America to win the award."

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the State of Florida and U.S. Congress, I congratulate Dan on this distinguished and well-deserved award. He is an American who deserves our gratitude and praise.

Dan, your community, State, and Nation are proud of you!

Daily Digest

Highlights

The House passed H.R. 2551, Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2012.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4813–S4853

Measures Introduced: Four bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1406–1409, and S. Res. 237. **Pages S4845–46**

Measures Reported:

Report to accompany S. 968, to prevent online threats to economic creativity and theft of intellectual property. (S. Rept. No. 112–39)

S. 27, to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market.

S. 846, to designate the United States courthouse located at 80 Lafayette Street in Jefferson City, Missouri, as the Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse. **Page S4845**

Measures Passed:

September 11th Moment of Remembrance: Senate agreed to S. Res. 237, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding coming together as a Nation and ceasing all work or other activity for a moment of remembrance beginning at 1 PM Eastern Daylight Time on September 11, 2011, in honor of the 10th anniversary of the terrorist attacks committed against the United States on September 11, 2001. **Pages S4836–37**

Government Charge Card Abuse Prevention Act: Senate passed S. 300, to prevent abuse of Government charge cards, after agreeing to the committee amendments. **Pages S4850–52**

Measures Considered:

Cut, Cap, and Balance Act: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 2560, to cut, cap, and balance the Federal budget. **Pages S4814–26**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 116), Senate tabled the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Pages S4825–26**

Moment of Silence—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-agreement was reached providing that at 3:40 p.m., on Monday, July 25, 2011, Senate observe a moment of silence in memory of Office Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson of the United States Capitol Police, who were killed 13 years ago defending the Capitol against an armed intruder. **Page S4852**

Engelmayer and Manglona Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 4:30 p.m., on Monday, July 25, 2011, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Paul A. Engelmayer, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, and the nomination of Ramona Villagomez Manglona, of the Northern Mariana Islands, to be Judge for the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands for a term of ten years; that there be one hour for debate, equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nomination of Paul A. Engelmayer, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, and the nomination of Ramona Villagomez Manglona, of the Northern Mariana Islands, to be Judge for the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands for a term of ten years, in that order; that no further motions be in order. **Page S4852**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

James T. Ryan, of Utah, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Institute of Building Sciences for a term expiring September 7, 2013.

Larry W. Walther, of Arkansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank

of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2013.

Mary B. DeRosa, of the District of Columbia, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-sixth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Frank E. Loy, of the District of Columbia, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-sixth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Kendrick B. Meek, of Florida, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-sixth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

6 Army nominations in the rank of general.

5 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Page S4853

Messages from the House:

Page S4845

Measures Referred:

Page S4845

Measures Placed on the Calendar:

Page S4845

Additional Cosponsors: Page S4846

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Page S4846

Additional Statements:

Pages S4845–50

Privileges of the Floor:

Page S4850

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—116)

Pages S4825–26

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2:44 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, July 25, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4853.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 8 public bills, H.R. 2623–2630; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 365–367 were introduced.

Pages H5398–99

Additional Cosponsors:

Page H5399

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2117, to prohibit the Department of Education from overreaching into academic affairs and program eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, with an amendment (H. Rept. 112–177) and

H.R. 2218, to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, with an amendment (H. Rept. 112–178).

Page H5398

Recess: The House recessed at 9:41 a.m. and reconvened at 10:02 a.m.

Page H5382

Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2012:

The House passed H.R. 2551, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, by a yea-and-nay vote of 252 yeas to 159 nays, Roll No. 629. Consideration of the measure began yesterday, July 21st.

Pages H5378–81, H5382–87

Agreed to:

Hayworth amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 112–173) that was debated on July 21st that cuts the \$632,780 increase in funding for the Botanic Garden and transfers it to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 299 ayes to 112 noes, Roll No. 623) and

Page H5383

Stutzman amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 112–173) that was debated on July 21st that reduces the Government Printing Office by \$4,946,140.80 by transferring \$3,414,150.29 from Government Printing Office, Congressional Printing and Binding, and \$1,531,990.51 from Government Printing Office, Office of Superintendent of Documents and transfers the funds to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 218 ayes to 194 noes, Roll No. 625).

