



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 2012

No. 95

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 21, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TED POE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

We pray for the gift of wisdom to all with great responsibility in this House for the leadership of our Nation.

May all the Members have the vision of our Nation where respect and understanding are the marks of civility, and honor and integrity are the marks of one's character.

Give them the grace to see the best in those with whom they find disagreement, and the courage to move together with them toward solutions that best serve our great Nation.

Raise up, O God, women and men from every nation who will lead toward the paths of peace, and whose good judgment will heal the hurt between all peoples.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done within these hallowed halls be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. DELAURO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

REPEAL OBAMACARE IN ITS ENTIRETY

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, soon we will know if the Supreme Court will defend the Constitution and strike down ObamaCare, or let it stand.

The Founders worried about the growth of government and the yielding of liberty. Ben Franklin warned us about the fragility of limited government when he proclaimed that the Constitutional Convention had produced "a Republic, if you can keep it."

Now it is 225 years later and a moment of truth. We will soon know if our Republic will reaffirm its commitment to the Constitution or succumb to the consolidation of unchecked power and the erosion of our cherished liberties.

Although I hope that ObamaCare will be struck down, the Founders ulti-

mately left the defense of the Constitution to the people. And I know that if the Supreme Court will not rise to the defense of the Constitution, the people will.

To all the patriots throughout the country who have dedicated themselves to the repeal of this law, let me remind you of the words of Thomas Jefferson, who once said:

The ground of liberty is to be gained by inches.

So I pledge to stand alongside all of you in that fight, inch by inch, to defend the Constitution, and repeal the ObamaCare law in its entirety.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY RESTORATION ACT

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

Ms. DELAURO. One year ago yesterday, the Supreme Court voted 5-4 in the case of Walmart v. Dukes to make it harder for workers to challenge discrimination in the workplace. Upending decades of judicial practice and precedent, the Court erected new unwarranted and challenging barriers for groups of private employees to challenge unemployment discrimination.

As a result, 1.5 million female Walmart employees were denied remedy for discrimination that resulted in smaller paychecks, limited professional advancement, and increased financial pressures for families trying to make ends meet. In fact, all workers throughout the country will find it more difficult to challenge any discrimination in the workplace because of the Court's decision.

Yesterday, I introduced the Equal Employment Opportunity Restoration Act, a thoughtful, careful, and effective legislative response to this flawed Supreme Court decision. It restores the rights of groups of plaintiffs to pursue

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.

H3917

actions against employment discrimination.

We need to see discrimination in the workplace addressed. We have to protect employees' rights to bring suit together. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. Help restore the legal rights of ordinary citizens over corporations.

FIX HEALTH CARE THE RIGHT WAY

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, next week the Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of President Obama's health care law.

While we don't yet know the outcome, there are things that we do know. We know that no matter what happens, you'll still be able to see your doctor, the emergency room will still treat you if you're in an accident or have a problem, and the pharmacy down the street will fill your prescription.

We know that the American people don't want government bureaucrats making their health care decisions, but they do want us to address real problems like skyrocketing costs of care or the challenges that many people are having of finding a physician.

We all know this law must be repealed. In its place, we must adopt reforms that will lower the cost of care, increase access, and enhance the quality. This must be done in a transparent, bipartisan way.

No matter what the Court determines, our work here has just begun. As representatives of the American people, we have a responsibility to fix health care in the right way.

BUSINESSES NEED STABILITY

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I come from an energy State, a State that has done hydraulic fracking since the 1940s. It is a State that has beautiful lands, clean air, and clean water.

But energy requires a tremendous amount of capital, and so it needs consistency in its laws and its regulations. In this day and age, that's a problem apparently because Federal regulations continue to change.

It shouldn't be an issue. We're a Nation of laws, not a Nation of leaders. As a Nation of laws, we center around what is consistent and stable so business can invest. When that is destabilized, no one knows what to do, no one knows how to invest, and jobs don't grow.

Let me just give you a few examples. The recess appointments done by this President just a few months ago destabilized the NLRB and CFPB. The Boeing rule that was put down just 2 years

ago now by the NLRB telling Boeing where they can and can't build. The immigration laws that are coming out right now begin to destabilize because no one knows when the law is going to be enforced and when it's not going to be enforced, and who gets a waiver and who doesn't. The Defense of Marriage Act that now is not going to be enforced anymore by this administration. The HHS decision that comes down and tells a religious group what they can practice as their doctrine and what they can't practice. And then yesterday, a requirement for executive privilege based on Fast and Furious.

The Missouri Senate has experienced this. *Hosanna Tabor v. EEOC* was a 9-0 Supreme Court ruling, kicking out the Obama administration trying to redefine what is a minister. It is time for stable regulations, stable rules, and the law to come around to Congress again.

EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE AND FAST AND FURIOUS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the government continues to hide the evidence of the Fast and Furious gun running scheme.

The attorney general says he doesn't know who authorized this reckless and deadly operation, but he still conceals documents to show what occurred. The President claims he was not involved, but minutes before Congress began the process to hold the Attorney General in contempt, the President—"the leader of the most transparent administration in history"—desperately asserted executive privilege to withhold the documents from Congress.

According to *The Washington Times*, when the President was a Senator, he said this about the previous administration:

There has been a tendency on the part of the administration to try to hide behind executive privilege every time there is something a little shaky taking place. I think the administration would best be served by coming clean on this. There doesn't seem to be any national security involved.

Mr. Speaker, that was then, and this is now. And this President conveniently does exactly what he criticized others for doing.

So the saga of the Republic continues, and that's just the way it is.

□ 0910

AMERICA'S HIGHWAY AND TRANSIT PROGRAMS

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, unless we act now, the highway and transit programs will expire in a few days, endangering our roads, bridges, transit

systems; and everyone who uses them will experience a decline in what they view as America.

So I would like to list the reasons we need to move quickly to pass a highway bill that is not simply an extension. One, we must raise America's standing in the world of infrastructure from 24th place to first. Three months ago, the Senate passed a responsible, bipartisan 2-year transportation bill that would save or create 2 million jobs. We have 2.2 million construction and manufacturing workers out of work; \$1,060 is how much we could save each family in transportation costs if we could come to an agreement. H.R. 7 was called by my friend Secretary LaHood "the most partisan transportation bill that (he had) ever seen, the worst transportation bill."

Mr. Speaker, I have more points. I will try to get them in later.

DOMESTIC ENERGY AND JOBS ACT GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4480.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROE of Tennessee). Pursuant to House Resolution 691 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. 4480.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) kindly take the chair.

□ 0911

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. 4480) to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas exploration, development, and production under oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in response to a drawdown of petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, with Mr. POE of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 20, 2012, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 112-540 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 112-540.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE _____—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
SEC. _____1. ELIGIBILITY FOR NEW LEASES AND
THE TRANSFER OF LEASES.

(a) ISSUANCE OF NEW LEASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall not offer new leases under a plan required by subsection (k) of section 161 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, as amended by section 102 of this Act, to a person described in paragraph (2) unless the person has renegotiated each covered lease with respect to which the person is a lessee, to modify the payment responsibilities of the person to require the payment of royalties if the price of oil and natural gas is greater than or equal to the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

(2) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—A person referred to in paragraph (1) is a person that—

(A) is a lessee that—

(i) holds a covered lease on the date on which the Secretary considers the issuance of the new lease; or

(ii) was issued a covered lease before the date of enactment of this Act, but transferred the covered lease to another person or entity (including a subsidiary or affiliate of the lessee) after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) any other person that has any direct or indirect interest in, or that derives any benefit from, a covered lease.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED LEASE.—The term “covered lease” means a lease for oil or gas production in the Gulf of Mexico that is—

(A) in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) issued by the Department of the Interior under section 304 of the Outer Continental Shelf Deep Water Royalty Relief Act (43 U.S.C. 1337 note; Public Law 104–58); and

(C) not subject to limitations on royalty relief based on market price that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

(2) LESSEE.—The term “lessee” includes any person or other entity that controls, is controlled by, or is in or under common control with, a lessee.

(3) NEW LEASE.—The term “new lease” means a lease issued in a lease sale under this Act, the amendments made by this Act, or any plan, strategy, or program under this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 691, 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. Mr. Chair, much of this bill deals with new giveaways to Big Oil. The issue that I'm raising right now is to deal with a continuing long-standing giveaway.

The Big Five oil companies made a record profit of \$137 billion last year; and in the first quarter of this year, they continued to capitalize on the pain that Americans are feeling at the pump, raking in \$368 million in profits per day.

Oil companies are not paying any royalties to the American people on oil produced in the Gulf of Mexico from leases issued between 1996 and 2000. Zero. No royalties. They're pumping

this oil for free without paying the taxpayers a single dime. Now they got this giveaway because of an incentive back in 1995 to companies to drill for oil when oil was selling for less than \$20 a barrel.

In recent years, the amount of free oil these companies have been pumping has gone through the roof as more of these faulty leases have gone into production. In fact, right now, more than 25 percent of all oil produced offshore on Federal lands is produced royalty-free, no payments to the taxpayers for the use of their land. These oil companies are getting a complete windfall on 25 percent of all the oil they produce offshore in the United States. They do not pay the American people one penny for this right, regardless of the fact that now oil is selling at about \$80 a barrel.

The number one entitlement program that should be on the chopping block for Congress shouldn't be Medicare. It shouldn't be Social Security. It shouldn't be health care for children. It should be the free drilling entitlement that oil companies are enjoying on public lands.

According to the Interior Department, American taxpayers stand to lose about \$9.5 billion over the next 10 years from this giveaway alone, this giveaway to Big Oil. The Government Accountability Office projects that all of this free drilling will cost us as much as \$53 billion over the life of these leases. My amendment would recover those revenues because they belong to the American people. These oil giants already receive \$4 billion a year in tax subsidies. They don't need an additional \$1 billion or more per year in free drilling.

The amendment would offer oil companies a choice: they can choose either to continue to produce royalty-free oil in the gulf but not be able to receive new leases, or they can agree to pay their fair share and be able to bid on new leases under this bill. And this amendment would not force companies to give up their leases. It would just simply impose a condition on future leases.

The Congressional Research Service has agreed repeatedly that this amendment would not be an abrogation of contracts or constitute a takings, as some of my colleagues have suggested it might. As CRS has stated:

As a general matter, the United States has broad discretion in setting the qualifications of those with whom it contracts.

These oil companies are the most profitable companies in the history of the world; yet they receive, as I said—and it's worth repeating—\$4 billion a year in taxpayer subsidies. They don't need to be drilling for free on public lands as well.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are serious about paying down the deficit and realistically financing necessary investments in this Nation, then there is no excuse for not supporting this amendment to recover

roughly \$1 billion a year that is rightfully owed to the American people.

It's time to end this taxpayer rip-off, this giveaway to Big Oil.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Well, I respect the relationship that I have with my friend and colleague from New Jersey. I appreciate the fact that Mr. HOLT is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources. I appreciate the fact that he came to Denver recently for a field hearing that the subcommittee had on hydraulic fracking.

So I do appreciate the work he does on the subcommittee, but I have to disagree with him on this amendment. And I would urge opposition to this amendment.

It's identical to one that failed on this House floor by a bipartisan vote earlier this year in February. And I have to remind my friend and colleague that this issue has been repeatedly settled in the Nation's courts of law with the courts determining that rewriting the terms of these leases to include price thresholds, which the Clinton administration apparently forgot to include in the leases, would be a direct violation of contract law.

Specifically, the U.S. Supreme Court found that the Department of the Interior did not have the authority to rewrite these contracts that were issued during the Clinton administration under the 1995 law. And I will also remind the gentleman that the Department of the Interior has lost this issue in the district court, appellate court, and the Supreme Court.

□ 0920

If this amendment passed, the issue would most certainly be challenged once again in court, where the Department would use taxpayer dollars to lose again.

Ultimately, this amendment seeks to force U.S. companies to break a contract negotiated under then-current government law or else be denied the opportunity to do business in the United States. The amendment aims to back companies into a corner and attempts to force them to break a legally binding contract.

Again, this amendment has failed on the House floor before, and I would urge continued opposition and a “no” vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Chair, this amendment breaks no contracts. We are here because the Congress, well over a decade ago when prices were less than \$20 a barrel, decided this giveaway made sense. If it

made sense then, it certainly does not make sense now.

Oil companies drill one-quarter of all offshore oil for free. If the other side is serious about addressing the deficit, this is revenue that should be received.

Please support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would urge opposition once again to this amendment, as we have done before in the House, and I would urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. WITTMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in House Report 112-540.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE —ADVANCING OFFSHORE WIND PRODUCTION

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Advancing Offshore Wind Production Act".

SEC. 2. OFFSHORE METEOROLOGICAL SITE TESTING AND MONITORING PROJECTS.

(a) DEFINITION OF AN OFFSHORE METEOROLOGICAL SITE TESTING AND MONITORING PROJECT.—In this section, the term "offshore meteorological site testing and monitoring project" means a project carried out on or in the waters of the Outer Continental Shelf administered by the Department of the Interior to test or monitor weather (including wind, tidal, current, and solar energy) using towers, buoys, or other temporary ocean infrastructure, that—

(1) causes—

(A) less than 1 acre of surface or seafloor disruption at the location of each meteorological tower or other device; and

(B) not more than 5 acres of surface or seafloor disruption within the proposed area affected by for the project (including hazards to navigation);

(2) is decommissioned not more than 5 years after the date of commencement of the project, including—

(A) removal of towers, buoys, or other temporary ocean infrastructure from the project site; and

(B) restoration of the project site to approximately the original condition of the site; and

(3) provides meteorological information obtained by the project to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) OFFSHORE METEOROLOGICAL PROJECT PERMITTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall by regulation require that any applicant seeking to conduct an offshore mete-

orological site testing and monitoring project on the outer Continental Shelf (as that term is defined in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.)) must obtain a permit and right of way for the project in accordance with this subsection.

(2) PERMIT AND RIGHT OF WAY TIMELINE AND CONDITIONS.—

(A) DEADLINE FOR APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall decide whether to issue a permit and right of way for an offshore meteorological site testing and monitoring project within 30 days after receiving an application.

(B) PUBLIC COMMENT AND CONSULTATION.—During the period referred to in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

(i) provide an opportunity for submission of comments by the public; and

(ii) consult with the Secretary of Defense, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and the heads of other Federal, State, and local agencies that would be affected by issuance of the permit and right of way.

(C) DENIAL OF PERMIT; OPPORTUNITY TO REMEDY DEFICIENCIES.—If the application is denied, the Secretary shall provide the applicant—

(i) in writing, clear and comprehensive reasons why the application was not approved and detailed information concerning any deficiencies in the application; and

(ii) an opportunity to remedy such deficiencies.

(c) NEPA EXCLUSION.—Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) shall not apply with respect to an offshore meteorological site testing and monitoring project.

(d) PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—The information provided to the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to subsection (a)(3) shall be treated by the Secretary as proprietary information and protected against disclosure.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 691, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Chairman, today, the House is taking an independent and important step forward to develop domestic sources of energy, create American jobs, and reduce our reliance on foreign sources of energy. And I'm a strong proponent of an all-of-the-above energy policy.

As a scientist by trade, I understand the need to achieve a balance to foster development of American energy while at the same time protecting the integrity of our environment. We can achieve efficiency and protection, and this bill helps us achieve both goals.

Offshore wind energy is an important component, furthering development of clean, renewable American energy sources. Unfortunately, the process is often unnecessarily slowed for years by bureaucratic hurdles in the permitting process and numerous other delays. The Cape Wind project in Massachusetts only recently received Federal permitting approval, a process 10 years in the making.

The U.S. built the Hoover Dam in 5 years during the height of the Great Depression. Within a decade of President Kennedy's call to put a man on

the Moon, the U.S. had won the space race. Americans have proven that we can accomplish great engineering and technical feats in small periods of time. However, today it's frustrating that this administration cannot point to one wind turbine operating offshore in Federal waters. They can, however, point to layer after layer after layer of regulations, bureaucracy, and red tape.

While it is critical that energy development is safe and environmentally friendly, the process must become more efficient. This amendment facilitates the development of an all-of-the-above energy strategy by streamlining the process for the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to develop offshore wind power.

My amendment will speed the production of wind energy, as it sets a 30-day time line for the Secretary of the Interior to act on permits for all weather testing and monitoring projects in the United States Outer Continental Shelf. This amendment will also streamline the environmental review process for these small wind testing towers.

This amendment also requires coordination with the Department of Defense and other affected agencies so the projects do not disrupt national security or other critical projects. This provision is especially important for the Commonwealth of Virginia, with its active defense community.

This amendment is identical to H.R. 2137, legislation I authored that passed out of the House Natural Resources Committee last July. This effort has been endorsed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Ocean Industries Association.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment creates a brand-new, burdensome permitting scheme that would complicate the process for obtaining a permit to construct a meteorological tower offshore and undermine offshore wind development. Let me say that again. This will actually make it harder to build an offshore wind project, not easier.

This amendment is similar to H.R. 2173, which was reported out of the Natural Resources Committee last year. When moving this bill through committee, the Republican majority was unable to find a single wind industry witness to come to testify on this bill, and that is because the industry that the majority is trying to help with this bill doesn't think that the measure is helpful.

So the wind industry does not support this bill. I'll just make that clear, if you are interested in helping an industry to grow. The bill has not been endorsed by any offshore wind companies or trade groups and those kinds of

companies that have popped up all over the country now. None of those companies are endorsing this bill.

I'm going to read a statement that is part of the legislative hearing record on this amendment. It is from Jim Lanard, the president of the Offshore Wind Development Coalition. Here's what he says on behalf of the coalition: Streamlining approvals of towers or buoys to test wind speeds offshore is an important goal. We believe that NEPA will allow this goal to be achieved.

So NEPA clearly is not the enemy here. But in case there is still doubt, he says: Disregarding the bill's NEPA exclusion, we believe—this is, again, Mr. Lanard speaking for the Offshore Wind Development Coalition—we believe that current practices are adequate for the approval of these towers or buoys.

This bill represents a fundamental misunderstanding of what the offshore wind industry really needs. A company is simply not going to invest millions of dollars engineering and constructing a huge meteorological tower on the Outer Continental Shelf unless they have a guarantee that they'll be able to use that area to build a wind farm.

To be very clear, the industry wants a lease before they invest millions of dollars into a project. To get a lease, we should and we do require consideration of the impacts of development on the environment and the competing uses of these public waters. We should and we do require coordination with the other agencies using the Outer Continental Shelf, like the Navy, the FAA and FCC. This amendment would dismantle that process.

This amendment says sorry, wind industry. You may have sunk millions of dollars into your meteorological tower, but it's time to tear it down. We let you build it without fully considering the impacts. And no wind farm either.

Plain and simple, this bill certainly reduces the likelihood that we will see wind constructed off the shores of our country. The companies affected by this bill were not consulted before creating it.

I have a document here from the Navy commenting on this bill. Essentially, it says the 30-day limit on consultations in the amendment is problematic. The Federal Aviation Administration has expressed similar concerns. The Federal Communications Commission has expressed similar concerns. This bill will make it harder to construct offshore wind projects, and maybe—and I think this is what it's all about—that's the point after all.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to my colleague, Representative MARKEY, that this administration has not yet seen

the completion of a single wind tower off the shore of the United States in over 3 years. Not a single one. This is a sincere and genuine attempt to cut through some of the red tape that's causing this kind of delay. How in the world can you have less red tape being bad for the construction of wind towers? This is truly a good solution. I applaud this legislation.

Representative WITTMAN has offered a bill that embodies the same concept that passed the committee by a bipartisan vote earlier this year. This is a good bill, a good amendment from that bill, and I would urge its adoption.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is that President Bush's Interior Department sat on offshore wind regulations for 4 years. Do you want to hear that again? President Bush's Interior Department sat on offshore wind regulations for 4 years. Did not promulgate them. President Obama got them done in his first 6 months. The Obama administration passionately believes in new wind. In fact, there's 35,000 new megawatts onshore, and they desperately want it offshore as well, and the process is working.

We agree that during the Bush years, the Cape wind process did not work, but there were no rules that were promulgated. Obama did it. The project is now approved for Cape wind, and it should move forward. There's nothing wrong with the process, and I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind folks that this bill does accommodate concerns that may be raised by the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies to make sure that all those thoughts and ideas are put into place in considering this permitting process. But it streamlines it. That's a simple, thoughtful process that gets to the point much quicker. So instead of taking 3 years to permit a tower, now it goes to 30 days. It seems to me it's counterintuitive to say that longer is better. In this case, since there are no active mills, windmills offshore, wind turbines offshore, it seems to me that we ought to quicken the process. This clearly does, yet it allows for proper due diligence, proper consideration of all of the different concerns. And this amendment, indeed, facilitates the development of an all-of-the-above energy strategy by streamlining the process with the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to develop offshore wind power and also to support good-paying American jobs. Let's not forget about that.

I urge my colleagues to accept this amendment and expedite offshore wind energy development, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. WESTMORELAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in House Report 112-540.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE VIII—SERVICE OVER THE COUNTER, SELF-CONTAINED, MEDIUM TEMPERATURE COMMERCIAL REFRIGERATORS

SEC. 801. SERVICE OVER THE COUNTER, SELF-CONTAINED, MEDIUM TEMPERATURE COMMERCIAL REFRIGERATORS.

Section 342(c) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6313(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—
(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) The term ‘(SOC-SC-M)’ means a medium temperature commercial refrigerator—

“(i) with a self-contained condensing unit and equipped with sliding or hinged doors in the back intended for use by sales personnel, and with glass or other transparent material in the front for displaying merchandise; and

“(ii) that has a height not greater than 66 inches and is intended to serve as a counter for transactions between sales personnel and customers.

“(C) The term ‘TDA’ means the total display area (ft²) of the refrigerated case, as defined in Air-Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute Standard 1200.”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) Each SOC-SC-M manufactured on or after the date which is 6 months after the date of enactment of the Better Use of Refrigerator Regulations Act shall have a total daily energy consumption (in kilowatt hours per day) of not more than 0.6 x TDA + 1.0.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 691, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my bipartisan amendment to H.R. 4480 with my colleague from Iowa (Mr. BRALEY).

Like this legislation, the amendment we offer today would ease expensive and burdensome energy regulations and help save American jobs.

By placing service-over-the-counter refrigerator units—which is a fancy

way of saying refrigerated display cases like you see in grocery stores and delis—into their own product classification, we can remove a burdensome regulation that could put this entire industry out of business.

Currently, these deli display cases are in the same classification as commercial reach-in refrigerators, similar to those you have in your home. This means that they must also meet the energy efficiency standards of those refrigerators. But that doesn't make any sense. These two types of refrigerators are designed for completely different purposes. Your refrigerator at home is only opened so many times. It has a light that comes on only when you open the door. These display cases are well lit. There's a lot of glass, which makes it harder to keep the energy efficiency at the same level as a reach-in refrigerator. And if you don't want to reach in and grab your popsicle and just come up with a stick, we need to put this in a totally different classification.

In my district, it's going to mean the cost of about 1,100 jobs. Across the United States, it's about 8,500 jobs that would be lost if these people are put out of business. As this bill does and as this amendment does, we think that it helps save jobs.

So with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Westmoreland amendment.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Let's just get to the heart of the question of energy efficiency. Back in 1987, I was the author of the Appliance Efficiency Act of 1987, which is the constitution for energy efficiency in the appliance field. Since that time, the efficiency of appliances has increased so dramatically that we have reduced the need for between 100 and 150 new coal-fired plants from ever having to be constructed in the United States. Why is that? Well, electricity that is not consumed results in less need for new coal-fired or any kind of fired electricity, saving the consumers, saving the environment, and just working smarter, not harder. If you can keep the popsicle cool with a more efficient refrigeration process, if you can have the toast pop up with a more efficient toasting process, if you can have every one of the appliances that we use, including the air-conditioning in this room—the air-conditioning in this room is just as good as it was in 1987 but it is 50 percent more efficient in its generating capacity than it was in 1987. That reduces the need to generate new electricity that is needed. That saves money, and it saves on environmental damage as well.

So right now we're about to consider something that deals with deli-style refrigerators. Now, we're having this conversation having had no hearings on this issue in the Energy and Commerce

Committee. We've had no testimony from the industry, no testimony from the Department of Energy on what this amendment could mean in terms of its impact. And we've had no evidence of an incapacity to be able to comply with these rules except for the fact that no one ever wants to necessarily become more efficient if they have to go through the extra effort and have never been required to do so.

□ 0940

The reason that we have these energy efficiency rules is that we're doing it for the betterment of the whole country and moving industries along, making sure that we do not have to produce this additional new electricity.

So, I think that it's better if we save money and save energy at the same time. That's what efficiency is all about. That's what working smarter, not harder is all about. The evidence is clear, since 1987, that we've done it. We've moved every other device along and made it more efficient, so I just don't know the reason why we would need a provision like this.

At this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, sometimes up here we have people that think they know more than the industry. This industry has jobs, it employs people, and they're trying to do the best they can with their technology. But we can't be up here and tell industry what's best for them if we don't know anything about refrigeration or the energy efficiencies that they're trying to do.

These folks are trying to do the right thing. They are trying to do it to the best of their ability, but with these regulations, they're unable to do it right now. All we're asking for is to save 8,500 jobs across this country. And with unemployment in Georgia above the national average, it's 1,100 jobs just in Georgia. So I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this amendment, and let's save 8,500 jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself, again, as much time as I may consume.

You know, this is just a continuation of the Republican obsession and opposition—obstinate, obdurate opposition—to increased efficiency in our society. Just a couple weeks ago they brought a bill out here on the floor that would roll back the efficiency of light bulbs in the United States, even though the entire industry has already complied with it. They were still trying to roll back the efficiency of light bulbs. Now we have the deli freezer, and we'll move on to product by product that they don't believe it is necessary to improve its efficiency whatsoever. And they just respond one by one almost to an incomprehensible set of demands made by, as yet, nonexistent experts telling us that it's impossible to comply.

So, why don't we have a hearing? Why don't we get the evidence? Why

don't we hear what every company in the United States says about deli freezers and then we can act upon it after we hear the evidence? But acting this way—you know, "congressional expert" is an oxymoron. We're not experts compared to real experts. We're only experts compared to other Congressmen. "Congressional expert" is an oxymoron, like jumbo shrimp or Salt Lake City nightlife. I mean, there is no such thing as a congressional expert. We should not be acting this way on the House floor trying to make ad hoc changes in efficiencies rules. It just doesn't make any sense.

Again, I oppose the way in which this is occurring, and I urge a "no" vote on the Westmoreland amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MS. BASS OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in House Report 112-540.

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 10, strike "The Committee" and insert the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee

Page 8, after line 13, insert the following:

(2) ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS.—The Committee shall conduct an analysis of how to shield American consumers and the United States economy from gasoline price fluctuations and supply disruptions in the oil market by reducing the dependence of the United States on oil.

Page 8, line 15, strike "analysis conducted under this section" and insert "analysis conducted under subsection (a)(1)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 691, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Chairman, my Los Angeles district is home to one of the largest urban oilfields in the United States, the Inglewood Oil Field. My constituents suffer from anxiety and stress because of the oil drilling. In 2006, drilling operations were ramped up, and the release of harmful fumes forced nearby residents to evacuate their homes.

In April 2012, the County of Los Angeles conducted a study in which over 70 percent of residents living near the oilfields expressed concerns about exposure to emissions from the oilfield. Meanwhile, my colleagues, unfortunately, on the other side of the aisle continue to push for more domestic drilling and relaxed regulations.

The bill before us today is based on two claims that appear to have become articles of faith. The claims are that

gas prices will fall if we weaken environmental protections and if we open more areas for drilling in the United States. The problem is that there is no empirical evidence supporting these claims. Oil prices are set on a world market, and no amount of domestic drilling in the United States will have a meaningful impact on that price. This isn't spin from some interest groups; this is the conclusion drawn by experts. It has been corroborated by the Associated Press and the Congressional Budget Office.

The AP conducted a thorough study of gasoline prices and U.S. oil production over the last 36 years and found zero correlation between the two. In other words, changes in U.S. oil production had absolutely no effect on gasoline prices, but that doesn't mean there's nothing we can do to help American families burdened by high fuel costs.

CBO recently released a study on energy security. They found that boosting U.S. oil production will not protect Americans from gasoline price spikes. Instead, CBO found that the only way to protect consumers from these spikes is to use less oil. The reason for this is simple: Gasoline prices are linked to the global oil market. That's why Japan, which imports all of its oil it uses, and Canada, which exports more than 75 percent of the oil it produces, experience the very same gasoline spikes we experience.

The best way to save money at the pump is to drive right past it. The Obama administration has been helping consumers do just that. We know that efficiency works to reduce cost. The Energy Information Administration has found that the cost per mile of driving has fallen by more than 25 percent since 1980 due to improvements in the efficiency of our vehicles.

President Obama has already taken action to reduce costs further. The new vehicle efficiency and greenhouse gas standards for model years 2012–2016 will save consumers, on average, over \$3,000 over the life of a vehicle, which is hundreds of dollars per year. The millions of Americans that have bought model year 2012 cars are already enjoying savings at the pump. In fact, the new standards are currently saving consumers 14 cents per gallon.

Furthermore, the energy efficiency sector is a booming job-creating field. In my district, CODA Automotive, an electric car company, recently opened their new headquarters. In a few short months last year they created 300 new jobs, and hundreds more will be created in the coming years. This is the type of job creation and cost savings that we should be focused on.

My amendment simply improves the bill by adding a provision that actually has something to do with gasoline prices. This amendment would require the newly created Interagency Committee to analyze how to protect American consumers from gasoline price spikes by reducing America's dependence on oil.

I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing that efficiency works and must be part of the solution. If not, this legislation will continue to ignore the only approach identified by CBO as helpful in protecting consumers from supply disruption and price spikes.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GARDNER. I have great respect for the gentlelady from California who joined this Congress in the class of 2010 election and served as Speaker of the House in California. It's great to work with you on the House floor, but unfortunately I am going to have to oppose the amendment.

The best way to reduce our dependence on foreign oil is to increase our energy opportunities right here in our own backyard. That's what the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act is all about. The components and pieces, the seven parts of this bill, are designed to reduce red tape to increase opportunity for American energy production—those productions occurring on our Federal lands, including renewable energy; the opportunity to create wind energy, solar energy on our Federal lands, making sure the Department of the Interior is planning for that, taking a look at.

But, again, the best way to reduce our reliance on oil imports is domestic production, the opportunity to increase that production right here in our own backyard. That's what this bill is about.

□ 0950

It's about creating jobs and opportunity for the American people. It's about making sure that we can reduce the price at the pump.

And let me talk just a little bit about reducing the price at the pump. The gentlelady from California mentioned the issue of CAFE standards, increasing efficiency in cars. Well, you know, you're only going to achieve those higher efficiencies through CAFE standards if you're able to afford a new car.

But we know that that is going to make cars more expensive. It's going to cost \$1,000 in the near term. It's going to add \$3,000 by 2025 to the cost of a vehicle. That's going to be higher if you talk to the National Automobile Dealers Association, the NADA.

So if you're not struggling under the burden of higher gas prices, then I guess you can afford a new car. Maybe you can, I don't know. But the fact is, if we continue to allow energy increases to increase nearly 100 percent, as they have over the past 3 years, the American people, our constituents, will be priced out of the ability to even contemplate the purchase of a new vehicle, continuing their struggle to make ends

meet, to heat and cool their home because of the cost of energy prices.

We know that we have opportunities right here in our own back yard: the Keystone XL pipeline, North American energy, energy from the Bakken oil fields of North Dakota. The cause of gasoline price fluctuation is already known.

The gentlelady from California mentioned the CBO study. The CBO study talks about demand as a factor in price, but seems to neglect that there is no supply connection. Supply matters. Supply and demand matters.

Let's take a look at natural gas. Production of natural gas right now, the price is at low levels because we have almost a glut of natural gas. As a result, the price of natural gas is low. Supply matters.

Secretary Chu testified before the Energy and Commerce Committee that supply matters. It's not just a demand equation. You can't just turned around and say as more people consume oil that increases the price of oil without taking a look at the other part of the equation: supply. More supply. Secretary Chu said so.

With that, Mr. Chairman, the best way to reduce our reliance on foreign imports is to create American jobs with American energy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BASS of California. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. I urge opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

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

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Chair understands that amendment No. 22 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in House Report 112-540.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. It is No. 23.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, after line 9, at the end of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 207. ENSURING FEASIBLE ANALYSES.

(a) DETERMINATION OF FEASIBILITY OF ANALYSES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, if the Secretary of Energy determines that the analyses required under section 203 are infeasible to conduct, require data that does not exist, or would generate results subject to such large estimates of uncertainty that the results would be neither reliable nor useful, the requirements under section 203(a) shall cease to be effective.

(b) NO REPORT OR DELAY OF FINAL ACTION ON CERTAIN RULES IF ANALYSES ARE INFEASIBLE.—If, pursuant to subsection (a), the requirements under section 203(a) cease to be effective, then the requirements under sections 204 and 205 shall cease to be effective.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 691, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that we can all simply agree to this amendment.

Among this bill's many provisions is one that creates a new interagency committee to do the impossible. It is charged with conducting an analysis of the EPA air quality rules that have not been proposed, using data that does not even exist. I'm concerned that this new interagency committee is being set up to fail.

First, the bill before us requires the new committee to examine the potential impact of several EPA air quality rules on gasoline prices. There's one significant problem. These rules have not yet been proposed.

Now, we can argue about whether they have been initiated, contemplated, discussed, mulled over, considered and so forth. But the fundamental fact is that the rules and their requirements have not even yet been proposed. The committee simply has nothing concrete to analyze.

As a result, any report that this new interagency committee would complete would be the product of a series of best guesses, estimates, approximations, and assumptions that cannot possibly provide credible assessment of a potential impact of these potential rules on gasoline prices.

Moreover, it may not even be possible for the interagency committee to complete this analysis, as insufficient as it will be, without a significant investment of resources at the Department of Energy.

We asked the Energy Information Administration what it would take to complete such an analysis. EIA, which is better positioned than any other government agency to tackle this project, said that it currently does not have the analytic capability even to conduct the State or regional level breakdowns required by such a bill.

The agency also would have to collect or purchase new data, despite the bill's hollow assurances that this isn't necessary. And the Department of Energy would have to devote significant new staff and contractor time to be able to comply with the bill's requirements. In essence, this bill proposes to devote scarce taxpayer dollars to produce a report that will not be reliable, credible, or even valuable to anyone.

My amendment simply states that if the Energy Department determines

that that analysis is not feasible to conduct, requires data that does not exist, or generates results that would not be reliable or useful, then the interagency committee does not have to complete the report. If it determined that such an analysis is infeasible, the 6-month delay of EPA rules then would not go into effect.

This amendment is a good-governance amendment that ensures effective use of taxpayer dollars. It's common sense.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I've enjoyed serving on the committee with the gentlelady from California, but I must oppose the amendment.

Talking about the process that we're going through on regulations, you know, this is the very heart of the bill, to understand the cost feasibility, what pressures regulations can put on the price of energy, the price of gasoline, and whether or not these regulations are going to cause price increases.

In fact, we know very well that they are going to cause price increases because we've had testimony from the Environmental Protection Agency admitting that some of these regulations, proposed regulations that they have on the books, or that they have promulgated contemplating will increase the price of gasoline and other prices in other energy areas.

These have real effects on consumers. In fact, if you just increase the price of gasoline by a penny a gallon, it will increase the daily cost to the American consumers and businesses millions and millions of dollars each and every day, one penny a gallon costing our economy millions and millions of dollars a day.

And so with this we're trying to actually say let's take a look at it to understand. We're not stopping them from going forward with their plans or developing rules. Certainly, we want to encourage the protection of our environment and make sure they're doing their job to protect our environment.

But we also need to have our eyes open and make sure that we have a chance to look before we leap when it comes to these regulations.

Delving down into the EPA's own process, though, if you look at what happens under the regulatory process, the cumulative impact analyses are feasible and already required by President Clinton's Executive Order 12866 and President Obama's Executive Order 13563. As recently as March of this year, just a couple of months ago, the White House issued a memo reiterating that "agencies should take active steps to take account of the cumulative effects of new and existing rules."

The EPA's own action development process, the internal process of the

EPA, requires that the analysis start early in rule development. That doesn't say you wait until the rule is developed. It doesn't say you wait until it's all done, complete, out there. Early in the rule development process, action development process, taking a look at it.

This information's available. They've got the data. They've got the studies. It's time that they use that information to understand the impact that it will have on our constituents back home who are finding it increasingly difficult to balance the cost of energy with costs like paying for their home mortgage, putting food on the table. And that's why we have an opportunity, with this bill, to create American energy security and to create jobs in this country.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1000

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, so I am prepared to close.

Mr. Chairman, as we know and as my colleague from Colorado has just illustrated, the bill creates redundant layers of bureaucracy and requires a study of key air pollution standards that are not even yet proposed by the EPA. This is clearly designed to postpone pollution cleanup.

My amendment is a straightforward amendment which simply says if the Energy Department's analysis of the EPA's air quality rules is not feasible or not useful, we should not be spending taxpayer resources on it.

I would note again that these EPA air quality rules that would be analyzed aren't even on the books yet. We shouldn't be wasting agency time and resources on tasks like the ones proposed here. This amendment is one of common sense. It is straightforward and very simple. So I hope my colleagues will support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Again, analyzing rules is part of its job. That's part of the EPA's job. It's part of the DOE's job. The DOE has a budget in excess of \$26 billion. In fact, we found out just a couple of days ago that one program at the Department of Energy is costing \$1.2 million per job created. It has the resources to do it within existing funds. This isn't going to cost any new money. What it is going to do is to make sure that we're protecting the American consumers before cost increases occur. With that, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WESTMORELAND). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs).

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

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MS. HANABUSA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in House Report 112-540.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 17, strike "and" after the semicolon at line 2, strike the period at line 9 and insert "; and", and after line 9 insert the following:

"(G) the best estimate, based upon commercial and scientific data, of the expected increase in domestic production of geothermal, solar, wind, or other renewable energy sources on lands defined as 'available lands' by section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, and any other lands deemed by the Territory or State of Hawaii, as the case may be, to be included within that definition.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 691, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment adds to title III, the Quadrennial Strategic Federal Onshore Energy Production Strategy, by providing another subsection, G, which basically mirrors the language found in the prior section, which addresses the Indian tribal lands. This particular amendment includes in that the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act lands.

As you are probably well aware, Hawaii is in a unique situation in that, in 1920, this Congress created the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act; and there is a special body of land, 203,000 acres approximately, which is under the control of Congress. Congress approves whether or not things can be amended in the act. Even upon statehood, that right was retained.

As such, this amendment seeks to have all of the alternative and renewable energy sources, including geothermal, solar, wind, and other renewable energy sources and lands, defined as "available lands" under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act in the strategic review. We believe this is not expanding this. It has no implications other than the fact that there is a body of land which somehow has been forgotten and that falls under Federal jurisdiction.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to accept this amendment.

Native Hawaiian homelands are not managed as tribal lands by the Federal Government, which is why they were not included in the underlying legislation. However, Hawaiian homelands can provide another great source for domestic energy development; therefore, we are prepared to accept this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in House Report 112-540.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 22, strike lines 3 through 5.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 691, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chair, I rise to introduce an amendment to the Strategic Energy Production Act. This bill is being pitched as an all-of-the-above energy bill when, in reality, it is an oil-above-all bill, which is full of giveaways to big energy companies.

Title IV of H.R. 4480 would impose arbitrary deadlines on the Interior Department's review of applications for permits to drill for oil and gas onshore. After 60 days, if the Interior Department has not completed its review of an application to drill, the permit would be deemed "approved" regardless of whether the Department ensured that the drilling was safe.

My amendment is quite simple. It would just strike this unwise and unwarranted provision. First, a little context would be helpful.

The United States is in the middle of a great drilling boom. In fact, the Obama administration has issued more drilling permits in the last 3 years than were issued in the first 3 years of the Bush administration. A recent Citigroup report suggests that the U.S. is already the world's fastest-growing oil and natural gas producer. In counting the output from Canada and Mexico, North America is the "new Middle East." Meanwhile, the top five oil companies made \$137 billion in profits last year. They are reaping the benefits of this revival, and they are doing just fine.

Oil and gas companies are currently sitting on 6,700 approved—and I underscore "approved"—drilling permits that are not being used. Issuing more drilling permits more quickly is not the answer. What we should not be doing is tying the hands of Interior De-

partment regulators by imposing an artificial and arbitrary shot clock in approving these drilling permits, especially when the risks of safety problems remain high. In fact, oil companies are already committing scores of serious safety violations when drilling on public lands onshore.

According to a recent Natural Resources Committee report, more than 2,000 safety and drilling violations were issued to 335 companies drilling in 17 States between 1998 and 2011. Overall, the analysis shows that only a very small percentage of these violations ever receive fines. In fact, of all of the fines issued, it only generated \$273,000 out of the 2,000 violations.

Here is an example: on dozens of occasions, oil and gas companies began drilling on Federal lands without the formal approval to do so. Many violations were issued because companies failed to keep proper records or to conduct routine safety tests. Some significant ones include: in 2009, an operator in Mississippi was found operating a well without any blow-out preventer or any equivalent well-control equipment. In 2010, an inspector at a New Mexico well found that one of the valves in the blow-out preventer, which is responsible for mitigating excessive pressure and flow, was leaking.

We have many examples of when safety was not put first. Instead of preventing these sorts of safety violations, this bill puts profits first and safety and oversight last.

I am pleased that the majority has acknowledged the important role the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act play in the proper review of drilling permits and that it has included language to prevent permits from being deemed approved in cases where reviews under those laws are still ongoing after 60 days.

However, I think it is important for us to look at the unintended consequences. If this provision is enacted, it could actually lead to more applications for drilling permits being rejected because the Secretary may have no choice but to reject any application for a permit to drill that was nearing the 60-day time limit if the safety review were not completed.

□ 1010

The bottom line here is that the United States oil and gas production is at an all-time high.

Allowing for proper safety review of permits is a necessary safeguard for the American people, and this is a prudent step. Taxpayers deserve a process that ensures that any drilling on their public lands is held to commonsense safety standards. Let's not compromise the safety of drilling on public lands in a headstrong rush to give the oil and gas industry the free pass it demands.

I respectfully urge all my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I do oppose this amendment.

The legislation we're looking at today, H.R. 4480, aims to reduce bureaucracy and ensure much needed certainty to allow energy production and job creation to move forward. It will give permit applicants assurance that their permits will be processed by the government in a timely fashion and ensure that needless bureaucratic delays are not hampering energy production as they are sometimes today.

The Department of the Interior is plagued with delays in permitting energy projects on Federal lands. These delays result in developers abandoning Federal lands to develop energy only on private land. This hinders the creation of thousands of American jobs. This legislation simply requires that a decision on a drilling permit be made. It does not require an approval, but simply a decision. The government must answer "yes" or "no." It's not acceptable for the government to stall, drag its feet, or even not respond.

These are decisions that State agencies are making in days, while the BLM is taking months. This amendment, however, would delete this deadline for the government to provide an answer. Under this amendment, the Federal Government could literally take forever to respond. A deadline is absolutely necessary to give energy producers the confidence they need to seek out Federal land for development rather than seeking to exclusively develop on private land.

An identical amendment to the one offered by the gentlewoman from California failed during the Natural Resources Committee markup, and it failed on a bipartisan vote. So I would ask for the same response here, that we vote this amendment down. I urge its opposition.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in House Report 112-540.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE —MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
SEC. —. CERTAIN REVENUES GENERATED BY THIS ACT TO BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION TO LIMIT EXCESSIVE SPECULATION IN ENERGY MARKETS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF TREASURY ACCOUNT.—The Secretary of the Treasury (in this section referred to as the "Secretary") shall establish an account in the Treasury of the United States.