Page H5384

Rejected:

Watt amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 112–173) that was debated on July 21st that sought to reduce funding for the Office of Congressional Ethics (OCE) by 40% (\$619,200) and transfer the funds to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 102 ayes to 302 noes with 7 voting "present", Roll No. 622);

Pages H5382–83

Broun (GA) amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 112–173) that was debated on July 21st that sought to reduce funding for the Botanic Garden to

the FY 2008 Level (\$3,192,000 reduction) and transfer the funds to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 153 ayes to 260 noes, Roll No. 624); **Pages H5383–84**

Thompson (PA) amendment (No. 15 printed in H. Rept. 112–173) that was debated on July 21st that sought to prohibit any funds in the bill from being available to purchase, acquire, install, or use any medium screw base compact fluorescent lamp or light bulb (CFL) (by a recorded vote of 130 ayes to 283 noes, Roll No. 626); **Pages H5385–86**

Holt amendment (No. 12 printed in H. Rept. 112–173) that sought to provide \$2.5 million for the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment and reduce funding for the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund by the same amount (by a recorded vote of 176 ayes to 235 noes, Roll No. 627); and **Pages H5379–80, H5385–86**

Moran amendment (No. 9 printed in H. Rept. 112–173) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for polystyrene containers in the food service facilities of the House of Representatives (by a recorded vote of 179 ayes to 234 noes, Roll No. 628). **Pages H5380–81, H5386–87**

H. Res. 359, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to yesterday, July 21st.

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, July 25th, when it shall convene at 10 a.m. for morning hour debate and 12 noon for legislative business. **Page H5387**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page 5381.

Amendments: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages H5399–H5400.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and seven recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5382, H5383, H5383–84, H5384–85, H5385, H5385–86, H5386–87 and H5387. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:01 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: On July 21, 2011, the full Committee continued markup of H.R. 2583, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2012. The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs held a markup of the following: H.R. 923, the “Veterans Pen-

sions 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, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to annually assess the skills of certain employees and managers of the Veterans Benefits Administration, and for other purposes. The following were forwarded, as amended: H.R. 1826, and H.R. 923. The following were forwarded without amendment: H.R. 1025 and H.R. 1898. H.R. 2349 was withdrawn.

Joint Meetings

COPTIC CHRISTIAN IN EGYPT

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Commission concluded a hearing to examine minority at risk, focusing on Coptic Christian in Egypt and renewed concerns over reports of disappearances, forced conversions and forced marriages of Coptic Christian women and girls, after receiving testimony from Jean Maher, Egyptian Union for Human Rights Organization, Houilles, France; Michele A. Clark, George Washington University Elliot School of International Affairs, Washington, D.C.; and Caroline Doss, Coptic Solidarity, Centreville, Virginia.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of July 25 through July 30, 2011

Senate Chamber

On *Monday*, at 4:30 p.m., Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Paul A. Engelmayer, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, and the nomination of Ramona Villagomez Manglona, of the Northern Mariana Islands, to be Judge for the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands for a term of ten years, and vote on confirmation of the nominations, at approximately 5:30 p.m.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: July 28, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Brian T. Baenig, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture; to be immediately followed by a

hearing to examine opportunities for specialty crops and organics in the farm bill, 9:30 a.m., SD-G50.

Committee on Appropriations: July 27, Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of Education, 10 a.m., SD-124.

July 28, Subcommittee on Financial Service and General Government, to hold hearings to examine Federal disaster assistance budgeting, focusing on the role of the Federal government in mitigating the economic impact of severe weather events through long-term budgetary planning, 2 p.m., SD-138.

Committee on Armed Services: July 26, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of General Martin E. Dempsey, USA for reappointment to the grade of general and to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 9:30 a.m., SD-106.