(b) DEPOSIT INTO ACCOUNT OF CERTAIN REVENUES GENERATED BY THIS ACT.—The Secretary shall deposit into the account established under subsection (a) the first \$128,000,000 of the total of the amounts received by the United States under leases issued under this Act, the amendments made by this Act, or any plan, strategy, or program under this Act.

(c) AVAILABILITY AND USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amounts in the account established under subsection (a) shall be made available to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to use its existing authorities to limit excessive speculation in energy markets.

(2) SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATIONS.—The authority provided in paragraph (1) may be exercised only to such extent, and with respect to such amounts, as are provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 691, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would restore full funding, per the President's request of \$308 million, to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. The additional \$128 million in funds would be raised through the sale of new leases.

The current funding level for CFTC sets the commission up for failure. If the current funding level remains as is, Wall Street will be able to continue the risky manipulation of derivatives that brought on the last collapse, and Big Oil will continue to enjoy inflated profits every year due to erratic and artificially swollen oil prices. The losers will be the American people, who will pay more at the pump, or even worse.

At this funding level, the House majority sets up taxpayers to pay for yet another costly bailout of Wall Street. Republican and Democratic experts agree that the CFTC needs to be fully funded. Republican Gene Guilford, President and CEO of the Independent Connecticut Petroleum Association, served in the Commerce and Energy Departments under Ronald Reagan. He has said that the funding level for CFTC is "horribly counterproductive." It would "weaken its ability to enforce the oversight laws necessary to protect the American people."

According to Brooksley Born, the former chair of the CFTC, the commission is "desperately in need of additional funding." This budget, she argues, "would leave us all vulnerable to future financial crises."

According to Gary Gensler, the current chairman of the CFTC, the agency is only 10 percent larger than it was in

the 1990s, even as the futures market has grown to approximately \$37 trillion notional.

And through the Dodd-Frank reforms, Congress has added oversight of the \$300 trillion swaps market, which is even more complex, and increased the number of trades under their jurisdiction by 334 percent in 2011.

Gensler says, "It is as if all of a sudden the National Football League expanded eight times to play more than 100 games in a weekend with the same amount of referees."

We know for a fact that the risky behavior in the derivatives market is what precipitated the 2008 financial meltdown. It's still happening. We have seen it at MF Global and J.P. Morgan. We also know for a fact that excessive speculation in oil markets causes gas prices to oscillate wildly. Even the CEO of Exxon has said as much.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to help to make sure that the CFTC has the resources to do its job, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, this bill is trying to deal with the rising prices of energy by addressing the very important issue of supply and demand. While I think there's nothing wrong with looking into the possibility of market manipulation, I do think this bill is trying to address another very important part of the price equation, and that is supply and demand.

This issue has been studied, and it will continue to be studied. But I'll remind the gentlelady that we're dealing with an agency that has over \$200 million already in its budget, and this amendment adding \$128 million would be a significant increase in funding for FY12 for the CFTC budget. So I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

If you would just look at what the CFTC has said, going back in 2008:

The task force's preliminary assessment is that current oil prices and the increase in oil prices between January 2003 and June 2008 are largely due to fundamental supply and demand factors.

In 2009:

We find little evidence that hedge funds and other noncommercial (speculator) position changes cause price changes; the results instead suggest that price changes do precede their position changes.

So we can go on and on about what the CFTC has already said, but this bill deals with the issue of supply and demand.

With that, I would yield 2 minutes to a great leader from the State of Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) who has done tremendous work on this issue over at the CFTC and in commodity issues.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am the chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management that does have oversight of the CFTC.

I expected the arguments for this particular amendment to go a different direction, but it does occur to me that we are chastised, those of us on authorizing committees, Mr. Chairman, during the appropriations process, that trying to write policy in the appropriations bills is not allowed. Well, this is appropriating in an authorizing bill. It makes no sense whatsoever.

The Subcommittee on Agriculture on the Appropriations Committee goes through these spending requests in detail, over and over, in a few weeks of committee work, and then they will come to their conclusion. They have, in fact, come to their conclusion, and they will bring this bill forward next week.

It's a bit presumptuous to come in here to ask this body to spend another \$128 million on an agency that the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture has already spent plenty of time deciding how much that agency needs to spend over the coming year.

I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. If I might just take a second to remind the gentleman from Texas that, in fact, this amendment was made in order. And in the body of the language, it does talk about it being subject to appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time we have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

□ 1020

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentlelady.

Back 10 years ago, about a third of all of the interest in the oil futures marketplace was controlled by speculators, but two-thirds was controlled by the airline industry, the trucking industry, industries that are dependent upon oil. Today it's just the flip. Today two-thirds of that oil futures marketplace is controlled by speculators, and only one-third is controlled by the airline industry, trucking industry, and others dependent upon the price of oil.

So what happened? What happens is, all of a sudden, you have this crazy volatility where experts say that upwards of 20 percent of the price of a barrel of oil in the futures marketplace is related to speculation. It's not related to anything in the real marketplace. And so what happens? Well, that has a dramatically negative impact on truckers, on the airline industry because there are games being played out there.

By the way, with the speculators, they make money on the way up and they make money on the way down. That's not true for ordinary companies because they're not in there playing a

game. They are not speculators. They are not doing this as part of some kind of a casino that speculators thrive in.

And here's the rule: On the way up, the big guy cleans up; on the way down, the little guy gets cleaned out. And that's what we're seeing over and over and over again.

So the President has asked to increase the number of cops on the beat, the CFTC cops on the beat that can patrol to make sure that the games that are being played don't hurt the little guy. And what are the Republicans saying? They're saying they want to cut the President's request for more cops on the beat sixfold. And what happens then? Well, we're going to be deep-sixing the hopes, the dreams, the aspirations of ordinary companies who are still going to see these games being played. The DeLauro amendment makes it possible to put the CFTC cops back on the beat.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, again, we have to understand that the best thing that this Congress can do to drive down the price of gasoline is increasing our supply opportunities right here, to drive down the cost of energy by increasing our production right here.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. We are not here as representatives of Wall Street, but we are representatives of the American people. We need the CFTC to oversee the risky behaviors to enforce the law. We are here to represent the American taxpayer, not Wall Street or big banks.

The current funding that's being pursued by the majority is reckless. I urge my colleagues to put Main Street over Wall Street and support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MS. BASS OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in House Report 112-540.

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentlewoman rise as the designee of the gentlewoman from Texas?

Ms. BASS of California. I do rise as the designee for the gentlewoman from Texas, Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE —OFFICE OF ENERGY EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING AND OFFICE OF MINORITY AND WOMEN INCLUSION

SEC. 01. ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF ENERGY EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall establish an Office of Energy Employment and Training, which shall oversee the efforts of the Department of the Interior's energy planning, permitting, and regulatory activities to carry out the purposes, objectives, and requirements of this Act.

(b) DIRECTOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Office shall be directed by an Assistant Secretary for Energy Employment and Training, who shall report directly to the Secretary and shall be fully employed to carry out the functions of the Office.

(2) DUTIES.—The Assistant Secretary for Energy Employment and Training shall perform the following functions:

(A) Develop and implement systems to track the Department's compliance with the purposes, objectives, and requirements of the Act.

(B) Report at least quarterly to the Secretary regarding the Department's compliance with the purposes, objectives, and requirements of this Act, including but not limited to specific data regarding the numbers and types of jobs created through the Department's efforts and a report on all job training programs planned or in progress by the Department.

(C) Design and recommend to the Secretary programs and policies aimed at ensuring the Department's compliance with the purposes, objectives, and requirements of this Act, and oversee implementation of such programs approved by the Secretary.

(D) Develop procedures for enforcement of the Department's requirements and responsibilities under this Act.

(E) Support the activities of the Office of Minority and Women Inclusion and any other offices or branches established by the Secretary within the Office of Energy Employment and Training.

SEC. 02. OFFICE OF MINORITY AND WOMEN INCLUSION.

(a) OFFICE OF MINORITY AND WOMEN INCLUSION.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall establish an Office of Minority and Women Inclusion not later than 6 months after the effective date of this Act, that shall be responsible for all matters of the Department of the Interior relating to diversity in management, employment, and business activities.

(2) TRANSFER OF RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Secretary of the Interior shall ensure that the responsibilities described in paragraph (1) (or comparable responsibilities) that are assigned to any other office, agency, or bureau of the Department on the day before the date of enactment of this Act are transferred to the Office of Minority and Women Inclusion.

(3) DUTIES WITH RESPECT TO CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS.—The responsibilities described in paragraph (1) do not include enforcement of statutes, regulations, or executive orders pertaining to civil rights, except each Director shall coordinate with the Secretary, or the designee of the Secretary, regarding the design and implementation of any remedies resulting from violations of such statutes, regulations, or executive orders.

(b) DIRECTOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Office shall have a Director who shall be appointed by, and shall report to, the Secretary of the Interior. The position of Director shall be a career reserved position in the Senior Executive Service, as that position is defined in section 3132 of title 5, United States Code, or an equivalent designation.

(2) DUTIES.—The Director shall develop standards for—

(A) equal employment opportunity and the racial, ethnic, and gender diversity of the workforce and senior management of the Department;

(B) increased participation of minority-owned and women-owned businesses in the programs and contracts of the Department, including standards for coordinating technical assistance to such businesses; and

(C) assessing the diversity policies and practices of entities regulated by the Department.

(3) OTHER DUTIES.—The Director shall advise the Secretary of the Interior on the impact of the policies and regulations of the Department on minority-owned and women-owned businesses.

(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (2)(C) may be construed to mandate any requirement on or otherwise affect the lending policies and practices of any regulated entity, or to require any specific action based on the findings of the assessment.

(C) INCLUSION IN ALL LEVELS OF BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall develop and implement standards and procedures to ensure, to the maximum extent possible, the fair inclusion and utilization of minorities, women, and minority-owned and women-owned businesses in all business and activities of the Department at all levels, including in procurement, insurance, and all types of contracts.

(2) CONTRACTS.—The procedures established by the Department for review and evaluation of contract proposals and for hiring service providers shall include, to the extent consistent with applicable law, a component that gives consideration to the diversity of the applicant. Such procedure shall include a written statement, in a form and with such content as the Director shall prescribe, that a contractor shall ensure, to the maximum extent possible, the fair inclusion of women and minorities in the workforce of the contractor and, as applicable, subcontractors.

(3) TERMINATION.—

(A) DETERMINATION.—The standards and procedures developed and implemented under this subsection shall include a procedure for the Director to make a determination whether a Department contractor, and, as applicable, a subcontractor has failed to make a good faith effort to include minorities and women in their workforce.

(B) EFFECT OF DETERMINATION.—

(i) RECOMMENDATION TO SECRETARY.—Upon a determination described in subparagraph (A), the Director shall make a recommendation to the Secretary that the contract be terminated.

(ii) ACTION BY SECRETARY.—Upon receipt of a recommendation under clause (i), the Secretary may—

(I) terminate the contract;

(II) make a referral to the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs of the Department of Labor; or

(III) take other appropriate action.

(d) REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress an annual report regarding the actions taken by the Department of the Interior agency and the Office pursuant to this section, which shall include—

(1) a statement of the total amounts paid by the Department to contractors since the previous report;

(2) the percentage of the amounts described in paragraph (1) that were paid to contractors described in subsection (c)(1);

(3) the successes achieved and challenges faced by the Department in operating minority and women outreach programs;

(4) the challenges the Department may face in hiring minority and women employees and contracting with minority-owned and women-owned businesses; and

(5) any other information, findings, conclusions, and recommendations for legislative or Department action, as the Director determines appropriate.

(e) DIVERSITY IN DEPARTMENT WORKFORCE.—The Secretary shall take affirmative steps to seek diversity in the workforce of the Department at all levels of the Department in a manner consistent with applicable law. Such steps shall include—

(1) recruiting at historically black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, women's colleges, and colleges that typically serve majority minority populations;

(2) sponsoring and recruiting at job fairs in urban communities;

(3) placing employment advertisements in newspapers and magazines oriented toward minorities and women;

(4) partnering with organizations that are focused on developing opportunities for minorities and women to be placed in energy industry internships, summer employment, and full-time positions;

(5) where feasible, partnering with inner-city high schools, girls' high schools, and high schools with majority minority populations to establish or enhance financial literacy programs and provide mentoring; and

(6) any other mass media communications that the Office determines necessary.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) MINORITY.—The term "minority" means United States citizens who are Asian Indian American, Asian Pacific American, Black American, Hispanic American, or Native American.

(2) MINORITY-OWNED BUSINESS.—The term "minority-owned business" means a for-profit enterprise, regardless of size, physically located in the United States or its trust territories, which is owned, operated, and controlled by minority group members. "Minority group members" are United States citizens who are Asian Indian American, Asian Pacific American, Black American, Hispanic American, or Native American (terminology in NMSDC categories). Ownership by minority individuals means the business is at least 51 percent owned by such individuals or, in the case of a publicly owned business, at least 51 percent of the stock is owned by one or more such individuals. Further, the management and daily operations are controlled by those minority group members. For purposes of NMSDC's program, a minority group member is an individual who is a United States citizen with at least ¼ or 25 percent minimum (documentation to support claim of 25 percent required from applicant) of one or more of the following:

(A) Asian Indian American, which is a United States citizen whose origins are from India, Pakistan, or Bangladesh.

(B) Asian Pacific American, which is a United States citizen whose origins are from Japan, China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Taiwan, Korea, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, the Philippines, Thailand, Samoa, the United States Trust Territories of the Pacific, or the Northern Marianas.

(C) Black American, which is a United States citizen having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa.

(D) Hispanic American, which is a United States citizen of true-born Hispanic heritage, from any of the Spanish-speaking areas of the following regions: Mexico, Central America, South America, and the Caribbean Basin only.

(E) Native American, which is a person who is an American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut or Native Hawaiian, and regarded as such by the community of which the person claims to be a part. Native Americans must be documented members of a North American tribe, band, or otherwise organized group of native people who are indigenous to the continental United States and proof can be provided through a Native.

(3) NMSDC.—The term "NMSDC" means the National Minority Supplier Development Council.

(4) OFFICE.—The term "Office" means the Office of Minority and Women Inclusion established under subsection (a).

(5) WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESS.—The term "women-owned business" means a business that can verify through evidence documentation that 51 percent or more is women-owned, managed, and controlled. The business must be open for at least 6 months. The business owner must be a United States citizen or legal resident alien. Evidence must indicate that—

(A) the contribution of capital or expertise by the woman business owner is real and substantial and in proportion to the interest owned;

(B) the woman business owner directs or causes the direction of management, policy, fiscal, and operational matters; and

(C) the woman business owner has the ability to perform in the area of specialty or expertise without reliance on either the finances or resources of a firm that is not owned by a woman.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 691, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as the designee to present Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE's amendment No. 27 to H.R. 4480, which would establish an Office of Energy Employment and Training as well as an Office of Minority and Women Inclusion that would be responsible for all matters relating to diversity in management, employment, and business activity.

This amendment simply recognizes the importance of developing a diverse and highly skilled technical workforce within the Department of the Interior. The Department of the Interior reviews permits, examines lease sales, and ensures that each application meets the highest safety standards. We should be focused on providing the Department of the Interior with trained technical engineers and other such necessary personnel to review drilling permit applications both carefully and thoroughly. Given the aftermath of the BP oil spill, it is easy to understand the importance of addressing all safety concerns prior to the issuance of oil and gas lease sales.

Since the disaster, Federal safety regulations have been tightened, spill

containment response capability has been enhanced, and lessons have been learned. These lessons must be understood by everyone involved in reviewing and approving each and every application for permits and lease sales. Responsible onshore drilling includes having our best minds working to carefully and diligently review each application. This amendment is intended to include both women and minorities in the process.

This amendment is designed to ensure that DOI is able to recruit, retain, and train skilled professionals, many of whom require a science, technology, or math background. The DOI would be encouraged to reach out to high school students, college students, and professionals.

It establishes an Office of Energy Employment and Training, which will oversee the efforts of the Department of the Interior's energy planning, permitting, and regulatory activities related to this act. This office will be responsible for issuing quarterly reports to the Secretary, which will include the amount of jobs created by the DOI, as well as reporting the types of job training programs that have been implemented or proposed.

This amendment also addresses the need to encourage diversity within the DOI by creating the Office of Minority and Women Inclusion, which is specifically designed to encourage diversity by reaching out to both women and minorities. Specifically, the DOI would have a director appointed by the Secretary of the Interior who will develop clear standards for equal employment opportunities and will address the need for increased racial, ethnic, and gender diversity at both the junior and senior management levels of the Department.

This amendment would require the DOI to take affirmative steps to seek diversity in the workforce of the Department at all levels. The Department of the Interior would be required to sponsor job fairs in urban communities and partner with organizations that are focused on developing opportunities for both minorities and women in the energy industry.

Again, it is the job of the DOI to ensure that all lease sales meet the highest reasonable standards for safety. This amendment is meant to ensure that women and minorities have a fair opportunity to participate in making these types of decisions within the Interior Department.

I support my colleague Ms. JACKSON LEE's amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. I rise to oppose this amendment, reluctantly. I understand the gentlewoman's intentions of this amendment, and portions of this idea have strong merit.

Let there be no doubt that the Department of the Interior can do a better job of both hiring and contracting in these areas, but this debate today isn't the most appropriate place for us to consider these particular reforms.

Every provision in this legislation has been carefully vetted through the legislative process. The House Natural Resources and Energy and Commerce Committees have both held oversight and legislative hearings and committee markups on the underlying legislation.

This subject, while it is something definitely worth considering, has not had this level of review under the legislative process and would insert a major programmatic and bureaucratic change in a simple bill that is geared toward expanding American energy production and jobs. Also, as currently drafted, the proposal is over 12 pages long and would add significant new Federal bureaucracy.

If the gentlewoman is willing to withdraw her amendment, I will commit the Natural Resources Committee to work with her to address this subject, and if she will not withdraw, then I must reluctantly oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BASS of California. I thank the gentleman for his offer, but given that I am the designee for Representative JACKSON LEE, I don't feel it is appropriate for me to withdraw the amendment.

I would simply close by saying that the purpose of the amendment is to recognize the importance of developing a diverse and highly skilled technical workforce within the DOI, and all studies have indicated that there is a serious lack of diversity.

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

□ 1030

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, Representative GARDNER from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank my colleague from Colorado for giving me the time on this amendment.

I want to tell a little story. A year ago, I had the opportunity to visit a hydraulic fracturing site in my district, a county called Weld County in northern Colorado, and when you're dealing with hydraulic fracturing, what happens is about 2 or 3 in the morning the crews that are overseeing the hydraulic fracturing—at least in this particular area—get up, they go to their trucks that actually have this panoramic view of the well site so they can monitor everything that's taking place. They can monitor all the equipment. They have computers inside the truck that explain and expound upon what's happening in the operation at that point. It's filled with engineers.

And on this particular tour site that I went to, the hydraulic fracturing, the production engineer was a woman. And I'm pretty sure that I would have been

rejected by her college for the engineering program before I even applied. So it was an incredible opportunity to learn from her the work that she was doing. There were many other women members of that particular crew.

And so I think the best way that we can get more women and more minorities hired and working in this country, whether it's energy or not, is to create more opportunity. More opportunity means more jobs. More jobs means more hiring. And when you have more hiring, we're going to put more people back to work: Men, women, minorities.

That's the opportunity that this bill presents. It's an opportunity to create jobs, an opportunity to lower the price of gas so that men, women, and minorities are able to afford the price of a gallon of gasoline to get to their job.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today to debate my amendment No. 27 to H.R. 4480, the "Strategic Energy Production Act of 2012," which would establish an Office of Energy Employment and Training, as well as, an Office of Minority and Women Inclusion that would be responsible for all matters relating to diversity in management, employment, and business activities.

As well as establishing an Office of Minority and Women Inclusion for the purpose of addressing the need for diversity within the DOI and within the pool of businesses that the DOI engages.

Texas serves as proof that the energy industry offers tremendous potential to provide jobs and foster economic growth. As a matter of fact, in 2008, Texas was one of the few States that saw its economy grow; grossing the second highest revenue of all States at \$1.2 trillion.

As the Representative of the 18th Congressional District of Houston, Texas, I can attest to the importance of a healthy energy industry. My district is the energy hub of Texas and is recognized worldwide for its energy industry, particularly for oil and natural gas, as well as biomedical research and aeronautics. Renewable energy sources—wind and solar—are also growing economic bases in Houston.

The energy industry and its supporting businesses provide my fellow Texans with tens of thousands of jobs, and have helped keep the State of Texas significantly below the national unemployment rate.

This prosperity can expand well beyond Texas, if the Federal and State governments will act decisively and responsibly to expand domestic energy productions in an environmentally conscious manner, and keep billions of dollars and countless jobs here at home. However I must place emphasis on the need to act both decisively and responsibly. It remains to be seen whether this bill truly accomplishes those goals. My amendment is designed to address the need for training and diversity in the Energy sector.

AMENDMENT NO. 27

My amendment recognizes the importance of developing a diverse and highly skilled technical workforce within the Department of Interior.

The Department of Interior reviews permits, and examines lease sales. Further, the DOT is responsible for ensuring that each application meets the highest safety standards.

We should be focused on providing the Department of Interior with trained technical engineers and other such necessary personnel to review drilling permit applications both carefully and thoroughly.

Given the aftermath of the BP Oil spill, it is easy to understand the importance of addressing all safety concerns prior to the issuance of oil and gas lease sales.

Since the disaster federal safety regulations have been tightened, spill containment response capability has been enhanced and lessons have been learned.

These lessons must be understood by everyone involved in reviewing and approving each and every application for permits and lease sales.

Responsible onshore drilling includes having our best minds working to carefully and diligently review each application. This amendment is intended to include both women and minorities in the process.

This amendment is designed to ensure that DOT is able to recruit, retain and train skilled professionals, many of whom require a science, technology, engineering, or math (STEM) backgrounds. The DOT will be encouraged to reach out to high school students, college students, and professional.

My Amendment establishes an Office of Energy Employment and Training which will oversee the efforts of the Department of Interior's energy planning, permitting, and regulatory activities related to this Act.

This Office will be responsible for issuing quarterly reports to the Secretary which will include the amount of jobs created by the DOT, as well as, reporting the types of job training programs that have been implemented or proposed.

This amendment also addresses the need to encourage diversity within the Department of Interior. By creating an the Office of Minority and Women Inclusion which is specifically designed to encourage diversity by reaching out to both women and minorities.

Specifically the DOT will have a Director appointed by the Secretary of the Interior who will develop clear standards for equal employment opportunities and will address the need for increased racial, ethnic, and gender diversity at both the junior and senior management levels of the Department.

This amendment would require the DOT to take affirmative steps to seek diversity in the workforce of the Department at all levels of the Department.

These steps would include recruiting at historically black colleges and universities, Hispanic-service institutions, and women's colleges and other majority minority service institutions. The Department will be able to find qualified candidates from diverse backgrounds if they expand the pool of candidates from which they select candidates.

The DOT would be required to sponsor job fairs in urban communities and partner with organization that are focused on developing opportunities for both minorities and women in the energy industry.

Again, it is the job of the Department of the Interior to ensure that all lease sales meet the highest reasonable standards for safety. This amendment is meant to include encourage and ensure that women and minorities have a fair opportunity to participate in making these types of decisions the DOI.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting my Amendment No. 27 to H.R. 4480.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah) having assumed the chair, Mr. WESTMORELAND, 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. 4480) to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas exploration, development, and production under oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in response to a drawdown of petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, had come to no resolution thereon.

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 10 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1059

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GARDNER) at 10 o'clock and 59 minutes a.m.

DOMESTIC ENERGY AND JOBS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 691 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. 4480.

Will the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) kindly take the chair.

□ 1100

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. 4480) to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas exploration, development, and production under oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in response to a drawdown of petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, with Mrs. EMERSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today,

amendment No. 27 printed in House Report 112-540 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112-540 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: Amendment No. 1 by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. WAXMAN of California.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. RUSH of Illinois.

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

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 14 by Mr. AMODEI of Nevada.

Amendment No. 15 by Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 16 by Mr. LANDRY of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 17 by Mr. RIGELL of Virginia.

Amendment No. 18 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 19 by Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.

Amendment No. 21 by Ms. BASS of California.

Amendment No. 23 by Mrs. CAPPS of California.

Amendment No. 25 by Ms. SPEIER of California.

Amendment No. 26 by Ms. DELAURO of Connecticut.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) 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 253, noes 163, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]

AYES—253

Adams	Barrow	Black
Aderholt	Bartlett	Blackburn
Akin	Barton (TX)	Bonner
Alexander	Bass (NH)	Bono Mack
Altmire	Benishke	Boren
Amash	Berg	Boswell
Amodei	Biggett	Boustany
Austria	Bilbray	Brady (TX)
Bachmann	Bilirakis	Brooks
Bachus	Bishop (GA)	Brown (GA)
Barletta	Bishop (UT)	Buchanan

Buchson Hartzler Petri Israel Moore Schwartz
 Buerkle Hastings (WA) Pitts Johnson (GA) Moran Scott (VA)
 Burgess Hayworth Platts Johnson, E. B. Murphy (CT) Scott, David
 Calvert Heck Poe (TX) Kaptur Nadler Serrano
 Camp Hensarling Pompeo Keating Napolitano Sewell
 Campbell Herger Posey Kildee Neal Sherman
 Canseco Herrera Beutler Price (GA) Kind Olver Shuler
 Cantor Hochul Quayle Kucinich Pallone Sires
 Capito Holden Reed Langevin Pascrell Slaughter
 Cardoza Huelskamp Rehberg Larsen (WA) Pastor (AZ) Smith (WA)
 Carter Huizenga (MI) Reichert Larson (CT) Pelosi Speier
 Cassidy Hultgren Renacci Lee (CA) Perlmutter Stark
 Chabot Hunter Ribble Levin Pingree (ME) Sutton
 Chaffetz Hurt Rigell Lipinski Pingree (ME) Thompson (CA)
 Coble Issa Rivera Loeb sack Polis Thompson (MS)
 Coffman (CO) Jenkins Roby Price (NC) Tierney
 Cole Johnson (IL) Roe (TN) Quigley Tonko
 Conaway Johnson (OH) Rogers (AL) Lujan Raball Towns
 Costa Johnson, Sam Rogers (KY) Lynch Rangel Tsongas
 Cravaack Jones Rogers (MI) Maloney Reyes Van Hollen
 Crawford Jordan Rohrabacher Markey Richardson Visclosky
 Crenshaw Kelly Rokita Rooney McCarthy (NY) Richmond Walz (MN)
 Critz King (IA) Rooney Ros-Lehtinen McCollum Roybal-Allard Wasserman
 Cuellar King (NY) Roskam Roskam Ruppertsberger Schultz
 Culberson Kingston Ross (AR) McGovern Rush Waters
 Davis (KY) Kinzinger (IL) Kissell Ryan (OH) Watt
 Denham Kline Royce Sanchez, Loretta Waxman
 Dent Labrador Runyan Sarbanes Meeks Welch
 DesJarlais Lamborn Ryan (WI) Michaud Schakowsky Wilson (FL)
 Diaz-Balart Lance Scalise Schilling Miller (NC) Schiff Woolsey
 Dold Landry Schilling Miller, George Schrader Yarmuth
 Donnelly (IN) Landry Schmidt Schrock
 Dreier Lankford Schmidt Schrock
 Duffy Latham Schweikert Bishop (NY) Jackson (IL) Miller (FL)
 Duncan (SC) LaTourette Scott (SC) Burton (IN) Jackson Lee Miller, Gary
 Duncan (TN) Latta Scott (SC) Clarke (NY) (TX) Murphy (PA)
 Ellmers LoBiondo Scott, Austin Filner Lewis (CA) Sánchez, Linda
 Emerson Long Lucas Sessions Shimkus Shuster Lewis (GA) T.
 Farenthold Lucas Luetkemeyer Shumaker Mack Velázquez
 Fincher Fitzpatrick Lummis Lungren, Daniel
 Flake Lungren, Daniel
 Fleischmann E. Smith (NE)
 Fleming Manzullo Smith (NJ)
 Flores Marchant Smith (TX)
 Forbes Marino Southerland
 Fortenberry Matheson Stearns
 Foxx McCarthy (CA) Stivers
 Franks (AZ) McCaul Stutzman
 Frelinghuysen McClintock Sullivan
 Gardner McCotter Terry
 Garrett McHenry Thompson (PA)
 Gerlach McKeon Thornberry
 Gibbs McKinley Tiberi
 Gibson McMorris Tipton
 Gingrey (GA) Rodgers Turner (NY)
 Gohmert Meehan Turner (OH)
 Goodlatte Mica Upton
 Gosar Miller (MI) Walberg
 Gowdy Mulvaney Walden
 Granger Myrick Walsh (IL)
 Graves (GA) Neugebauer Webster
 Graves (MO) Noem West
 Green, Al Nugent Westmoreland
 Green, Gene Nunes Whitfield
 Griffin (AR) Nunnelee Wilson (SC)
 Griffith (VA) Olson Wittman
 Grimm Owens Wolf
 Guinta Palazzo Womack
 Guthrie Paul Woodall
 Hall Paulsen Yoder
 Hanna Pearce Young (AK)
 Harper Pence Young (FL)
 Harris Peterson Young (IN)

NOES—163

Ackerman Cicilline Edwards
 Andrews Clarke (MI) Ellison
 Baca Clay Engel
 Baldwin Cleaver Eshoo
 Barber Clyburn Farr
 Bass (CA) Cohen Fattah
 Becerra Connolly (VA) Frank (MA)
 Berkley Conyers Fudge
 Berman Cooper Garamendi
 Blumenauer Costello Gonzalez
 Bonamici Courtney Grijalva
 Brady (PA) Crowley Gutierrez
 Braley (IA) Cummings Hahn
 Brown (FL) Davis (CA) Hanabusa
 Butterfield Davis (IL) Hastings (FL)
 Capps DeFazio Higgs
 Capuano DeGette Himes
 Carnahan DeLauro Hinchey
 Carney Deutch Hinojosa
 Carson (IN) Dicks Hirono
 Castor (FL) Dingell Holt
 Chandler Doggett Honda
 Chu Doyle Hoyer

and bicameral camaraderie and a team spirit and friendship that we would never have had an opportunity to build if not for playing this game. I know we all feel strongly, hopefully, that we use the friendships that we build on the field and take those into the Chamber here so we can work together on the problems facing our country. That's such a tough and important priority for all of us.
 We do want to congratulate, although not too enthusiastically, the Bad News Babes for their victory this year in the game, 13-10. It was heart-breaking. We kept it close. We were coming back in the last inning. We had a real opportunity but came up short.
 We all, as women Members, want to thank the fabulous, indomitable Natalie Buchanan, who is on the leadership staff of KEVIN MCCARTHY, for coming out there with us every morning at 7 a.m.
 Natalie, stand up.
 She is on the floor with KEVIN MCCARTHY every day here. We love Natalie.
 Tori Barnes, my cocaptain's daughter, is our coach year in and year out. I also want to recognize, on my staff, Mackenzie Smith and Kate Houghton, who is on my staff but is battling leukemia right now and who we all played for on both teams. She's coming through and getting healthy.
 Madam Chair, thank you for your friendship. Thank you to all the women, and thank you all, as a breast cancer survivor. Both the House leadership teams came out to the game, continued to support us, and it means so much to me personally.
 I wish everybody a wonderful summer, and we will be back next year so we can take that trophy back.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN
 The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.
 There was no objection.
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) 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 164, noes 249, not voting 19, as follows:
 [Roll No. 393]
 AYES—164

NOT VOTING—16
 Miller (FL)
 Miller, Gary
 Murphy (PA)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Velázquez

□ 1127
 Mr. SHERMAN changed his vote from "aye" to "no."
 Messrs. RIBBLE, NUGENT, AL GREEN of Texas, CUELLAR, and SIMPSON changed their vote from "no" to "aye."
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 Stated for:
 Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 392, I was present but the voting machine did not record my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."
 Stated against:
 Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 392, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."
 Mr. HEINRICH. Madam Chair, on June 21, 2012, I unfortunately missed one vote, rollcall Number 392. If I had been present, I would have cast the following vote on this amendment to H.R. 4480, Strategic Energy Production Act: Rollcall vote 392 (Hastings Amendment): "no."
 (By unanimous consent, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ was allowed to speak out of order.)

WOMEN'S CONGRESSIONAL SOFTBALL
 Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Well, I wish I were standing before you this morning to announce the Congressional Women's Softball team's second big victory. Unfortunately, I can't share that good news with you, but I can share the news with you that our bipartisan team, with the Bad News Babes, the women members of the press corps, raised over \$50,000 for the Young Survival Coalition. We're very proud of that.
 We are proud, as congressional women, that we play in a bipartisan spirit, that we have built a bipartisan

and bicameral camaraderie and a team spirit and friendship that we would never have had an opportunity to build if not for playing this game. I know we all feel strongly, hopefully, that we use the friendships that we build on the field and take those into the Chamber here so we can work together on the problems facing our country. That's such a tough and important priority for all of us.
 We do want to congratulate, although not too enthusiastically, the Bad News Babes for their victory this year in the game, 13-10. It was heart-breaking. We kept it close. We were coming back in the last inning. We had a real opportunity but came up short.
 We all, as women Members, want to thank the fabulous, indomitable Natalie Buchanan, who is on the leadership staff of KEVIN MCCARTHY, for coming out there with us every morning at 7 a.m.
 Natalie, stand up.
 She is on the floor with KEVIN MCCARTHY every day here. We love Natalie.
 Tori Barnes, my cocaptain's daughter, is our coach year in and year out. I also want to recognize, on my staff, Mackenzie Smith and Kate Houghton, who is on my staff but is battling leukemia right now and who we all played for on both teams. She's coming through and getting healthy.
 Madam Chair, thank you for your friendship. Thank you to all the women, and thank you all, as a breast cancer survivor. Both the House leadership teams came out to the game, continued to support us, and it means so much to me personally.
 I wish everybody a wonderful summer, and we will be back next year so we can take that trophy back.
 AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN
 The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.
 There was no objection.
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) 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 164, noes 249, not voting 19, as follows:
 [Roll No. 393]
 AYES—164

Ackerman Bass (CA) Bonamici
 Andrews Becerra Boswell
 Baca Berkeley Brady (PA)
 Baldwin Berman Braley (IA)
 Barber Blumenauer Brown (FL)

Butterfield Higgins Pelosi Luetskemeyer Pitts Shimkus Capps Higgins Perlmutter
Capps Himes Perlmutter Shuler Shuster Cardoza Himes Peters
Capuano Hinchey Peters Lungren, Daniel Pompeo Pompeo Pompeo Pingree (ME)
Carnahan Hinojosa Pingree (ME) E. E. E. Possey Price (NC) Price (NC)
Carney Hirono Polis Price (NC) Price (NC) Price (NC) Price (NC)
Carson (IN) Hochul Price (NC) Marchant Quayle Quayle Quayle
Castor (FL) Holt Quigley Reed Reed Reed Reed
Chandler Honda Rahall Matheson Rehberg Rehberg Rehberg
Chu Hoyer Rangel McCarthy (CA) Reichert Reichert Reichert
Cicilline Israel Reyes Renacci Renacci Renacci Stivers
Clarke (MI) Johnson (IL) Richardson McClintock Ribble Ribble Ribble
Clay Johnson, E. B. Richmond McCotter Ricottell Ricottell Ricottell
Clever Keating Rothman (NJ) McHenry McHenry McHenry
Clyburn Kildee Roybal-Allard McIntyre McIntyre McIntyre
Cohen Kind Ruppensberger McKeon McKeon McKeon
Connolly (VA) Kucinich Rush Rush Rush
Conyers Conyers Ryan (OH) McKinley McKinley McKinley
Cooper Larsen (WA) Sanchez, Loretta Rodgers Rodgers Rodgers
Costello Larson (CT) Sarbanes Sarbanes Sarbanes
Courtney Lee (CA) Schakowsky Meehan Meehan Meehan
Crowley Levin Schiff Miller (MI) Upton Upton Upton
Cuellar Lipinski Schwartz Mulvaney Mulvaney Mulvaney
Cummins Loebsock Scott (VA) Ross (AR) Ross (AR) Ross (AR)
Davis (CA) Lofgren, Zoe Serrano Myrick Myrick Myrick
Davis (IL) Lowey Sewell Neugebauer Neugebauer Neugebauer
DeFazio Lujan Sherman Noem Noem Noem
DeGette Lynch Sires Nunes Nunes Nunes
DeLauro Maloney Slaughter Slaughter Slaughter
Deutch Markey Smith (WA) Nunnlee Nunnlee Nunnlee
Dicks Matsui Speier Olson Olson Olson
Dingell McCarthy (NY) Stark Stark Stark
Doyle McCollum Sutton Paul Paul Paul
Edwards McDermott Thompson (CA) Paulsen Paulsen Paulsen
Ellison McGovern Thompson (MS) Pearce Pearce Pearce
Engel McNeerney Tierney Tierney Tierney
Eshoo Meeks Tonko Pence Pence Pence
Farr Michaud Towns Peterson Peterson Peterson
Fattah Miller (NC) Tsongas Petri Petri Petri
Frank (MA) Miller, George Van Hollen Van Hollen Van Hollen
Fudge Moore Visclosky Visclosky Visclosky
Garamendi Moran Walz (MN) Burton (IN) Burton (IN) Burton (IN)
Gibson Murphy (CT) Wasserman Clarke (NY) Johnson (GA) Johnson (GA)
Gonzalez Nadler Schultz Schuck Schuck Schuck
Green, Al Napolitano Waters Waters Waters
Grijalva Neal Watt Watt Watt
Gutierrez Olver Waxman Waxman Waxman
Hahn Owens Welch Welch Welch
Hanabusa Pallone Wilson (FL) Wilson (FL) Wilson (FL)
Hastings (FL) Pascrell Woolsey Woolsey Woolsey
Heinrich Pastor (AZ) Yarmuth Yarmuth Yarmuth

NOES—249

Adams Coffman (CO) Griffin (AR) Griffin (AR) Griffin (AR)
Aderholt Cole Griffith (VA) Griffith (VA) Griffith (VA)
Akin Conaway Grimm Grimm Grimm
Alexander Costa Guinta Guinta Guinta
Altmire Cravaack Guthrie Guthrie Guthrie
Amash Crawford Hall Hall Hall
Amodei Crenshaw Hanna Hanna Hanna
Austria Critz Harper Harper Harper
Bachmann Culberson Harris Harris Harris
Bachus Davis (KY) Hartzler Hartzler Hartzler
Barletta Denham Hastings (WA) Hastings (WA) Hastings (WA)
Barrow Dent Hayworth Hayworth Hayworth
Bartlett DesJarlais Heck Heck Heck
Barton (TX) Diaz-Balart Hensarling Hensarling Hensarling
Bass (NH) Dold Herger Herger Herger
Benishek Donnelly (IN) Herrera Beutler Herrera Beutler
Berg Dreier Holden Holden Holden
Biggert Duffy Huelskamp Huelskamp Huelskamp
Billbray Duncan (SC) Huizenga (MI) Huizenga (MI)
Bilirakis Duncan (TN) Hultgren Hultgren Hultgren
Bishop (GA) Ellmers Hunter Hunter Hunter
Bishop (UT) Emerson Hurt Hurt Hurt
Black Farenthold Issa Issa Issa
Blackburn Fincher Jenkins Jenkins Jenkins
Bonner Fitzpatrick Johnson (OH) Johnson (OH) Johnson (OH)
Bono Mack Flake Johnson, Sam Johnson, Sam Johnson, Sam
Boren Fleischmann Jones Jones Jones
Boustany Fleming Jordan Jordan Jordan
Brady (TX) Flores Kaptur Kaptur Kaptur
Brooks Forbes Kelly Kelly Kelly
Broun (GA) Fortenberry King (IA) King (IA) King (IA)
Buchanan Foxx King (NY) King (NY) King (NY)
Bucshon Franks (AZ) Kingston Kingston Kingston
Buerkle Frelinghuysen Kinzinger (IL) Kinzinger (IL) Kinzinger (IL)
Burgess Gardner Kissell Kissell Kissell
Calvert Garrett Kline Kline Kline
Camp Gerlach Labrador Labrador Labrador
Campbell Gibbs Lamborn Lamborn Lamborn
Canseco Gingrey (GA) Lance Lance Lance
Cantor Gohmert Landry Landry Landry
Capito Goodlatte Lankford Lankford Lankford
Cardoza Gosar Latham Latham Latham
Carter Gowdy LaTourette LaTourette LaTourette
Cassidy Granger Latta Latta Latta
Chabot Graves (GA) LoBiondo LoBiondo LoBiondo
Chaffetz Graves (MO) Long Long Long
Coble Green, Gene Lucas Lucas Lucas

Pitts Shimkus Capps Higgins Perlmutter
Shuler Shuster Cardoza Himes Peters
Pompeo Pompeo Pompeo Pingree (ME)
Possey Price (NC) Price (NC) Price (NC)
Price (GA) Price (GA) Price (GA)
Quayle Quayle Quayle Quayle
Reed Reed Reed Reed
Rehberg Rehberg Rehberg Rehberg
Reichert Reichert Reichert Reichert
Renacci Renacci Renacci Renacci
Ribble Ribble Ribble Ribble
Ricottell Ricottell Ricottell Ricottell
Robby Terry Terry Terry Terry
Roe (TN) Thompson (PA) Thompson (PA) Thompson (PA)
Rogers (AL) Thornberry Thornberry Thornberry
Rogers (KY) Tiberi Tiberi Tiberi
Rogers (MI) Tipton Tipton Tipton
Rohrabacher Turner (NY) Turner (NY) Turner (NY)
Rooney Turner (OH) Turner (OH) Turner (OH)
Ros-Lehtinen Upton Upton Upton
Roskam Walden Walden Walden
Ross (AR) Walsh (IL) Walsh (IL) Walsh (IL)
Ross (FL) Webster Webster Webster
Royce West West West
Runyan Runyan Runyan Runyan
Ryan (WI) Scalise Scalise Scalise
Schilling Schilling Schilling Schilling
Schmidt Schmidt Schmidt Schmidt
Schock Schradler Schradler Schradler
Schrader Woodall Woodall Woodall
Schweikert Yoder Yoder Yoder
Scott (SC) Young (AK) Young (AK) Young (AK)
Scott, Austin Young (FL) Young (FL) Young (FL)
Sensenbrenner Young (IN) Young (IN) Young (IN)
Sessions Sessions Sessions Sessions

NOT VOTING—19

Miller, Gary Miller, Gary Miller, Gary
Poe (TX) Poe (TX) Poe (TX)
Rivera Rivera Rivera
Sánchez, Linda Sánchez, Linda Sánchez, Linda
T. T. T.
Scott, David Scott, David Scott, David
Velázquez Velázquez Velázquez

□ 1135

Mr. LEVIN changed his vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 393, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 242, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

AYES—177

Ackerman Bass (CA) Bonamici Bonamici Bonamici
Andrews Becerra Boswell Boswell Boswell
Baca Berkeley Brady (PA) Brady (PA) Brady (PA)
Baldwin Berlan Braley (IA) Braley (IA) Braley (IA)
Barber Bishop (GA) Brown (FL) Brown (FL) Brown (FL)
Barrow Blumenauer Butterfield Butterfield Butterfield

Higgins Himes Hinchey Hinojosa Hirono Hochul Holden Holt Honda Hoyer Israel Johnson (GA) Johnson (IL) Johnson, E. B. Kaptur Keating Kildee Kucinich Langevin Larsen (WA) Larson (CT) Lee (CA) Levin Lewis (GA) Lipinski Loebsock Lofgren, Zoe Lowey Lujan Lynch Maloney Markey Matsui Michael McCarthy (NY) McCollum McDermott McGovern McNerney Meeks Michaud Miller (NC) Miller, George Moore Moran Murphy (CT) Nadler Napolitano Neal Olver Owens Pallone Pascrell Pastor (AZ) Pelosi