July 27, Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, to hold hearings to examine financial management and business transformation at the Department of Defense, 2 p.m., SR-232A.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: July 26, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Martin J. Gruenberg, of Maryland, to be Chairperson and to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Thomas J. Curry, of Massachusetts, to be Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, and S. Roy Woodall, Jr., of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, 10 a.m., SD-538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: July 27, Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard, to hold hearings to examine defending United States economic interests in the changing arctic, focusing on if there is a strategy, 10:30 a.m., SR-253.

July 27, Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Insurance, to hold hearings to examine improving highway and vehicle safety, focusing on reauthorization of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2:30 p.m., SR-253.

July 28, Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security, to hold hearings to examine aviation fuels, focusing on needs, challenges, and alternatives, 10 a.m., SR-253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: July 28, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Charles DeWitt McConnell, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of Energy for Fossil Energy, and Rebecca R. Wodder, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife, 10 a.m., SD-366.

July 28, Subcommittee on National Parks, to hold hearings to examine S. 264, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, S. 265, to authorize the acquisition of core battlefield land at Champion Hill, Port Gibson, and Raymond for addition to Vicksburg National Military Park, S. 324, to amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission, S. 764, to amend

the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to make technical corrections to the segment designations for the Chetco River, Oregon, S. 864, to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California, S. 883, to authorize National Mall Liberty Fund D.C. to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia to honor free persons and slaves who fought for independence, liberty, and justice for all during the American Revolution, S. 888, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 925, to designate Mt. Andrea Lawrence, S. 970, to designate additional segments and tributaries of White Clay Creek, in the States of Delaware and Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 1063, to allow for the harvest of gull eggs by the Huna Tlingit people within Glacier Bay National Park in the State of Alaska, S. 1134, to authorize the St. Croix River Crossing Project with appropriate mitigation measures to promote river values, and S. 1235, to recognize the memorial at the Navy UDT-SEAL Museum in Fort Pierce, Florida, as the official national memorial of Navy SEALs and their predecessors, 2:30 p.m., SD-366.

Committee on Finance: July 26, to hold hearings to examine perspectives on deficit reduction, focusing on a review of key issues, 10 a.m., SD-215.

July 27, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine chief executive officer (CEO) perspectives on how the tax code affects hiring, businesses and economic growth, 10 a.m., SD-215.

July 28, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Janice Eberly, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and Juan F. Vasquez, of Texas, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court, 10 a.m., SD-215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: July 26, business meeting to consider S. 1280, to amend the Peace Corps Act to require sexual assault risk-reduction and response training, and the development of sexual assault protocol and guidelines, the establishment of victims advocates, the establishment of a Sexual Assault Advisory Council, S. Res. 216, encouraging women's political participation in Saudi Arabia, S. Con. Res. 17, expressing the sense of Congress that Taiwan should be accorded observer status in the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), S. Res. 227, calling for the protection of the Mekong River Basin and increased United States support for delaying the construction of mainstream dams along the Mekong River, S. Res. 175, expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to ongoing violations of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Georgia and the importance of a peaceful and just resolution to the conflict within Georgia's internationally recognized borders, Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Rwanda Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, signed at Kigali on February 19, 2008 (Treaty Doc. 110-23), Convention between the Government of the United States

of America and the Government of the Republic of Hungary for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed on February 4, 2010, at Budapest (the “proposed Convention”) and a related agreement effected by an exchange of notes on February 4, 2010 (Treaty Doc. 111–07), Protocol Amending the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed on May 20, 2009, at Luxembourg (the “proposed Protocol”) and a related agreement effected by the exchange of notes also signed on May 20, 2009 (Treaty Doc. 111–08), Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Swiss Confederation for the Avoidance of Double Taxation with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington on October 2, 1996, signed on September 23, 2009, at Washington, as corrected by an exchange of notes effected November 16, 2010 and a related agreement effected by an exchange of notes on September 23, 2009 (Treaty Doc. 112–01), Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Bermuda relating to Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, signed at Hamilton on January 12, 2009 (Treaty Doc. 111–06), and the nominations of Jonathan Don Farrar, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Nicaragua, Derek J. Mitchell, of Connecticut, to be Special Representative and Policy Coordinator for Burma, with the rank of Ambassador, Frankie Annette Reed, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Fiji Islands, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Nauru, the Kingdom of Tonga, Tuvalu, and the Republic of Kiribati, Paul D. Wohlers, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Macedonia, William H. Moser, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Moldova, Thomas M. Countryman, of Washington, to be Assistant Secretary of State for International Security and Non-Proliferation, Jeffrey DeLaurentis, to be Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador, and to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during his tenure of service as Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, all of the Department of State, 2:30 p.m., S–116, Capitol.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: July 26, to hold hearings to examine building a ladder of opportunity, focusing on what’s working to make the American dream a reality for middle class families, 10 a.m., SD–430.