NOES—242

Coble Coffman (CO) Graves (GA) Graves (GA) Graves (GA)
Cole Griffith (AR) Griffith (AR) Griffith (AR)
Conaway Grimm Grimm Grimm
Costello Cravaack Guinta Guinta Guinta
Crawford Crawford Guthrie Guthrie Guthrie
Crenshaw Hall Hall Hall
Culberson Culberson Hanna Hanna Hanna
Davis (KY) Davis (KY) Harper Harper Harper
Denham Denham Harris Harris Harris
DesJarlais DesJarlais Hartzler Hartzler Hartzler
Diaz-Balart Diaz-Balart Hastings (WA) Hastings (WA) Hastings (WA)
Dingell Dingell Hayworth Hayworth Hayworth
Dold Dold Heck Heck Heck
Donnelly (IN) Donnelly (IN) Hensarling Hensarling Hensarling
Dreier Dreier Herger Herger Herger
Duffy Duffy Herrera Beutler Herrera Beutler
Duncan (SC) Duncan (SC) Huelskamp Huelskamp Huelskamp
Duncan (TN) Duncan (TN) Huizenga (MI) Huizenga (MI) Huizenga (MI)
Ellmers Ellmers Hultgren Hultgren Hultgren
Emerson Emerson Hunter Hunter Hunter
Farenthold Farenthold Hurt Hurt Hurt
Fincher Fincher Issa Issa Issa
Flake Flake Jenkins Jenkins Jenkins
Fleming Fleming Johnson (OH) Johnson (OH) Johnson (OH)
Fortenberry Fortenberry Johnson, Sam Johnson, Sam Johnson, Sam
Flores Flores Jones Jones Jones
Forbes Forbes Jordan Jordan Jordan
Fortenberry Fortenberry Kelly Kelly Kelly
Foxx Foxx King (IA) King (IA) King (IA)
Franks (AZ) Franks (AZ) King (NY) King (NY) King (NY)
Frelinghuysen Frelinghuysen Kinzinger (IL) Kinzinger (IL) Kinzinger (IL)
Gardner Gardner Kissell Kissell Kissell
Garrett Garrett Kline Kline Kline
Gerlach Gerlach Labrador Labrador Labrador
Gibbs Gibbs Lamborn Lamborn Lamborn
Gingrey (GA) Lance Lance Lance
Gohmert Gohmert Landry Landry Landry
Goodlatte Goodlatte Lankford Lankford Lankford
Gosar Gosar Latham Latham Latham
Gowdy Gowdy LaTourette LaTourette LaTourette
Granger Granger Latta Latta Latta
Graves (GA) LoBiondo LoBiondo LoBiondo
Graves (MO) Long Long Long
Green, Gene Lucas Lucas Lucas

Latta Pence
 LoBiondo Peterson
 Long Petri
 Lucas Pitts
 Luetkemeyer Platts
 Lummis Poe (TX)
 Lungren, Daniel Pompeo
 E. Posey
 Manzullo Price (GA)
 Marchant Quayle
 Marino Reed
 Matheson Rehberg
 McCarthy (CA) Reichert
 McCaul Renacci
 McClintock Ribble
 McCotter Rigell
 McHenry Rivera
 McIntyre Roby
 McKeon Roe (TN)
 McKinley Rogers (AL)
 McMorris Rogers (KY)
 Rodgers Rogers (MI)
 Meehan Rohrabacher
 Mica Rokita
 Miller (MI) Rooney
 Mulvaney Ros-Lehtinen
 Murphy (PA) Roskam
 Myrick Ross (AR)
 Neugebauer Ross (FL)
 Noem Royce
 Nugent Runyan
 Nunes Ryan (WI)
 Nunnelee Scalise
 Olson Schilling
 Owens Schmidt
 Palazzo Schock
 Paul Schweikert
 Paulsen Scott (SC)
 Pearce Scott, Austin

Sensenbrenner Sessions
 Shimkus Shuster
 Simpson Simpson
 Smith (NE) Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX) Southernland
 Starns Stivers
 Stutzman Stutzman
 Sullivan Terry
 Thompson (PA) Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry Thornberry
 Tiberi Tiberi
 Tipton Tipton
 Turner (NY) Turner (NY)
 Turner (OH) Turner (OH)
 Upton Upton
 Walberg Walberg
 Walden Walden
 Walsh (IL) Walsh (IL)
 Webster Webster
 West West
 Westmoreland Westmoreland
 Whitfield Whitfield
 Wilson (SC) Wilson (SC)
 Wittman Wittman
 Wolf Wolf
 Womack Womack
 Woodall Woodall
 Yoder Yoder
 Young (AK) Young (AK)
 Young (FL) Young (FL)
 Young (IN) Young (IN)

[Roll No. 395]

AYES—174

Ackerman Garamendi
 Baca Gonzalez
 Baldwin Green, Al
 Barber Green, Gene
 Barrow Grijalva
 Bass (CA) Gutierrez
 Bass (NH) Hahn
 Becerra Hanabusa
 Berkley Hastings (FL)
 Berman Hayworth
 Bishop (GA) Heinrich
 Blumenauer Higgins
 Bonamici Himes
 Boswell Hinchey
 Brady (PA) Hinojosa
 Braley (IA) Hirono
 Butterfield Holden
 Capps Holt
 Capuano Honda
 Hoyer Hoyer
 Israel Israel
 Johnson (GA) Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (IL) Johnson (IL)
 Kaptur Kaptur
 Keating Keating
 Kildee Kildee
 Kind Kind
 Kissell Kissell
 Kucinich Kucinich
 Langevin Langevin
 Larsen (WA) Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT) Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA) Lee (CA)
 Levin Levin
 Lewis (GA) Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski Lipinski
 Loebsack Loebsack
 Lofgren, Zoe Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey Lowey
 Luján Luján
 Lynch Lynch
 Maloney Maloney
 Markey Markey
 Matheson Matheson
 Matsui Matsui
 McCarthy (NY) McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum McCollum
 McDermott McDermott
 McGovern McGovern
 McNerney McNerney
 Meeks Meeks
 Michaud Michaud
 Miller (NC) Miller (NC)
 Miller, George Miller, George
 Moran Moran
 Murphy (CT) Murphy (CT)
 Nadler Nadler
 Napolitano Napolitano
 Neal Neal

Herrera Beutler
 Hochul Mica
 Huelskamp Miller (MI)
 Huizenga (MI) Mulvaney
 Hultgren Murphy (PA)
 Hunter Myrick
 Hurt Neugebauer
 Issa Noem
 Jenkins Nugent
 Johnson (OH) Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B. Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam Johnson, Sam
 Jones Jones
 Jordan Jordan
 Price (NC) Price (NC)
 Quigley Quigley
 Kelly Kelly
 King (IA) King (IA)
 King (NY) King (NY)
 Reichert Reichert
 Reyes Reyes
 Richardson Richardson
 Richmond Richmond
 Ross (AR) Ross (AR)
 Rothman (NJ) Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard Roybal-Allard
 Ruppberger Ruppberger
 Rush Rush
 Ryan (OH) Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez, Loretta Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes Sarbanes
 Schakowsky Schakowsky
 Schiff Schiff
 Schrader Schrader
 Schwartz Schwartz
 Lummis Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel Lungren, Daniel
 E. E.
 Manzullo Manzullo
 Marchant Marchant
 Marino Marino
 McCarthy (CA) McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul McCaul
 McClintock McClintock
 McCotter McCotter
 McHenry McHenry
 McIntyre McIntyre
 McKeon McKeon
 McKinley McKinley
 McMorris McMorris
 Rodgers Rodgers

NOT VOTING—14

Bishop (NY) Jackson Lee
 Clarke (NY) (TX)
 Doggett Lewis (CA)
 Filner Mack
 Gallegly Miller (FL)
 Jackson (IL) Miller, Gary

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1143

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

Stated for:
 Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 395,
 I was away from the Capitol due to prior com-
 mitments to my constituents. Had I been
 present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. RUSH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) on
 which further proceedings were post-
 poned and on which the noes prevailed
 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 will be a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 164, noes 255,
 not voting 13, as follows:

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (NY) Jackson (IL)
 Burton (IN) Jackson Lee
 Clarke (NY) (TX)
 Filner Lewis (CA)
 Gallegly Mack

Miller (FL)
 Miller, Gary
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1140

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 394,
 I was away from the Capitol due to prior com-
 mitments to my constituents. Had I been
 present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. GENE GREEN
 OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE
 GREEN) 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 amend-
 ment.

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 de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 174, noes 244,
 not voting 14, as follows:

Adams Calvert
 Aderholt Camp
 Akin Campbell
 Alexander Canseco
 Altmire Cantor
 Amash Capito
 Amodei Carter
 Andrews Cassidy
 Austria Chabot
 Bachmann Chaffetz
 Bachus Clyburn
 Barletta Coble
 Bartlett Coffman (CO)
 Barton (TX) Cole
 Benishek Conaway
 Berg Costello
 Biggert Cravaack
 Bilbray Crawford
 Bilirakis Crenshaw
 Bishop (UT) Culberson
 Black Davis (KY)
 Blackburn Denham
 Bonner Dent
 Bono Mack DesJarlais
 Boren Diaz-Balart
 Boustany Donnelly (IN)
 Brady (TX) Dreier
 Brooks Duffy
 Broun (GA) Duncan (SC)
 Brown (FL) Duncan (TN)
 Buchanan Ellmers
 Bucshon Emerson
 Buerkle Farenthold
 Burgess Fincher
 Burton (IN) Fitzpatrick

NOES—244

Flake
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffith (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck
 Hensarling
 Herger

[Roll No. 396]

AYES—164

Ackerman Fudge Pallone
 Andrews Garamendi Pascarell
 Baca Gonzalez Pastor (AZ)
 Baldwin Grijalva Pelosi
 Barber Gutierrez Peters
 Bass (CA) Hahn Pingree (ME)
 Becerra Hanabusa Polis
 Berkley Hastings (FL) Price (NC)
 Berman Heinrich Quigley
 Blumenauer Higgins Rahall
 Bonamici Himes Rangel
 Boswell Hinchey Reyes
 Brady (PA) Hinojosa Richardson
 Braley (IA) Hirono Labrador
 Brown (FL) Holt Rothman (NJ)
 Butterfield Honda Roybal-Allard
 Capps Hoyer Ruppersberger
 Capuano Israel Rush
 Cardoza Johnson (GA) Ryan (OH)
 Carnahan Johnson, E. B. Sanchez, Loretta
 Carney Kaptur Sarbanes
 Carson (IN) Keating Schakowsky
 Castor (FL) Kildee Schiff
 Chandler Kind Schrader
 Chu Kucinich Schwartz
 Cicilline Langevin Scott (VA)
 Clarke (MI) Larson (CT) Scott, David
 Clay Lee (CA) Serrano
 Cleaver Levin Sewell
 Clyburn Lewis (GA) Sherman
 Cohen Lipinski Shuler
 Connolly (VA) Loeb sack Sires
 Conyers Lofgren, Zoe Slaughter
 Cooper Lowey Smith (WA)
 Costa Lujan Speier
 Courtney Lynch Stark
 Crowley Maloney Sutton
 Cummings Markey Thumpton (CA)
 Davis (CA) Matsui Thompson (MS)
 Davis (IL) McCarthy (NY) Tierney
 DeFazio McCollum Tonko
 DeGette McDermott Towns
 DeLauro McGovern Tsongas
 Deutch McNerney Van Hollen
 Dicks Meeks Visclosky
 Dingell Michaud Walz (MN)
 Doggett Miller (NC) Wasserman
 Doyle Miller, George Schultz
 Edwards Moore Waters
 Ellison Moran Watt
 Engel Murphy (CT) Waxman
 Eshoo Nadler Welch
 Farr Napolitano Wilson (FL)
 Fattah Neal Woolsey
 Frank (MA) Oliver Yarmuth

NOES—255

Adams Cantor Foxx
 Aderholt Capito Franks (AZ)
 Akin Carter Frelinghuysen
 Alexander Cassidy Gardner
 Altmire Chabot Garrett
 Amash Chaffetz Gerlach
 Amodei Coble Gibbs
 Austria Coffman (CO) Gibson
 Bachmann Cole Gingrey (GA)
 Barletta Conaway Gohmert
 Barrow Costello Goodlatte
 Bartlett Cravaack Gosar
 Barton (TX) Crawford Gowdy
 Bass (NH) Crenshaw Granger
 Benishek Critz Graves (GA)
 Berg Cuellar Graves (MO)
 Biggert Culberson Green, Al
 Bilbray Davis (KY) Green, Gene
 Bilirakis Denham Griffin (AR)
 Bishop (GA) Dent Griffith (VA)
 Bishop (UT) DesJarlais Grimm
 Black Diaz-Balart Guinta
 Blackburn Dold Guthrie
 Bonner Donnelly (IN) Hall
 Bono Mack Dreier Hanna
 Boren Duffy Harper
 Boustany Duncan (SC) Harris
 Brady (TX) Duncan (TN) Hartzler
 Brooks Ellmers Hastings (WA)
 Brown (GA) Emerson Hayworth
 Buchanan Farenthold Heck
 Bucshon Fincher Hensarling
 Buerkle Fitzpatrick Herger
 Burgess Flake Herrera Beutler
 Burton (IN) Fleischmann Hochul
 Calvert Fleming Holden
 Camp Flores Huelskamp
 Campbell Forbes Huizenga (MI)
 Canseco Fortenberry Hultgren

Hunter Mica Runyan
 Hurt Miller (MI) Ryan (WI)
 Issa Mulvaney Scalise
 Jenkins Murphy (PA) Schilling
 Johnson (IL) Myrick Schmidt
 Johnson (OH) Neugebauer Schock
 Johnson, Sam Noem Schweikert
 Jones Nugent Scott (SC)
 Jordan Nunes Scott, Austin
 Kelly Nunnelee Sensenbrenner
 King (IA) Olson Sessions
 King (NY) Owens Shimkus
 Kingston Palazzo Shuster
 Kinzinger (IL) Paul Simpson
 Kissell Paulsen Smith (NE)
 Kline Pearce Smith (NJ)
 Labrador Pence Smith (TX)
 Lamborn Perlmutter Southerland
 Lance Peterson Stearns
 Landry Petri Stivers
 Lankford Pitts Stutzman
 Larsen (WA) Platts Sullivan
 Latham Poe (TX) Terry
 LaTourette Pompeo Thompson (PA)
 Latta Posey Thornberry
 LoBiondo Price (GA) Tiberi
 Long Quayle Reed
 Lucas Luetkemeyer Rehberg
 Lummis Reichert Turner (NY)
 Lungren, Daniel Renacci Turner (OH)
 E. Ribble Upton
 Manzullo Rigell Walden
 Marchant Rivera Walsh (IL)
 Marino Roby Webster
 Matheson Roe (TN) West
 McCarthy (CA) Rogers (AL) Westmoreland
 McCaul Rogers (KY) Whitfield
 McClintock Rogers (MI) Wilson (SC)
 McCotter Rohrabacher Wittman
 McHenry Rokita Wolf
 McIntyre Rooney Womack
 McKeon Ros-Lehtinen Woodall
 McKinley Roskam Yoder
 McMorris Ross (AR) Young (AK)
 Rodgers Ross (FL) Young (FL)
 Meehan Royce Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Bachus Jackson (IL) Miller (FL)
 Bishop (NY) Jackson Lee Miller, Gary
 Clarke (NY) (TX) Sanchez, Linda
 Filner Lewis (CA) T.
 Gallegly Mack Velázquez

□ 1148

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

Stated for:
 Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 396,
 I was away from the Capitol due to prior com-
 mitments to my constituents. Had I been
 present, I would have voted “aye.”

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 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 164, noes 256,
 not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 397]

AYES—164

Ackerman Baca Barber
 Andrews Baldwin Bass (CA)

Bass (NH) Higgins Pelosi
 Becerra Himes Peters
 Berkley Hinchey Pingree (ME)
 Berman Hirono Platts
 Blumenauer Hochul Polis
 Bonamici Holt Price (NC)
 Brady (PA) Honda Quigley
 Braley (IA) Hoyer Rahall
 Brown (FL) Israel Rangel
 Butterfield Johnson (GA) Reichert
 Capps Johnson, E. B. Reyes
 Capuano Jones Richardson
 Carnahan Kaptur Richmond
 Carson (IN) Keating Rothman (NJ)
 Castor (FL) Castor (FL) Roybal-Allard
 Chandler Kind Ruppersberger
 Chu Kucinich Rush
 Cicilline Langevin Ryan (OH)
 Clarke (MI) Clay Larsen (WA)
 Clay Cleaver Larson (CT)
 Cleaver Lee (CA) Sarbanes
 Clyburn Cohen Schakowsky
 Cohen Connolly (VA) Levin
 Connolly (VA) Conyers Lewis (GA)
 Conyers Costello Lipinski
 Cooper Courtney LoBiondo
 Costa Lujan Scott (VA)
 Courtney Lynch Scott, David
 Crowley Maloney Serrano
 Cummings Markey Smith (NJ)
 Davis (CA) Matsui Smith (WA)
 Davis (IL) DeLauro Speier
 DeFazio DeGette DeLauro Deutch
 DeLauro Dicks McCarthy (NY)
 Deutch Dingell McCollum
 Dicks Dingell McCollum
 Dingell Doyle McDermott
 Doggett Edwards McNerney
 Doyle Eshoo Miller (NC)
 Edwards Farr Miller, George
 Ellison Fattah Moore
 Engel Fattah Moore
 Eshoo Farr Moore
 Farr Fattah Moore
 Fattah Frank (MA) Oliver
 Frank (MA) Oliver

NOES—256

Adams Carter Gerlach
 Aderholt Cassidy Gibbs
 Akin Chabot Gibson
 Alexander Chaffetz Gingrey (GA)
 Altmire Chandler Gohmert
 Amash Coble Gonzalez
 Amodei Coffman (CO) Goodlatte
 Austria Cole Gosar
 Bachmann Conaway Gowdy
 Bachus Cooper Granger
 Barletta Costa Graves (GA)
 Barrow Cravaack Graves (MO)
 Bartlett Crawford Green, Al
 Barton (TX) Crenshaw Green, Gene
 Benishek Critz Griffin (AR)
 Berg Cuellar Griffith (VA)
 Biggert Culberson Grimm
 Bilbray Davis (KY) Guinta
 Bilirakis Denham Guthrie
 Bishop (GA) Dent Hall
 Bishop (UT) DesJarlais Hanna
 Black Diaz-Balart Harper
 Blackburn Doggett Harris
 Bonner Dold Hartzler
 Bono Mack Donnelly (IN) Hastings (WA)
 Boren Dreier Hayworth
 Boswell Duffy Heck
 Boustany Duncan (SC) Hensarling
 Brady (TX) Duncan (TN) Herger
 Brooks Ellmers Herrera Beutler
 Brown (GA) Emerson Hinojosa
 Buchanan Farenthold Holden
 Bucshon Fincher Huelskamp
 Buerkle Flake Huizenga (MI)
 Burgess Fleischmann Hultgren
 Burton (IN) Fleming Hunter
 Calvert Calvert Flores
 Camp Calvert Forbes
 Campbell Fortenberry Issa
 Canseco Canseco Fox
 Cantor Cantor Franks (AZ)
 Capito Capito Frelinghuysen
 Cardoza Gardner Jordan
 Carney Garrett Kelly

King (IA) Nugent
 King (NY) Nunes
 Kingston Nunnelee
 Kinzinger (IL) Olson
 Kissell Palazzo
 Kline Paul
 Labrador Paulsen
 Lamborn Pearce
 Lance Pence
 Landry Perlmutter
 Lankford Peterson
 Latham Petri
 LaTourette Pitts
 Latta Poe (TX)
 Long Pompeo
 Lucas Posey
 Luetkemeyer Price (GA)
 Lummis Quayle
 Lungren, Daniel Reed
 E. Rehberg
 Manzullo Renacci
 Marchant Ribble
 Marino Rigell
 Matheson Rivera
 McCarthy (CA) Roby
 McCaul Roe (TN)
 McClintock Rogers (AL)
 McCotter Rogers (KY)
 McHenry Rogers (MI)
 McIntyre Rohrabacher
 McKeon Rokita
 McKinley Rooney
 McMorris Ros-Lehtinen
 Rodgers Roskam
 Meehan Ross (AR)
 Mica Ross (FL)
 Miller (MI) Royce
 Mulvaney Runyan
 Murphy (PA) Ryan (WI)
 Myrick Scalise
 Neugebauer Schilling
 Noem Schmidt

NOT VOTING—12

Bishop (NY) Jackson Lee
 Clarke (NY) (TX) Miller, Gary
 Filner Lewis (CA) Sánchez, Linda
 Gallegly Mack T.
 Jackson (IL) Miller (FL) Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1152

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.
 Stated for:
 Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 397,
 I was away from the Capitol due to prior com-
 mitments to my constituents. Had I been
 present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY
 OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CON-
 NOLLY) 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 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 190, noes 230,
 not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]
 AYES—190
 Ackerman
 Altmire
 Andrews
 Baca
 Baldwin
 Barber
 Barrow
 Bass (CA)
 Becerra
 Berkley
 Berman
 Hanna
 Biggart
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Boswell
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown (FL)
 Burgess
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Castor (FL)
 Chandler
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke (MI)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Kucinich
 Lance
 Langevin
 Cohen
 Connolly (VA)
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Courtney
 Critz
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 Deutch
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Dold
 Donnelly (IN)
 Doyle
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Farr
 Fattah

Frank (MA)
 Fudge
 Garamendi
 Gibson
 Gonzalez
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Guterrez
 Hahn
 Hanabusa
 Hastings (FL)
 Heinrich
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hiroo
 Hochul
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Israel
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kildee
 Kind
 Kissell
 Kucinich
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski
 Loebsack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Luján
 Lynch
 Maloney
 Markey
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Michaud
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Murphy (CT)