July 28, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine Food and Drug Administration (FDA) user fees, focusing on advancing public health, 9:45 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: July 26, Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Contracting Oversight, to hold hearings to examine small business con-

tracts, focusing on how oversight failures and regulatory loopholes allow large businesses to get and keep small business contracts, 10 a.m., SD–342.

July 26, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia, to hold hearings to examine Federal workers’ compensation program for injured employees, 2 p.m., SD–342.

July 27, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine ten years after 9/11, focusing on emergency communications, 10 a.m., SD–342.

July 28, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Mark D. Acton, of Kentucky, and Robert G. Taub, of New York, both to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: July 28, 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, 2:15 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary: July 26, Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees and Border Security, to hold hearings to examine the economic imperative for enacting immigration reform, 10 a.m., SD–226.

July 27, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine fulfilling our treaty obligations and protecting Americans abroad, 10 a.m., SD–226.

July 27, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Edgardo Ramos, of Connecticut, Andrew L. Carter, Jr., and Jesse M. Furman, all to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, James Rodney Gilstrap, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas, and Jennifer Guerin Zipp, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

July 28, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 401, to help Federal prosecutors and investigators combat public corruption by strengthening and clarifying the law, S. 657, to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, S. 409, to ban the sale of certain synthetic drugs, S. 605, to amend the Controlled Substances Act to place synthetic drugs in Schedule I, S. 839, to ban the sale of certain synthetic drugs, and the nomination of Steve Six, of Kansas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: July 27, to hold hearings to examine the lifetime costs of supporting the newest generation of veterans, 10 a.m., SD–562.

Select Committee on Intelligence: July 26, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Matthew G. Olsen, of Maryland, to be Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, 10 a.m., SD–562.

July 26, Full Committee, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

July 28, Full Committee, closed business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, July 27, Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management, hearing on Agricultural Program Audit: Examination of Title I and the SURE Program, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

July 28, Subcommittee on Rural Development, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture, hearing on Agricultural Program Audit: Examination of USDA Research Programs, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, July 27, Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, markup of the FY 2012 State and Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, 10 a.m., H-140 Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services, July 26, full Committee, hearing on Ten Years After the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force: Current Status of Legal Authorities, Detention, and Prosecution in the War on Terror, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

July 26, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, hearing on Department of Defense investment in technology and capability to meet emerging security threats, 1:30 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

July 26, Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing on total force readiness, 3 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

July 27, full Committee, hearing on the Way Ahead in Afghanistan, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

July 27, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing on the Reserve Components as an Operational Force: Potential Legislative and Policy Changes, 1:30 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

July 27, Subcommittee on Strategic Force, hearing on sustaining nuclear deterrence after New START, 3 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

July 28, Panel on Defense Financial Management and Auditability Reform, meeting to receive testimony on DOD's plans for financial management improvement and achieving audit readiness, 8 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, July 26, Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, hearing entitled "Redefining 'Fiduciary': Assessing the Impact of the Labor Department's Proposal on Workers and Retirees." 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

July 27, full Committee, hearing entitled "Education Reforms: Exploring Teacher Quality Initiatives." 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, July 26, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing is entitled "Cybersecurity: An Overview of Risks to Critical Infrastructure." 11 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, July 26, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing entitled "Examining Rental Purchase Agreements and the Potential Role for Federal Regulation." 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

July 26, Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy and Technology, hearing entitled "Impact of Monetary Policy on the Economy: A Regional Fed Perspective on Inflation, Unemployment, and QE3." 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