NOES—230

Burton (IN)
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Canseco
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)
 Cole
 Conaway
 Cravaack
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Davis (KY)
 Denham
 Dent
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Dreier
 Brooks
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Buerkle

Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayworth
 Heck
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Herrera Beutler
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Kelly
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Labrador
 Lamborn
 Landry
 Lankford
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Latta
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Marino
 Matheson
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCotter
 McHenry
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Visclosky
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Woolsey
 Yarmuth

Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Olver
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree (ME)
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reyes
 Richardson
 Richmond
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Shuler
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stark
 Sutton

McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meehan
 Mica
 Miller (MI)
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Myrick
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Paul
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Pence
 Petri
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Quayle
 Reed
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Walberg
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rigell
 Rivera
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross (AR)
 Ross (FL)

Royce
 Runyan
 Ryan (WI)
 Scalise
 Schilling
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stearns
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Sullivan
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner (NY)
 Turner (OH)
 Upton
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walsh (IL)
 Webster
 West
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Bishop (NY) Jackson Lee
 Clarke (NY) (TX) Miller, Gary
 Filner Lewis (CA) Sánchez, Linda
 Gallegly Mack T.
 Jackson (IL) Miller (FL) Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1155

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

Stated for:
 Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 398,
 I was away from the Capitol due to prior com-
 mitments to my constituents. Had I been
 present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. AMODEI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI)
 on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the ayes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 257, noes 162,
 not voting 13, as follows:

Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Flake
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hall

[Roll No. 399]

AYES—257

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishkek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach

Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Hochul
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Riviera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—162

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Bass (CA)
Becerra

Berman
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castor (FL)

Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castor (FL)

Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono

Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebbeck
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Gonzalez
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Oliver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pascarella
Peters
Pingree (ME)

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (NY)
Burton (IN)
Clarke (NY)
Filner
Gallegly

Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Lewis (CA)
Mack

Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1158

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

Stated against:
Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 399,
I was away from the Capitol due to prior com-
mitments to my constituents. Had I been
present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr.
MARKEY) 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 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 161, noes 256,
not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 400]

AYES—161

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono

Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebbeck
Lofgren, Zoe
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—256

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishkek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor

Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Frank (MA)

Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Himes
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa

Jenkins Myrick
 Johnson (IL) Neugebauer
 Johnson (OH) Noem
 Johnson, E. B. Nugent
 Johnson, Sam Nunes
 Jordan Nunnelee
 Kelly Olson
 King (IA) Palazzo
 King (NY) Paul
 Kingston Paulsen
 Kinzinger (IL) Pearce
 Kline Pence
 Labrador Perlmutter
 Lamborn Peterson
 Lance Petri
 Landry Pitts
 Lankford Poe (TX)
 Larsen (WA) Polis
 Latham Pompeo
 LaTourette Posey
 Latta Price (GA)
 Long Quayle
 Lucas Reed
 Luetkemeyer Rehberg
 Luján Reichert
 Lummis Renacci
 Lungren, Daniel Ribble
 E. Richmond
 Manzullo Rigell
 Marchant Rivera
 Marino Roby
 Matheson Roe (TN)
 McCarthy (CA) Rogers (AL)
 McCaul Rogers (KY)
 McClintock Rogers (MI)
 McCotter Rohrabacher
 McHenry Rokita
 McKeon Rooney
 McKinley Ros-Lehtinen
 McMorris Roskam
 Rodgers Ross (AR)
 Meehan Ross (FL)
 Mica Royce
 Miller (MI) Runyan
 Mulvaney Ryan (OH)
 Murphy (PA) Ryan (WI)

Scalise
 Schilling
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stearns
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Sullivan
 Terry
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner (NY)
 Turner (OH)
 Upton
 Visclosky
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walsh (IL)
 Webster
 West
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

[Roll No. 401]

AYES—244

Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Gonzalez
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Hanabusa
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayworth
 Heck
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Herrera Beutler
 Hinojosa
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Kelly
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Labrador
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Landry
 Lankford
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Latta
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Emerson
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Flake
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs

Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Courtney
 Critz
 Crowley
 Davis (CA)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 Deutch
 Dicks
 Donnelly (IN)
 Doyle
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Farr
 Fattah
 Reed
 Frank (MA)
 Fudge
 Garamendi
 Gibson
 Grijalva
 Gutierrez
 Hahn
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Heinrich
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinchey
 Hirono
 Hochul
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Israel
 Johnson (GA)
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kildee
 Kind
 Kissell

Quigley
 Rahall
 Reyes
 Richardson
 Rothman (NJ)
 Royal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schilling
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sherman
 Shuler
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stark
 Sutton
 Thompson (CA)
 Tierney
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Vislosky
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Peterson
 Wilson (FL)
 Woolsey
 Yarmuth
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Bishop (NY)
 Burton (IN)
 Clarke (NY)
 Filner
 Gallegly
 Herrera Beutler

Miller, Gary
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Velázquez
 Watt

Bachus
 Bishop (NY)
 Burton (IN)
 Clarke (NY)
 Filner
 Gallegly

Jackson (IL)
 Jackson Lee
 (TX)
 Lewis (CA)
 Mack
 Miller (FL)

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

□ 1201

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.
 Stated for:
 Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 400,
 I was away from the Capitol due to prior com-
 mitments to my constituents. Had I been
 present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. LANDRY
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Louisiana (Mr.
 LANDRY) on which further proceedings
 were postponed and on which the ayes
 prevailed 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 244, noes 173,
 not voting 15, as follows:

Ackerman
 Andrews
 Baca
 Baldwin
 Barber
 Barrow
 Bass (CA)
 Bass (NH)
 Becerra
 Berkley
 Berman
 Biggert

NOES—173

Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Boswell
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Butterfield
 Campbell
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan

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

□ 1205

Ms. RICHARDSON changed her vote
 from “aye” to “no.”
 So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.
 Stated against:
 Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 401,
 I was away from the Capitol due to prior com-
 mitments to my constituents. Had I been
 present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. RIGELL
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL)
 on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the ayes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.
 The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.
 A recorded vote was ordered.
 The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
 minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 263, noes 146,
 not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 402]

AYES—263

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Clever
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Eillers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach

NOES—146

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber

Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda

NOT VOTING—23

Bass (CA)
Becerra
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Burton (IN)
Clarke (NY)
Dicks
Filner
Gallegly

Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Lujan
Lummis
Mack
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 168, noes 250, not voting 14, as follows:

Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Rangel
Sánchez, Linda T.
Serrano
Simpson
Turner (NY)
Velázquez

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge

[Roll No. 403]

AYES—168

Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meeke
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neal
Oliver
Oliver
Owens

NOES—250

Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Eillers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger

Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley

NOT VOTING—14

Bishop (NY)
Burton (IN)
Clarke (NY)
Filner
Gallegly
Jackson (IL)

McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)

□ 1212

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 403, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. WITTMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) 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 256, noes 161, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 404]
AYES—256
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen

Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmitt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—161

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holden
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer

Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchee
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lowe
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley

NOT VOTING—15

Bishop (NY)
Braley (IA)
Clarke (NY)
Dicks
Filner
Gallegly
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Napolitano
Sánchez, Linda T.
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1215

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 404, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 404, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MS. BASS OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) 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 186, noes 233, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]

AYES—186

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

NOES—233

Adams	Brady (TX)	Culberson
Aderholt	Brooks	Davis (KY)
Akin	Broun (GA)	Denham
Alexander	Buchanan	Dent
Amash	Bucshon	DesJarlais
Amodei	Buerkle	Diaz-Balart
Austria	Burgess	Dold
Bachmann	Burton (IN)	Dreier
Bachus	Calvert	Duffy
Barletta	Camp	Duncan (SC)
Barton (TX)	Campbell	Duncan (TN)
Bass (NH)	Canseco	Ellmers
Benishkek	Cantor	Emerson
Berg	Capito	Farenthold
Biggert	Carter	Fincher
Bilirakis	Cassidy	Flake
Bishop (UT)	Chaffetz	Fleischmann
Black	Coble	Fleming
Blackburn	Coffman (CO)	Flores
Bonner	Cole	Forbes
Bono Mack	Conaway	Foxx
Boren	Cravaack	Franks (AZ)
Boustany	Crawford	Frelinghuysen
	Crenshaw	Gardner

Garrett	Lucas	Rohrabacher
Gerlach	Luetkemeyer	Rokita
Gibbs	Lummis	Rooney
Gingrey (GA)	Lungren, Daniel	Ros-Lehtinen
Gohmert	E.	Roskam
Goodlatte	Manzullo	Ross (AR)
Gosar	Marchant	Ross (FL)
Gowdy	Marino	Royce
Granger	Matheson	Runyan
Graves (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Graves (MO)	McCaul	Scalise
Griffin (AR)	McClintock	Schmidt
Griffith (VA)	McCotter	Schock
Grimm	McHenry	Schweikert
Guinta	McKeon	Scott (SC)
Guthrie	McKinley	Scott, Austin
Hall	McMorris	Scott, Austin
Hanna	Rodgers	Sensenbrenner
Harper	Meehan	Sessions
Harris	Mica	Shimkus
Hartzler	Miller (MI)	Shuler
Hastings (WA)	Mulvaney	Shuster
Hayworth	Murphy (PA)	Simpson
Heck	Myrick	Smith (NE)
Hensarling	Neugebauer	Smith (NJ)
Herger	Noem	Smith (TX)
Herrera Beutler	Nugent	Southernland
Huelskamp	Nunes	Stearns
Huizenga (MI)	Nunnelee	Stivers
Hultgren	Olson	Stutzman
Hunter	Palazzo	Sullivan
Hurt	Paul	Terry
Issa	Paulsen	Thompson (PA)
Jenkins	Pearce	Thornberry
Johnson (IL)	Pence	Tiberi
Johnson (OH)	Peterson	Tipton
Johnson, Sam	Petri	Turner (NY)
Jones	Pitts	Turner (OH)
Jordan	Platts	Upton
Kelly	Poe (TX)	Walberg
King (IA)	Pompeo	Waldeen
King (NY)	Posey	Walsh (IL)
Kingston	Price (GA)	Webster
Kinzinger (IL)	Quayle	West
Kline	Reed	Westmoreland
Labrador	Rehberg	Whitfield
Lamborn	Renacci	Wilson (SC)
Lance	Ribble	Wittman
Landry	Rigell	Wolf
Lankford	Rivera	Womack
Latham	Roby	Yoder
LaTourette	Roe (TN)	Young (AK)
Speier	Latta	Young (FL)
Stark	Rogers (AL)	Young (IN)
LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)	
Long	Rogers (MI)	

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (NY)	Jackson Lee	Miller, Gary
Clarke (NY)	(TX)	Sánchez, Linda
Filner	Lewis (CA)	T.
Gallegly	Mack	Velázquez
Jackson (IL)	Miller (FL)	Watt

□ 1219

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 405, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) 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 162, noes 254, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 406]

AYES—162

Ackerman	Green, Al	Pastor (AZ)
Andrews	Grijalva	Pelosi
Baca	Gutierrez	Perlmutter
Baldwin	Hahn	Peters
Barber	Hanabusa	Pingree (ME)
Bass (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Polis
Becerra	Heinrich	Price (NC)
Berkley	Higgins	Quigley
Berman	Himes	Rahall
Blumenauer	Hinchoy	Reyes
Bonamici	Hinojosa	Richardson
Boswell	Hirono	Richmond
Brady (PA)	Holt	Rothman (NJ)
Bralley (IA)	Honda	Roybal-Allard
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	Israel	Rush
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Schiff
Capuano	Johnson (IL)	Schrader
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Schwartz
Carney	Kaptur	Scott (VA)
Carson (IN)	Keating	Scott, David
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Serrano
Chabot	Kind	Sewell
Chandler	Kucinich	Sherman
Chu	Langevin	Shuler
Ciçilline	Larsen (WA)	Sires
Clarke (MI)	Larson (CT)	Slaughter
Clay	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Cleaver	Levin	Smith (WA)
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)	Speier
Cohen	Lipinski	Stark
Connolly (VA)	Loeb sack	Sutton
Conyers	Lofgren, Zoe	Thompson (CA)
Cooper	Lowe y	Thompson (MS)
Costa	Luján	Tierney
Costello	Lynch	Tonko
Courtney	Maloney	Towns
Critz	Markey	Tsongas
Crowley	Matsui	Van Hollen
Cuellar	McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky
Cummings	McCollum	Walz (MN)
Davis (CA)	McDermott	Wasserman
Davis (IL)	McGovern	Schultz
DeFazio	McIntyre	Waters
DeGette	McNerney	Watt
DeLauro	Meeks	Waxman
Deutch	Michaud	Welch
Dicks	Miller (NC)	Wilson (FL)
Dingell	Miller, George	Woodall
Doggett	Moore	Woolsey
Donnelly (IN)	Moran	Yarmuth
Doyle	Murphy (CT)	
Edwards	Nadler	
Ellison	Neal	
Engel	Olver	
Eshoo	Pallone	
Farr	Pascrell	
Fattah		

NOES—254

Adams	Burton (IN)	Duncan (TN)
Aderholt	Calvert	Ellmers
Akin	Camp	Emerson
Alexander	Campbell	Farenthold
Altmire	Canseco	Fincher
Amash	Cantor	Fitzpatrick
Amodei	Capito	Flake
Austria	Cardoza	Fleischmann
Bachmann	Carter	Fleming
Bachus	Cassidy	Flores
Barletta	Chabot	Forbes
Barrow	Chaffetz	Fortenberry
Bartlett	Chandler	Poxx
Barton (TX)	Coble	Franks (AZ)
Bass (NH)	Coffman (CO)	Frelinghuysen
Benishkek	Cole	Gardner
Berg	Conaway	Garrett
Biggert	Costa	Gerlach
Bilirakis	Costello	Gibbs
Bishop (GA)	Cravaack	Gibson
Bishop (UT)	Crawford	Gingrey (GA)
Black	Crenshaw	Gohmert
Blackburn	Critz	Goodlatte
Bonner	Cuellar	Gosar
Bono Mack	Culberson	Gowdy
Boren	Davis (KY)	Granger
Boustany	Denham	Graves (GA)
Brady (TX)	Dent	Graves (MO)
Brooks	DesJarlais	Green, Gene
Broun (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Griffin (AR)
Buchanan	Dold	Griffith (VA)
Bucshon	Donnelly (IN)	Grimm
Buerkle	Dreier	Guinta
Burgess	Duffy	Guthrie
	Duncan (SC)	Hall

Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock

McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam

Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souterland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Chandler
Tiberi
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 162, noes 255, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 407]

AYES—162

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chiu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez

Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinche
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Townes
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam

Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam

NOT VOTING—15

Bishop (NY)
Clarke (NY)
Filner
Gallegly
Herger
Jackson (IL)

Jackson Lee
(TX)
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Meeks
Miller (FL)

Miller, Gary
Rangel
Sánchez, Linda T.
Velázquez

□ 1225

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

Stated for: Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 407, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) 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 180, noes 235, not voting 17, as follows:

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

□ 1222

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

Stated for: Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 406, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) 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.

NOES—255

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishak
Berg
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle

Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clever
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Costa
Gibson
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)

[Roll No. 408]

AYES—180

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

NOES—235

Adams	Calvert	Flake
Aderholt	Camp	Fleischmann
Akin	Campbell	Fleming
Alexander	Canseco	Flores
Amash	Cantor	Forbes
Amodi	Capito	Fortenberry
Austria	Carter	Fox
Bachmann	Cassidy	Franks (AZ)
Bachus	Chabot	Frelinghuysen
Barletta	Chaffetz	Gardner
Bartlett	Coble	Garrett
Barton (TX)	Coffman (CO)	Gerlach
Bass (NH)	Cole	Gibbs
Benishek	Conaway	Gingrey (GA)
Berg	Cooper	Gohmert
Biggart	Cravaack	Goodlatte
Billbray	Crawford	Gosar
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Gowdy
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Granger
Black	Davis (KY)	Graves (GA)
Blackburn	Denham	Graves (MO)
Bonner	Dent	Griffin (AR)
Bono Mack	DesJarlais	Griffith (VA)
Boren	Diaz-Balart	Grimm
Boustany	Dold	Guinta
Brady (TX)	Dreier	Guthrie
Brooks	Duffy	Hall
Broun (GA)	Duncan (SC)	Harper
Buchanan	Duncan (TN)	Harris
Bucshon	Ellmers	Hartzler
Buerkle	Emerson	Hastings (WA)
Burgess	Farenthold	Hayworth
Burton (IN)	Fincher	Heck

Hensarling	Meehan	Runyan
Herrera Beutler	Mica	Ryan (WI)
Huelskamp	Miller (MI)	Scalise
Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney	Schilling
Hultgren	Murphy (PA)	Schmidt
Hunter	Myrick	Schock
Hurt	Neugebauer	Schweikert
Issa	Noem	Scott (SC)
Jenkins	Nugent	Scott, Austin
Johnson (IL)	Nunes	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (OH)	Nunnelee	Sessions
Johnson, Sam	Olson	Shimkus
Jordan	Palazzo	Shuster
Kelly	Paul	Simpson
King (IA)	Paulsen	Smith (NE)
King (NY)	Pearce	Smith (NJ)
Kingston	Pence	Smith (TX)
Kinzinger (IL)	Petri	Southerland
Kline	Pitts	Stearns
Labrador	Platts	Stivers
Lamborn	Poe (TX)	Stutzman
Lance	Polis	Sullivan
Landry	Pompeo	Terry
Lankford	Posey	Thompson (PA)
Latham	Price (GA)	Thornberry
LaTourette	Quayle	Tiberi
Latta	Reed	Tipton
LoBiondo	Rehberg	Turner (NY)
Long	Reichert	Turner (OH)
Lucas	Renacci	Upton
Luetkemeyer	Ribble	Walberg
Lummis	Rigell	Walden
Lungren, Daniel	Rivera	Walsh (IL)
E.	Roby	Webster
Manzullo	Roe (TN)	West
Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Westmoreland
Marino	Rogers (KY)	Whitfield
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (MI)	Wilson (SC)
McCaul	Rohrabacher	Wittman
McClintock	Rokita	Wolf
McCotter	Rooney	Womack
McHenry	Ros-Lehtinen	Woodall
McKeon	Ross	Yoder
McKinley	Ross (AR)	Young (AK)
McMorris	Ross (FL)	Young (FL)
Rodgers	Royce	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—17

Bishop (NY)	Jackson Lee	Miller, George
Clarke (NY)	(TX)	Rangel
Finer	Lewis (CA)	Sánchez, Linda
Galleghy	Mack	T.
Hanna	Meeks	Velázquez
Herger	Miller (FL)	
Jackson (IL)	Miller, Gary	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1230

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 408, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule,
the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCARTHY of California) having assumed the chair, Mrs. EMERSON, 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. 4480) to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas exploration, development, and production under oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in re-

sponse to a drawdown of petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and, pursuant to House Resolution 691, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment 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 to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Slaughter moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4480 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE —MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
SEC. 1. PROHIBITING NEW LEASES FOR MAJOR OIL COMPANIES UNTIL THEY FOREGO TAX BREAKS AND BUY AMERICAN.

(a) FORGOING TAX SUBSIDIES TO QUALIFY FOR NEW LEASES.—A major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) may obtain a lease made available under a plan required by subsection (k) of section 161 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, as amended by section 102 of this Act, only if that company agrees not to claim certain Federal tax benefits with respect to oil and gas exploration and production activities pursuant to that lease, including—

(1) percentage depletion allowances under sections 613 and 613A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(2) the domestic production activities deduction under section 199 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(b) BUY AMERICAN REQUIREMENT.—A plan required by subsection (k) of section 161 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, as amended by section 102 of this Act, shall encourage each major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) that obtains an oil and gas lease made available under such plan to use only materials made in the United States in drilling operations and avoid outsourcing American jobs.

Ms. SLAUGHTER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, with every decade that passes, the middle class has faced higher and higher prices at the pump. Meanwhile, the world's five biggest oil companies have reported record profits year after year. Between 2001 and 2011, the five biggest oil companies made more than \$1 trillion in profits.

Despite these record profits, the majority continues to put the wishes of Big Oil before the needs of the middle class. Instead of balancing our Nation's budget by closing tax loopholes on Big Oil, they have repeatedly told the middle class that they should sacrifice the programs on which they rely to live.

Twice, the majority has passed the Ryan budget, which would end Medicare as America knows it. And picture this for your mother or your most elderly relatives. In its place, they would be given a health care voucher and sent into the marketplace on their own to find health care on their own. Meanwhile, they work hard and we call all the time for votes, not to protect the billion-dollar Big Oil subsidies from any cuts, but, again, to protect our vanishing middle class. I think this approach is not only wrongheaded and will hurt us all, but it's morally wrong.

A year ago, Speaker BOEHNER told "60 Minutes" that ending subsidies for Big Oil companies is "certainly something we should be looking at." I couldn't agree more. He continued, "We're in a time when the Federal Government is short on revenues. We need to control spending, but we need to have revenues to keep the government moving, and they ought to be paying their fair share." Speaker BOEHNER was absolutely right, and this is the time to do it.

By voting in support of my amendment, the whole House will finally have the opportunity to demand that Big Oil pay its fair share.

Last year, the five biggest oil companies in the world made a combined record profit of \$137 billion. During that same time, thousands of middle class Americans slid out of the middle class and into poverty. While ExxonMobil was busy using at least 20 tax shelters to lower their tax rate to a mere 13 percent, over 20 million people were living on less than \$9,000 a year. That's not America. I think we need to balance our budget by asking those who have benefited the most simply to pay a fair share, not by taking from those who have the least. Our country was never based on that.

With my amendment, the world's biggest oil companies would begin to pay their fair share. They would be barred from receiving new drilling leases until they gave up their oil and gas subsidies. In addition, my amendment would require each Big Oil company that obtains an oil and gas lease to use American-made products and hire

American workers who are more than ready and willing to do the job. This amendment will do much of what we've been striving to do this whole term.

The amendment will not kill the bill nor send it back to committee. If we approve this amendment, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage.