July 27, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled "Oversight of the Credit Rating Agencies Post Dodd-Frank." 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

July 27, Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade, hearing entitled "The Impact of the World Bank and Multi-Lateral Development Banks on National Security and U.S. Job Creation." 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

July 28, Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity, hearing entitled "Insurance Oversight: Policy Implications for U.S. Consumers, Businesses and Jobs." 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, July 26, Subcommittee on Europe and Eurasia, hearing on Eastern Europe: The State of Democracy and Freedom, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

July 26, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Reassessing American Grand Strategy in South Asia, 2:30 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

July 26, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights and the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, joint hearing on AFRICOM: Promoting Partnership for Global Security in Africa, 2 p.m., 2255 Rayburn.

July 27, Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia, hearing on Axis of Abuse: U.S. Human Rights Policy toward Iran and Syria, Part 1, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

July 28, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights, hearing on Improving Implementation of the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, July 26, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies, hearing entitled "The Last Line of Defense: Federal, State, and Local Efforts to Prevent Nuclear and Radiological Terrorism Within the United States." 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

July 27, full Committee, hearing entitled "Al Shabaab: Recruitment and Radicalization within the Muslim American Community and the Threat to the Homeland." 9:30 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, July 26, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security, hearing on H.R. 2572, the "Clean Up Government Act of 2011." 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

July 26, Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement, hearing on H.R. 2497, the "Hinder the Administration's Legalization Temptation Act." 1:30 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

July 27, Subcommittee on Courts, Commercial and Administrative Law, hearing entitled "Chapter 7 Bankruptcy Trustee Responsibilities and Remuneration." 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

July 27, full Committee, begin markup of the following: H.R. 1981, the "Protecting Children From Internet Pornographers Act of 2011"; H.R. 1433, the "Private Property Rights Protection Act of 2011"; H.R. _____, the "Appeal Time Clarification Act of 2011"; and H.R. 83, the "Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2011". 11:15 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

July 28, full Committee, continue markup of the following: H.R. 1981, the “Protecting Children From Internet Pornographers Act of 2011”; H.R. 1433, the “Private Property Rights Protection Act of 2011”; H.R. _____, the “Appeal Time Clarification Act of 2011”; and H.R. 83, the “Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2011”. 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, July 26, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans, and Insular Affairs, hearing entitled “NOAA’s Fishery Science: Is the Lack of Basic Science Costing Jobs?” 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

July 26, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, hearing on the following: H.R. 2578, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act related to a segment of the Lower Merced River in California, and for other purposes; and H.R. 1581, the “Wilderness and Roadless Area Release Act of 2011.” 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

July 27, full Committee, hearing entitled “State Perspectives on Offshore Revenue Sharing.” 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

July 28, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs, hearing on the following: H.R. 50, the “Multinational Species Conservation Funds Reauthorization Act”; H.R. 1760, the “Great Ape Conservation Reauthorization Amendments Act”; and H.R. 1761, the “Marine Turtle Conservation Reauthorization Act.” 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, July 26, full Committee, hearing entitled “Operation Fast and Furious: The Other Side of the Border.” 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

July 26, Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs, Stimulus Oversight and Government Spending, hearing entitled “Lights Out: How EPA Regulations Threaten Affordable Power and Job Creation.” 1:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

July 27, full Committee, hearing entitled “Disposal of Federal Real Property: Legislative Proposals.” 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

July 27, Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service and Labor Policy, hearing entitled “The Thrift Savings Plan: Helping Federal Employees Achieve Retirement Security.” 1:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

July 28, Subcommittee on Government Organization, Efficiency and Financial Management, hearing entitled “Improper Medicare Payments: \$48 Billion in Waste?” 9:30 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

July 28, Subcommittee on Health Care, District of Columbia, Census, and the National Archives, hearing entitled “Impact of Obamacare on Job Creators and Their Decision to Offer Health Insurance.” 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, July 25, full Committee, hearing on H.R. 1938, the “North-American-Made Energy Security Act.” 3 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

July 26, full Committee, hearing on H.R. 2587, the “Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act.” 3 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, July 26, Subcommittee on Research and Science Education, hearing entitled “The Merit Review Process: Ensuring Limited