It's up to us, ladies and gentlemen. We can return home this weekend and tell our constituents that finally we voted for the middle class, which is what they want us to do, or we can turn our backs on this opportunity before us and go home and explain why this Congress would vote to gut Medicare but won't ask Big Oil to pay their fair share.

I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit and stand up for the middle class and the suffering Americans.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentlelady is correct on one point: that it is up to us. It is up to us to protect and defend the middle class. It's up to us to work toward the development of American jobs. It's up to us to reduce the reliance on foreign oil. It's up to us to make sure that we have an opportunity to buy American from North Dakota, from Pennsylvania, from New York, from Colorado. We have an opportunity to buy energy from those States.

What about Ohio? What about Pennsylvania?

This will allow us to produce energy in this country, to buy energy from this country instead of growing our dependence on overseas energy, the Keystone XL pipeline, opportunities to look at our Federal resources for coal, for solar, for wind, traditional and renewable energy.

This bill is about American jobs, about lowering the price at the pump. We have seen over the past 3 years as gasoline prices have gone up nearly 100 percent.

We talk about putting people back to work. We talk about protecting the middle class. You know what will help people rise above it? You know what will help people move forward? It's making sure that they can afford the gasoline that they put into their tank, that they're not trying to sacrifice groceries for gasoline.

□ 1240

A one-penny increase and the price of gasoline will cost American consumers and businesses millions and millions of dollars a day.

You want to talk about things that we could do to help this country, it is an abundant and affordable energy policy, one that weans us off of foreign energy, makes sure that we are producing it here, and one that makes sure we are taking advantage of all of our energy—

renewable, traditional—in the sense that we're not just looking at quick-fix politics, but we're looking at long-term supply solutions.

But once again, we are met with opposition that includes more politics, less energy; more rhetoric, less opportunity. This isn't about smoke and mirrors. This is about putting Americans back to work producing American energy and making sure that we are watching out for our constituents, lowering the price of energy so that they can improve their lives and that of their families.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this motion to recommit. Let's move forward with American jobs, American energy, and support the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and the motion to instruct on H.R. 4348.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 166, nays 243, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 409]

YEAS—166

Ackerman	DeGette	Kissell
Andrews	DeLauro	Kucinich
Baca	Deutch	Langevin
Baldwin	Dicks	Larsen (WA)
Barber	Dingell	Larson (CT)
Bass (CA)	Doggett	Lee (CA)
Becerra	Doyle	Levin
Berkley	Edwards	Lewis (GA)
Berman	Ellison	Lipinski
Bishop (GA)	Engel	Loebsack
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Lofgren, Zoe
Bonamici	Farr	Lowey
Boswell	Fattah	Lujan
Brady (PA)	Frank (MA)	Lynch
Bralley (IA)	Fudge	Maloney
Brown (FL)	Garamendi	Markey
Butterfield	Gonzalez	Matsui
Capps	Green, Al	McCarthy (NY)
Capuano	Grijalva	McCollum
Carnahan	Gutierrez	McDermott
Carney	Hahn	McGovern
Carson (IN)	Hanabusa	McIntyre
Castor (FL)	Hastings (FL)	McNerney
Chandler	Heinrich	Michaud
Chu	Higgins	Miller (NC)
Cicilline	Himes	Moore
Clarke (MI)	Hinchee	Moran
Clay	Hinojosa	Murphy (CT)
Cleaver	Hirono	Nadler
Clyburn	Hochul	Napolitano
Cohen	Holden	Neal
Connolly (VA)	Holt	Oliver
Conyers	Honda	Owens
Cooper	Israel	Pallone
Costello	Johnson (GA)	Pascrell
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor (AZ)
Crowley	Jones	Pelosi
Cummings	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Davis (CA)	Keating	Peters
Davis (IL)	Kildee	Pingree (ME)
DeFazio	Kind	Polis

Price (NC)
 Qigley
 Rahall
 Reyes
 Richardson
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schwartz

Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sherman
 Shuler
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stark
 Waxman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Woolsey
 Yarmuth

Towns
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Visclosky
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Woolsey
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23
 Bishop (NY)
 Cardoza
 Clarke (NY)
 Filner
 Flores
 Gallegly
 Hoyer
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson Lee
 Kingston
 Lewis (CA)
 Mack
 Meeks
 Miller (FL)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George

Rangel
 Ross (FL)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Schweikert
 Sewell
 Smith (NJ)
 Velázquez

Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Marino
 Matheson
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCotter
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meehan
 Mica
 Miller (MI)
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Myrick
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 Olson
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Paul
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Pence
 Peterson

Petri
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Quayle
 Reed
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rigell
 Rivera
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross (AR)
 Ross (FL)
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ryan (WI)
 Scalise
 Schilling
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Scott, Austin

Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stearns
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner (NY)
 Turner (OH)
 Upton
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walsh (IL)
 Webster
 West
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

NAYS—243

Adams
 Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Altmire
 Amash
 Amodei
 Austria
 Gowdy
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Barrow
 Bartlett
 Barton (TX)
 Bass (NH)
 Benishek
 Berg
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Bonner
 Bono Mack
 Boren
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brooks
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Buerkle
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Canseco
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)
 Cole
 Conaway
 Costa
 Cravaack
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Critz
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Davis (KY)
 Denham
 Dent
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Dold
 Donnelly (IN)
 Dreier
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Emerson
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Flake
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gardner
 Garrett

Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green, Gene
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayworth
 Heck
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Herrera Beutler
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan
 Kelly
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Labrador
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Sessions
 Landry
 Lankford
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Latta
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Marino
 Matheson
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCotter
 McHenry
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meehan
 Mica
 Miller (MI)
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Myrick
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes

Nunnelee
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Paul
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Pence
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Quayle
 Reed
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Richmond
 Rigell
 Rivera
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross (AR)
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ryan (WI)
 Scalise
 Schilling
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schrader
 Scott (SC)
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stearns
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Sullivan
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner (NY)
 Turner (OH)
 Upton
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walsh (IL)
 Webster
 West
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Cantor
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

□ 1258

Mr. ROE of Tennessee changed his vote changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 409, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 163, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 410]

AYES—248

Adams
 Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Altmire
 Amash
 Amodei
 Austria
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Barrow
 Barton (TX)
 Benishek
 Berg
 Biggert
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Bonner
 Bono Mack
 Boren
 Boswell
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brooks
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Buerkle
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Canseco
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Chandler
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)

Cole
 Conaway
 Costa
 Costello
 Cravaack
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Cruz
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Davis (KY)
 Denham
 Dent
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Donnelly (IN)
 Dreier
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Emerson
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Flake
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)

Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Herrera Beutler
 Hochul
 Holden
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Kelly
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kissell
 Kline
 Labrador
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Landry
 Lankford
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Latta
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Lucas

Ackerman
 Andrews
 Baca
 Baldwin
 Barber
 Bartlett
 Bass (CA)
 Bass (NH)
 Becerra
 Berkley
 Berman
 Bilbray
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown (FL)
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Castor (FL)
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke (MI)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly (VA)
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 Deutch
 Dicks
 Doggett
 Dold
 McGovern
 McNeerney
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Farr
 Fattah
 Frank (MA)
 Fudge

NOES—163

Garamendi
 Gonzalez
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutierrez
 Hahn
 Hanabusa
 Hastings (FL)
 Hayworth
 Heinrich
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Brown (FL)
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Israel
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kildee
 Kind
 Kucinich
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Luján
 Lynch
 Maloney
 Markey
 Matsui
 McCarthy (NY)
 Dicks
 Doggett
 Dold
 McGovern
 McNeerney
 Michael
 Miller (NC)
 Moore
 Moran
 Murphy (CT)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal

Olver
 Pallone
 Passarelli
 Pastor (AZ)
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Pingree (ME)
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Reyes
 Richardson
 Richmond
 Rothman (NJ)
 Holt
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sherman
 Shuler
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Stark
 Sutton
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Visclosky
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Woolsey
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Bishop (NY)
 Cardoza
 Clarke (NY)

Dingell
 Filner
 Gallegly

Jackson (IL)
 Jackson Lee
 (TX)

Lewis (CA) Miller, George Smith (NJ)
 Mack Rangel Speier
 Meeks Sánchez, Linda Sullivan
 Miller (FL) T. Velázquez
 Miller, Gary Sewell

Fudge Luetkemeyer Rogers (MI)
 Gardner Lummis Rohrabacher
 Garrett Lungren, Daniel Rokita
 Gerlach E. Rooney
 Gibbs Manzullo Ros-Lehtinen
 Gingrey (GA) Marchant Roskam
 Gohmert Marino Matheson Ross (AR)
 Gonzalez McCarthy (CA) Ross (FL)
 Goodlatte Gosar Royce
 Gowdy McCaul Runyan
 Granger McClintock Ryan (OH)
 Graves (GA) McHenry Ryan (WI)
 Graves (MO) McIntyre Scalise
 Griffin (AR) McKeon Schilling
 Griffith (VA) McKinley Schmidt
 Grimm McMorris Schock
 Guinta Rodgers Schweikert
 Guthrie Meehan Scott (SC)
 Hall Mica Scott, Austin
 Hanna Mulvaney Sensenbrenner
 Harper Murphy (PA) Serrano
 Harris Myrick Sessions
 Hartzler Neugebauer Shimkus
 Hastings (WA) Noem Shuler
 Heck Nugent Shuster
 Hensarling Nunes Simpson
 Herger Nunnelee Smith (NE)
 Herrera Beutler Olson Smith (TX)
 Holden Owens Southerland
 Huelskamp Palazzo Stearns
 Huizenga (MI) Pastor (AZ) Stivers
 Hultgren Paul Stutzman
 Hunter Paulsen Sullivan
 Hurt Pearce Sutton
 Issa Pence Terry
 Jenkins Perlmutter Thompson (MS)
 Johnson (OH) Peterson Thompson (PA)
 Johnson, Sam Petri Thornberry
 Jones Pitts Tiberi
 Jordan Platts Tipton
 Kelly Poe (TX) Turner (OH)
 Kind Pompeo Upton
 King (IA) Posey Visclosky
 King (NY) Price (GA) Walberg
 Kingston Quayle Walden
 Kinzinger (IL) Rahall Walsh (IL)
 Kissell Reed Walz (MN)
 Kline Rehberg West
 Labrador Reichert Westmoreland
 Lamborn Renacci Whitfield
 Lance Ribble Wilson (SC)
 Landry Richmond Wittman
 Lankford Rigell Womack
 LaTourette Rivera Woodall
 Latta Roby Yoder
 Loeb sack Roe (TN) Young (FL)
 Long Rogers (AL) Young (IN)
 Lucas Rogers (KY)

Thompson (CA) Waxman
 Tonko Welch
 Towns Wilson (FL)
 Tsongas Wolf
 Van Hollen Woolsey
 Wasserman Yarmuth
 Smith (NJ) Schultz Young (AK)
 Smith (WA) Waters
 Stark Watt

□ 1305

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. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to state for the RECORD that I missed rollcall vote 410 to H.R. 4480 taken on June 21, 2012, and I would have voted “aye” on the measure. This critical legislation promotes an American energy plan that will not only reduce our dependence on foreign oil, but also spur economic growth and job creation. Additionally, the legislation will protect American refineries by reducing unnecessary red tape and burdensome Obama Administration regulations.

Stated against:

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 410, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 410, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on H.R. 4348 offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 260, nays 138, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 411]

YEAS—260

Adams Boren Crawford
 Aderholt Boswell Crenshaw
 Akin Boustany Critz
 Alexander Brady (TX) Cuellar
 Altmire Brooks Culberson
 Amash Broun (GA) Davis (KY)
 Amodei Brown (FL) DeFazio
 Austria Buchanan Dent
 Baca Bucshon Diaz-Balart
 Bachmann Buerkle Dold
 Bachus Burgess Donnelly (IN)
 Baldwin Burton (IN) Doyle
 Barber Calvert Dreier
 Barletta Campbell Duffy
 Barrow Canseco Duncan (SC)
 Bartlett Cantor Ellmers
 Barton (TX) Capito Emerson
 Bass (NH) Carter Farenthold
 Benishek Cassidy Pincher
 Berg Chabot Fitzpatrick
 Biggert Chaffetz Flake
 Bilbray Chandler Fleischmann
 Bilirakis Clyburn Fleming
 Bishop (GA) Coble Flores
 Bishop (UT) Coffman (CO) Forbes
 Black Cole Fortenberry
 Blackburn Conaway Foxx
 Bonner Costello Franks (AZ)
 Bono Mack Cravaack Frelinghuysen

NAYS—138

Andrews Edwards Lowey
 Bass (CA) Ellison Luján
 Becerra Engel Lynch
 Berkley Farr Maloney
 Berman Fattah Markey
 Blumenauer Frank (MA) Matsui
 Bonamici Garamendi McCarthy (NY)
 Brady (PA) Gibson McCollum
 Braley (IA) Green, Al McDermott
 Butterfield Grijalva McGovern
 Camp Hahn McNERney
 Capps Hanabusa Michaud
 Capuano Hastings (FL) Miller (NC)
 Carnahan Hayworth Moran
 Carney Heinrich Murphy (CT)
 Carson (IN) Himes Nadler
 Castor (FL) Hinchey Napolitano
 Chu Hirono Neal
 Cicilline Hochul Oliver
 Clarke (MI) Holt Pallone
 Clay Honda Pascarell
 Cleaver Hoyer Pelosi
 Cohen Israel Peters
 Connolly (VA) Johnson (GA) Pingree (ME)
 Conyers Johnson (IL) Polis
 Cooper Johnson, E. B. Price (NC)
 Costa Kaptur Quigley
 Courtney Keating Reyes
 Crowley Kildee Richardson
 Cummings Kucinich Rothman (NJ)
 Davis (CA) Langevin Roybal-Allard
 Davis (IL) Larsen (WA) Ruppersberger
 DeGette Larson (CT) Rush
 DeLauro Lee (CA) Sanchez, Loretta
 Denham Levin Sarbanes
 Deutch Lewis (GA) Schakowsky
 Dingell Lipinski Schiff
 Doggett LoBiondo Schrader

NOT VOTING—34

Ackerman Higgins Miller, Gary
 Bishop (NY) Hinojosa Miller, George
 Cardoza Jackson (IL) Moore
 Clarke (NY) Jackson Lee Rangel
 DesJarlais (TX) Sánchez, Linda
 Dicks Latham T.
 Duncan (TN) Lewis (CA) Sires
 Eshoo Lofgren, Zoe Speier
 Filner Mack Tierney
 Gallegly McCotter Turner (NY)
 Green, Gene Meeks Velázquez
 Gutierrez Miller (FL) Webster

□ 1312

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 411, Coal Ash Instruction, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to cast a vote on rollcall vote No. 411, the McKinley Motion to Instruct on H.R. 4348. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 411, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I was unfortunately delayed by a meeting and was unable to cast a vote on rollcalls 410 and 411 on Thursday, June 21, 2012. I would have voted “no” on both Final Passage of H.R. 4480 and the Republican Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 4348.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was not present in the House Chamber on Thursday, June 21 to vote on rollcalls 392 through 411. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcalls 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 400, 403, 405, 406, 407, 408 and 409. I would have voted “nay” on rollcalls 392, 399, 401, 402, 410 and 411.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on the Legislative Day of June 21, 2012, upon request of a leave of absence, a series of votes were held. Had I been present for these rollcall votes, I would have voted “no” on rollcall 392—the Hastings (WA) Manager’s Amendment; “yes” on rollcall 393—the Waxman Amendment; “yes” on rollcall 394—the Connolly Amendment; “yes” on rollcall 395—the Gene Green Amendment; “yes” on rollcall 396—the Rush Amendment; “yes” on rollcall 397—the Holt Amendment; “yes” on rollcall 398—the Connolly/Lewis (GA) Amendment; “no” on rollcall 399—the Amodei Amendment; “yes” on rollcall 400—the Markey Amendment; “no” on rollcall 401—the Landry Amendment; “no” on rollcall 402—the Rigell Amendment; “yes” on rollcall 403—the Holt Amendment; “no” on rollcall 404—the Wittman/Rigell Amendment; “yes” on rollcall 405—the Bass (CA) Amendment; “yes” on rollcall 406—the Capps Amendment; “yes” on

rollcall 407—Speier Amendment; “yes” on rollcall 408—the DeLauro/Markey/Frank Amendment; “yes” on rollcall 409—the Motion to Re-commit on H.R. 4480; “no” on rollcall 410—Final Passage of H.R. 4480; and “no” on rollcall 411—Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 4348.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5973, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5972, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-545) on the resolution (H. Res. 697) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5973) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the majority leader, to inquire of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet in pro forma session, but no votes are expected.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House may consider two appropriations bills next week, H.R. 5972, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, and H.R. 5973, the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Food and Drug Administration Act.

Members are advised that the House will begin consideration of one of these two bills after the 6:30 p.m. vote series on Tuesday and should expect an additional late evening series of votes on amendments. Again, Mr. Speaker, that is on Tuesday.

The House is also scheduled to consider a privileged resolution finding Eric H. Holder, Jr., Attorney General of the U.S. Department of Justice, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with a subpoena issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Finally, I expect the House to consider legislation dealing with both the expiring authority of our Nation's highway programs, as well as the pending increase in the Federal subsidized student loan rate.

Before I yield back, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure Members that we will accommodate both the congressional White House picnic on Wednesday night, as well as the congressional baseball game on Thursday evening. Debate may continue on appropriations amendments after the picnic and during the baseball game, but during those events no votes will take place.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Obviously, the gentleman has spoken to a number of very important pieces of legislation, and I want to talk about those. Then I want to talk about what I believe to be a diversion from the important business of this country. But I will get to, first, the highway conference.

On Friday, it will be 100 days since the Senate has passed a bipartisan bill, a bill which had 75 Members of the United States Senate for it. That conference has not yet reported out. I understand there is some activity on that.

The House overwhelmingly voted for the Walz MTI, and it said the conferees ought to report out a conference report by tomorrow. I don't know whether that's about to happen—today is tomorrow—but we will see whether or not it proceeds. Perhaps the gentleman can give us some information on that issue.

I've offered a motion, as the gentleman knows, to instruct to give the House an up-or-down vote on the Senate bill if we can't wait for a bill that comes out of conference. Clearly, if it doesn't come out of conference, it's going to cost us a lot of jobs. It will not protect the 1.9 million jobs the Senate bill protects, and it will not create approximately 1 million additional jobs.

As the gentleman knows, it is our view that we've been considering a lot of legislation which does not create jobs, does not impact positively the growth in our economy; but I think there is little dispute that the highway bill will in fact do that.

In addition, there has been a lot of talk about certainty. I agree with the premise that we ought to give certainty to the economy and to employ-

ers and employees, and to States and subdivisions and private sector contractors. Obviously, if we don't extend the highway bill, that will not be the case. In fact, it will be a very uncertain world in which they will be operating.

So can my friend tell me what the status of the conference is, if he knows? I will tell you, very frankly, that the Democratic conferees do not know the status of the conference.

And I will yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I would say to the gentleman the conferees continue to work in a bicameral nature. The discussions are proceeding between Chairman MICA and Chairman BOXER. And as the gentleman knows, I have said before, we are desirous of seeing a bill done, as the gentleman said, to afford more certainty to the folks who are relying on the funding of our Nation's transportation program. We certainly think it would be a huge benefit to producing a bill prior to the expiration of the program next week, but knowing full well most of us do not want to see any kind of shutdown in the funding, that we would be prepared in any way to make sure that does not happen.

□ 1320

But the intention is to allow these conferees to continue to do their work and, hopefully, we'll have a bill to vote on next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. I hope the gentleman's correct.

My concern, and the concern on this side, continues to be the position—as Mr. SHUSTER, who is the one of the ranking members and whose dad, of course, chaired the Transportation Committee at one point in time. There was a story that SHUSTER acknowledged that the House GOP's leadership's inability to pass its 5-year, \$260 billion transportation bill “weakens our hand in conference.” And this is what concerned me, Mr. Leader.

But he added, “It's not an option to give away the House position.”

Now, he was referring to, of course, a bill which has not passed this House, has not even been brought to the floor of this House. And that article went on to say, House Republicans say they are willing to walk away from the highway bill talks if they cannot get what they want.

Now, this was an interview—I see Mr. SHUSTER on the floor, and Mr. SHUSTER's a friend of mine. I'll be glad to hear what he has to say on that matter, and I'll yield to him.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And what I was referring to is we did send over a position on our extension, and that was the streamlining that we wanted in our original bill but was in the extension. So that's what I was talking about. That's the House position. And as far as I can tell, things are moving in a positive direction. But I guess we'll be debating your motion to instruct a little later.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. I certainly hope that we are moving in a positive direction because we've been a long time getting to resolution of this matter.

Next I would like to ask—you indicated that student loans may be on the calendar as well. Can the gentleman tell me what his expectation is on that, if he knows?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I'd say to the gentleman, it has been our position all along that we do not want to see the expiration of the funding of the program to impact the students that right now are struggling, and we have presented to both the White House, as well as the gentleman's side of the aisle here in the Capitol, various ways of accomplishing that end in a responsible manner, in a fiscally responsible manner so that we're not digging the hole any deeper, we're not incurring any additional debt in order to do that, and thus far, have not seen a willingness on the part of the White House.

I am aware that there are discussions ongoing on the other side of the Capitol to see if there can be some resolution on this issue. And that's all I can say to the gentleman as far as I know.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I'm hopeful that we can resolve this in a way that is agreeable to at least the majority of both Houses and to the President of the United States because if we don't, as the gentleman knows, we're going to increase interest rates by doubling them from 3.4 to 6.8 percent.

Today's college students are leaving with an average of \$26,000 in debt. This would add another \$1,000 of debt to those students, and right now, with students owing more than \$1 trillion, placing more debt on their head. And I would urge us, therefore, to come to an agreement, come to an agreement that both sides could vote for.

Obviously, as the gentleman knows, the House bill that passed was a pay-for that Democrats didn't vote for here, and I think it was well known that the Senate would not agree to that, so I'm hopeful that we do reach an agreement that will provide for its passage.