Federal Resources are Invested in the Best Science.” 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, July 27, full Committee, hearing entitled “Bureaucratic Obstacles for Small Exporters: Is our National Export Strategy Working?” 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

July 28, Subcommittee on Healthcare and Technology, hearing entitled “Small Businesses and PPACA: If They Like Their Coverage, Can They Keep It?” 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

July 28, Subcommittee on Investigations, Oversight and Regulations, hearing entitled “Open for Business: The Impact of the CFPB on Small Business.” 1:30 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, July 26, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, hearing entitled “How to Improve Operations and Implement Efficiencies for the United States Coast Guard.” 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

July 27, Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing entitled “The European Union’s Emissions Trading Scheme: A Violation of International Law.” 9 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

July 28, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, hearing entitled “The Economic Development Administration: How to Improve Effectiveness through Reforms and Consolidations.” 10:30 a.m., 2253 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, July 25, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on the following: H.R. 198, the “Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act”; H.R. 1154, the “Veterans Equal Treatment for Service Dogs Act”; H.R. 1855, the “Veterans’ Traumatic Brain Injury Rehabilitative Services’ Improvements Act of 2011”; H.R. 2074, the “Veterans Sexual Assault Prevention Act”; H.R. 2530, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for increased flexibility in establishing rates for reimbursement of State homes by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for nursing home care provided to veterans; and draft legislation. 4 p.m., 334 Cannon.

July 27, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, markup on pending legislation, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

July 28, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Evaluating VA’s SDVOSB Certification Process, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

July 28, Subcommittee on Health, markup of pending legislation, 9:30 a.m., 340 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, July 26, full Committee, hearing on alternative tax systems, with a focus on tax systems that are based on taxing consumption rather than income, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

July 28, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing on the new IRS paid tax return preparer program, 9:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, July 27, Subcommittee on Terrorism, HUMINT, Analysis, and Counterintelligence, hearing on Preventing Violent Radicalization in America, 3 p.m., B-318 Rayburn.

July 28, full Committee, hearing on Ongoing Intelligence Activities, 4 p.m., HVC-304. This is a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: July 26, to hold hearings to examine Bosnia, focusing on obstacles to progress and recommendations for the international response, 2 p.m., 210, Cannon Building.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: July 28, to hold hearings to examine United States policy and the Organization for Co-operation in Europe, focusing on

making good on commitments and challenges, including unresolved conflicts, ethnic tension, corruption and lack of governance, racism and intolerance, and trafficking in persons, 1:30 p.m., 210, Cannon Building.

Joint Economic Committee: July 27, to hold hearings to examine maximizing America's prosperity, focusing on how fiscal rules can restrain Federal overspending, 10 a.m., SH-216.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, July 25

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 4:30 p.m.), Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Paul A. Engelmayer, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, and the nomination of Ramona Villagomez Manglona, of the Northern Mariana Islands, to be Judge for the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands for a term of ten years, and vote on confirmation of the nominations, at approximately 5:30 p.m.

(At 3:40 p.m., the Senate will observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson of the United States Capitol Police.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Monday, July 25

House Chamber

Program for Monday: Begin consideration of H.R. 2584—Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Black, Diane, Tenn., E1391
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E1388
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E1389
Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E1388
Grimm, Michael G., N.Y., E1387
Heinrich, Martin, N.M., E1391
Holden, Tim, Pa., E1390

Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E1388
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1387
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E1392
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E1390
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E1392
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1389
Reed, Tom, N.Y., E1391
Rooney, Thomas J., Fla., E1393
Rothman, Steven R., N.J., E1392

Schmidt, Jean, Ohio, E1388
Austin, David, Ga., E1391
Serrano, José E., N.Y., E1391
Sessions, Pete, Tex., E1388
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E1389
Speier, Jackie, Calif., E1387
Waters, Maxine, Calif., E1391



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office at www.gpo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$252.00 for six months, \$503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, \$10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, \$21.00; greater than 400 pages, \$31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$146.00 per year, or purchased for \$3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.