Now, let me ask the gentleman—we, of course, made the representation that we ought to be focused on jobs. We believe that's critically important, and we believe that ought to be the focus of this Congress. It's the focus of the American people.

We went through, in years past, distractions. You say, with just some 30 full days left between now and the election, that you're going to bring up a resolution that came out of committee, as I understand, yesterday, without much time for consideration or deliberation, a very, very serious matter.

Attorney General Holder, of course, has been involved in making sure that votes are not suppressed all over this country. He has, in my view, conducted himself in a way that brought credit to the Justice Department, to himself, and to this administration.

I don't know—well, let me ask the gentleman. How long do you expect to spend on this motion?

I don't think any of us have seen the final bill that's going to come to the floor or the resolution that's going to come to the floor suggesting that Mr. Holder be held in contempt. I don't think anybody outside of the committees has had an opportunity to consider this very weighty, important matter, very disruptive matter, if I would say, and distracting matter.

What procedure does the gentleman suggest is going to be pursued next week on this matter?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I'd respond to the gentleman, and I think the gentleman does know this is a privileged resolution of which he speaks, and it would be subject to the 1-hour rule, just as privileged resolutions were under their majority, Mr. Speaker, and we will expect to proceed accordingly.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. Which means that a matter of great weight is going to be brought to the floor within just a few days of being passed out of committee, with a relatively short period of time for either debate or for consideration.

There is, of course, precedent, and the gentleman's correct. It is a privileged resolution, and I understand the rules under privileged resolutions. But I do understand that this is a matter that's going to require a very careful, judicious, if I can say, consideration. And to bring it up at a time when we ought to be focused on jobs, when you're trying to do two appropriations bills, when you're talking about the highway bill and we're talking about the student loan bill, and to treat it as somewhat of a suspension bill provision, with little time to really have it discussed with the seriousness that the subject matter requires, I would suggest to the gentleman that this is going to be not only a distraction, but an unfortunate taking our focus off of creating jobs here in America.

I yield to my friend if he wants to make a comment.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I'd say to the gentleman, this is an issue of making sure that the American people are given an opportunity to have all the information surrounding the issues involved with the Fast and Furious program.

This is an issue that we feel, as has been indicated by the actions of Chairman ISSA, that in acting with all reason, asking of the administration and the Attorney General to produce certain documents, the Attorney General, having agreed to produce certain documents, then refusing to do so, Chairman ISSA, leading up to the vote in committee the other day had said all along, if the Attorney General had produced the documents, that there would be a postponement of the hearing.

And in the same fashion, Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, the Demo-

cratic whip, if the Attorney General would do what it is he committed to do and produce the documents, we'll postpone the vote. We've not seen any indication of that. He has not done that. And that's why I've announced the vote.

Mr. HOYER. Let me ask the gentleman, does the gentleman intend to go the Rules Committee to get a rule, or bring the privileged resolution directly to the floor?

I yield to my friend.

□ 1330

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say that some of that is still in discussion, but this resolution does have privilege.

Mr. HOYER. With respect to another piece of legislation, I would like to ask the gentleman about the Violence Against Women Act, which, again, the Senate passed in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion and which we passed in a relatively partisan fashion over here, where the parties were split.

Will the gentleman tell me whether or not he knows the status of that legislation and whether or not we expect to consider that anytime soon.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman, as he knows, the Senate has the so-called "blue slip" problem with its bill, and that is about as far as I know as to the progress in the Senate.

As the gentleman knows, we passed the bill here in the House. We did so in recognizing the suggestions and incorporating the suggestions that the GAO had made as to how to streamline the grant programs on the Violence Against Women Act to allow for dollars to reach victims in a more expeditious manner. We wholeheartedly support the passage of that as the gentleman saw when it passed the House. We would like to see a resolution on this.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

As the gentleman knows, we believe that the bill that passed the House on the Violence Against Women Act left out a lot of women. It reduced the scope that the Senate passed with, again, a bipartisan vote with, frankly, all the women on the Republican side of the aisle in the United States Senate voting for the Senate bill. We think the House bill restricted the coverage of that bill. It seems to me that we ought to be against violence against all women and other persons who may be subject to domestic violence. We would hope that that matter could be resolved, frankly, along the lines of making sure that all people are protected from domestic violence.

Lastly, may I ask the gentleman what he expects the schedule for the balance of July to be. Again, I would reiterate, as the gentleman knows, we have very, very few days left, less than 30 full days between now and the election following this week. There are another 8 days that are 6:30 days, or some number, either 7 or 8 6:30 days, so we don't have very much time to deal with

some of the pressing problems, including dealing with middle class tax cuts to make sure that working people in this country who are having a hard time making ends meet don't get an increase in their taxes on January 1.

Will the gentleman tell me what he expects the schedule to be in the month of July.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I will respond to the gentleman and say to the gentleman that, again, if he looks at the schedule, we are scheduled and have been in accord with that schedule and in session more days this year than we were in a similar year last session. So I would say to the gentleman the schedule is right on track. The predictability, the certainty of this schedule, has allowed for the work to continue.

We will be here throughout July. Our intention is to continue to focus on job creation. We will be looking, obviously, towards the Supreme Court and what its actions may bring next week on the issue of ObamaCare. If we have to act in response to that to assure all Americans that we want and care about their health care, we will do so. If the Court does not strike down the bill in its entirety, the gentleman knows our conference is fully committed to the total repeal of the ObamaCare bill.

In July, we will continue to focus on that bill and its impact on employers. We also are very concerned about the overreach of the regulatory agencies in this town and intend to bring forward a bill with a series of provisions which will address the red tape that has begun to strangle the innovation and growth in this economy.

We will also be very focused on a measure to stop the tax hike that is facing the American people this year. If you look at the enormity of the tax hike, it is something that is hanging over this economy, that is hanging over the mindset of small business people and working families. I don't think anybody would advocate raising taxes, especially in this economy.

That will be the outline of our work with, obviously, some other measures that may be brought up in July.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Let me just add, Mr. Speaker, that, clearly, when you look at the Congress to which he referred in terms of its productivity in the 2007 and 2008 years, we think the productivity was very much higher. I won't go through the litany of those figures; but I think, if the majority leader reviews them, he will see in terms of the productivity of the Congress that we moved America much further forward.

Having said that, I want to say that we hope that we will continue to focus on jobs. I know I share the gentleman's view—and I think all of us share the view—that we want to have reasonable regulations that help grow the economy, not impede its growth. We're for that. We may have a difference of opinion on what that does when we think of deregulating the protection of our en-

vironment, when we think of deregulating the safety of our financial markets. When we took the referee off the field, it had an extraordinarily negative impact on this country and on every taxpayer in this country and on every business in this country. It was not useful. It was not helpful.

I think we have a difference of opinion on whether or not we want to make sure there is a level playing field, a fair playing field, for all the participants in our economy—both businesses and consumers. Clearly, there was an effort that was being made to undermine the ability of the CFTC to fully oversee what was a market that went out of control. As a result, there were dire consequences to our country and its fiscal status.

So I am hopeful that we don't pursue a regulatory agenda, which is an agenda with the net result of taking the referee off the field. I don't think the American public wants that, and I don't really think that that's reasonable. Further, I think they think we really need to be focused on things that will immediately grow this economy. The highway bill would have done that. Unfortunately, that highway bill has stayed in limbo for too long a time. I am hopeful that we can move it.

Unless the gentleman has something further to say, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 25, 2012

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

MOTIONS TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 4348.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Hoyer moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4348 be instructed to recede from disagreement to the amendment of the Senate:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and in-

clude extraneous materials on my motion to instruct.

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

There was no objection.

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

Tomorrow will mark, as I said a little earlier, 100 days since the United States Senate approved its bipartisan compromise highway bill in the United States Senate. There were 74 Senators who voted for that. Essentially half of the Republican Conference in the United States Senate voted for that bill.

There has been a bill in the House committee. That bill has languished in the House committee for many, many months—in fact, for about 4 months after the Speaker said he wanted to bring it to the floor. It has not come to the floor, apparently, because the Republican Party is divided on that bill, and they don't have the votes for that bill.

□ 1340

That measure passed the Senate 74–22, and it would have been, by the way, 75–22 had FRANK LAUTENBERG been there. He made that statement on the floor. That's three-quarters of the Senate, with the support of 22 Senate Republicans.

Americans are wishing that we would come together, reason together, and act together to give certainty to them, to the economy, and to their country. Unfortunately, the House bill that was passed was effectively a bill simply to go to conference. I know my friend—and he is my friend—Mr. SHUSTER from Pennsylvania will say that in the article that was written, that it was simply “that House bill” to which he was referring. I take him at his word that he was referring to that. But very frankly, others have said that there were items in the bill in committee that were critically important to them that ought to be in the conference committee report, and obviously the Senate would not agree to those.

This bill, to which I refer and which this motion to instruct refers, is supported by chambers of commerce in cities and counties across this Nation.

This is truly a bipartisan piece of legislation in the great tradition of transportation bills passed since the Eisenhower era. The gentleman who is managing the time on the Republican side, his father was a great proponent of infrastructure investment, a great leader in this Congress on infrastructure, and, in fact, participated—every time that I think he brought a bill out as ranking member, it was passed in a bipartisan fashion. Unfortunately, we haven't gotten to that point at this point of time.

Instead of taking up that bill, the Senate bill, and allowing us to have a vote on it here in the House—in my opinion, if the Republican leadership let its Members vote free of influence by the leadership, that bill would have

the majority of votes on this House floor. Speaker BOEHNER has said he wants this House to work its will. In my point of view, in my estimation, that bill has a majority support on the floor of this House. It would have, I think, every Democratic vote, just as the Export-Import Bank had every vote on our side of the aisle. That's why it passed overwhelmingly, not withstanding Republican opposition.

The caucus on the other side of the aisle, in my opinion, remains divided over how to proceed. House Republicans have, once again, turned an opportunity to invest in job creation into a partisan exercise in saying "no" to any legislation that might strengthen our recovery and lower our unemployment rate.

I'm not unmindful, and I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania will observe, that apparently there has been some progress made. The progress that has been made is unknown to the Democratic side of this aisle. Neither the ranking member knows what progress has been made, nor the ranking member of the subcommittee knows what progress has been made. But we're going to be told, apparently, there is some progress that has been made. I hope that's the case. But, very frankly, if that progress is not made, we ought to pass the Senate bill.

When presented with a real chance to lead, frankly, Republicans in my view too often have walked away. Whether it was keeping government going on continuing resolutions, whether it was on making sure that the most reliable and creditworthy Nation in the world did not default on its debt, whether it was on passing an Export-Import Bank to make sure that we created jobs and were competitive in this country, too often our Republican friends have decided not to go there.

Republicans are unwilling to act on must-pass bills, and in several cases played a dangerous game by holding bills hostage. As I said, this includes the debt limit crisis last summer and the debate over extending the middle class payroll tax last December. Over and over again, our Republican colleagues have proven themselves to be the "Walk-Away Caucus."

This Congress has been in session for only 60 days so far this year. Between now and the election, we're scheduled to be in session for 38 days, but only 30 of those are full work days. Between now and the election—that's 4 months from now. Thirty days between today—June 21—and the election in November.

With one wasted opportunity after another, they've earned the 112th a place in history as truly another "Do-Nothing Congress," a phrase made famous by Harry Truman.

Mr. Speaker, my motion is simple. It instructs the House conferees to agree to the Senate's version that is based on bipartisanship and doing what's right for our economy. What does that bill mean?

The Senate bill leverages Federal funding to protect 1.9 million jobs. Why

is that important? Because we lost 28,000 construction jobs last month alone. Why? Because we failed to pass this bill. In addition to the 1.9 million jobs that this bill would provide, it would provide another 1 million jobs as we expand transportation opportunities.

In my home State of Maryland, nearly 29,000 jobs are supported by Federal transportation investments. Those are jobs of families who are paying taxes, sending their kids to school, buying groceries, buying goods and services, and supporting our economy.

In Speaker BOEHNER's home State of Ohio, over 55,000 jobs are supported by this bill. And in Virginia, Republican leader CANTOR's home State, almost 40,000 jobs are on the line. That highway funding expires July 1, just a few days from now.

For the sake of all these workers, for the sake of all these families who rely on these jobs, and for the sake of all those workers and families who would be advantaged by the passage of this bill and the jobs that it will create—not only save, but create—in Maryland and Ohio, in Virginia—my colleague Mr. MORAN is here—and across our country, let's pass this bill.

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, let's pass a transportation bill that isn't simply another short-term extension. Such extensions provide no certainty to the businesses that rely on sound infrastructure to move goods to market. Let's pass the long-term reauthorization we need that will help put our economy back in drive—not in neutral and not in reverse.

Don't take my word for it why this is so important and so urgent. Listen to President Ronald Reagan, who said in 1982—and I'm sure, frankly, the gentleman's dad would have supported these statements:

The time has come to preserve what past Americans spent so much time and effort to create, and that means a nationwide conservation effort in the best sense of the word. America can't afford throwaway roads or disposable transit systems.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's not too late for this Do-Nothing Congress to make a U-turn and get back to work. It's not too late to heed President Reagan's wise words. It's not too late to provide our businesses with the certainty they're asking for.

I urge my Republican friends to start working with Democrats to make the investments we need to grow jobs and strengthen our competitiveness before it's too late. Frankly, that's what the American people expect. Let's for once not disappoint them. Let's pass this motion, and work together to move this country forward.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

A lot of what Mr. HOYER said I agree with when it comes to moving a transportation bill. I think it is important

to America, and our infrastructure is the backbone of our economy. We all know, I think, that in many places in the country it's crumbling, and we here in Congress need to do our job. But this motion to instruct the conferees to accept the Senate bill in its entirety is contrary to the purpose of having a House and a Senate conference.

I know my friend from Maryland has been one of the great defenders of this institution. To suggest that we should just up and take the Senate bill is a bit surprising to me that the gentleman would do that. As I said, he's been a real champion to make sure that the House maintains its position and he has always been a strong defender.

□ 1350

Also, I would just like to remind my Democrat colleagues, because we've been debating this bill for the past several months—my colleagues sometimes need to be reminded that when they controlled both the House and the Senate, they weren't able to get a bill out of full committee on any basis, partisan or bipartisan. So it has been a difficult road. And again, they saw the difficulties back when they were in the majority.

But it's our responsibility to sit down with our Senate colleagues and address areas where we have differences of opinion. And I might add too that there's a statement that just went out from Chairman BOXER and Chairman MICA, a joint statement, that reads:

The conferees have moved forward toward a bipartisan, bicameral agreement on a highway reauthorization bill. Both House and Senate conferees will continue to work with a goal of completing a package by next week.

So there's been movement.

I would urge the gentleman to retract his motion, not offer it, because I think there is a point when the chair of the conference and the vice chair of the conference are saying, there has been movement, that it is very positive. The Senate bill, though, if you will want to continue, the Senate bill includes provisions that I have serious concerns with; and I believe many on the other side of the aisle would have serious concerns about it.

When they get to study the Senate bill, you will find that it requires that all new passenger vehicles, all new passenger vehicles beginning in 2015, be equipped with event data recorders. These recorders are similar to the black boxes that are required in aircraft. While the intent of this provision is to collect safety information, I believe many of us would see it as a slippery slope toward Big Government and Big Brother knowing what we're doing and where we are.

So, again, I think if my colleagues on the other side—and we've talked about different ways to collect data—and those on the other side of the aisle have great concerns about allowing information to be collected by Big Brother. And privacy is a big concern for many across America.

There are also areas where the Senate bill does not go far enough. While the Senate bill includes a few provisions to streamline the project delivery process, it does not go far enough. And I believe we are at a time in our history—and the gentleman and many people around here mentioned my father and the good work that he did, and he did great work. But the times have changed in the sense that the last two highway bills that were passed, the economy was in good shape, the highway trust was flush with cash, and we had the ability, as Members of Congress, to direct money back to our States and our districts. So it's been a very difficult process, minus those three things.

Again, these streamlining projects, the Senate bill does not set hard deadlines for Federal agencies to approve projects. So they can just go on and on and on—and have. And that's why it takes 14 to 15 years to build a major highway project in this country.

I was just out in Oklahoma City a month or so ago. They just opened up the Oklahoma City Crosstown Express. It cost \$680 million and took 15 years to build. If we're able to do some of these streamlining projects, we believe we can cut that time in half. So if you just look at that project in Oklahoma City, \$680 million, on inflation alone we could have saved \$60 million to \$80 million on that project alone; \$60 million to \$80 million would go a long way in fixing infrastructure in Maryland and Pennsylvania and Virginia and New Jersey. So these are the kinds of revisions. That's just one, setting the hard deadlines.

It does not allow State environmental laws to be used in place of Federal environmental laws. When a State has a more rigorous environmental process, like California, like other States, why do they need the Federal Government's approval when theirs goes far beyond what we do here in Washington? Or if it's equal to the Federal Government, instead of going through a second environmental regulatory process, let's let the States use theirs—if it's equal to or exceeds the EPA standards.

It does not expand the list of projects that qualify for categorical exclusions. What are categorical exclusions? If you are going to replace a bridge with another bridge in the same footprint, if you are going to expand a roadbed in the current right-of-way, it would allow there to be an abbreviated, a faster review process so that we can get those bridges built faster, we can get those lanes added more quickly.

Again, what it comes down to is saving money. Time is money. I think we all know that. And it also does not expedite projects that are being rebuilt due to disasters. Again, we've seen it in Minnesota. When the bridge collapsed, in 436 days we were able to construct a major bridge crossing over that river in Minnesota.

Also, program consolidation is another important reform that the House

has been pushing. The Senate has been pushing to add two new programs at a dollar cost of \$3 billion a year. At a time when the highway trust fund is going broke, we should be focusing our limited transportation dollars on consolidating programs and eliminating wasteful programs, not creating new ones.

Funding flexibility for the States, another critical point that allows the States to fund the most economically significant highway and bridge projects in their State. The Federal Government should not mandate the States to plant flowers and beautification.

Even bike paths—and I have been a big supporter of bike paths in the past; but today when we have bridges crumbling, when there is safety in question, in good conscience we can't tell States to spend that type of money. But if they want to, they can. They can opt out. They can spend that money if they so desire. But again, I think this is not a time when the Federal Government should be telling States to spend money on projects that aren't going to be the most beneficial to their constituencies. We need to focus those resources.

These are issues that are not addressed in the Senate bill and should be addressed in this conference. And from the statement that I read earlier, I believe we are moving in a direction to adopt some of what I just talked about.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion. I would urge the gentleman, my friend from Maryland, to step back again at a time when we're getting so close. As the gentleman fully knows—he's been in this institution long enough and has negotiated many, many significant pieces of legislation—this is not a time for us to be out here talking about it, but to hunker down, make sure the conferees, the two chairmen are able to move forward to get a bill that's going to benefit America.

And with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to say to the gentleman, the items that he mentioned—some of which we may agree on, some of which we may not agree on—frankly, could have been included in the bill that the House could have reported out of committee and brought to the floor. That didn't happen. What we did was, with the inability to pass a bill that came out of your committee on the floor of the House, we then repaired to what was essentially a shell of a bill to go to conference.

The problem that I have with the gentleman's statement is I hope that the statement that "we may be getting there" is correct.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

But if we "may be" getting there, we're getting there because we've con-

stantly done motions like this to get us to the issue. We are talking about some 2-plus million jobs. That's why the Chamber of Commerce is involved. That's why counties, States, and local municipalities are involved, saying, Come to an agreement.

Very frankly, the bill that we passed here had some things that didn't relate to transportation. What the gentleman has mentioned are items that dealt with transportation. Your bill, as you well know, had items in it which were clearly not acceptable to the President of the United States because they were unrelated to transportation.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

The gentleman hasn't mentioned any of those. I am pleased that he hasn't mentioned those.

I hope that the House Republicans have now decided that's not going to be the litmus test for whether or not we create jobs and save jobs in the transportation field and give certainty to contractors and to public entities.

At this point in time, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from New Jersey (Mr. SIRES).

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of Congressman HOYER's motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 4348, the surface transportation bill.

This motion to instruct conferees would ask the conference committee to end their differences and support the Senate-passed measure. Senate 1813, or MAP-21, was passed by an overwhelming bipartisan majority with a final vote of 74-22.

Tomorrow marks 100 days since the Senate passed their bipartisan bill. We have just over 1 week before the extension expires. We cannot afford to pass yet another short-term extension. We need to create jobs here in America.

National unemployment is 8.2 percent, and construction unemployment is nearly double, at 14.2 percent. Summer has officially started, and the construction season is short. We have 1.2 million unemployed construction workers who are waiting for work.

□ 1400

MAP-21 is estimated to save 1.9 million jobs and create another 1 million jobs. We have the legislative solution to create jobs. It is the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to put their differences aside and pass a comprehensive reauthorization. MAP-21 was passed on a bipartisan majority in the Senate. Let us do the same here in the House and put America back to work.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Just in response to my good friend from Maryland, I'm glad he brought up some of those other provisions, and they are job-creating provisions.

The RAMP Act will unlock the Harbor Trust Fund so we can invest in our

ports, which I know the gentleman has a major port in Maryland. But those dollars are going to rebuilding and dredging and doing the things we need to do to be competitive around the world. So that's a jobs act that's in the transportation bill. And I might add, ports are certainly transportation.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

We have also a reform in there on the coal ash, which is an element that goes into making cement. Of course, building roads and bridges, it's about cement and concrete. So there's another provision in it we believe will help our industries to be able to continue to make and produce cement to build our roads.

Finally, the Keystone pipeline. I think all of America—or most of America knows that's been paying attention, which is about 80 percent—believe it is a positive thing to bring oil and energy to America to help power this economy while creating 20,000 jobs and maybe as much as a hundred thousand jobs in indirect labor and jobs to this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Science and Technology Committee, Ms. JOHNSON from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I rise in support of Democratic Whip HOYER's motion to instruct the conferees, which directs the conferees to agree to the Senate-passed transportation bill, MAP-21.

MAP-21 passed the Senate by a strong bipartisan vote of 74-22, and it is critical that the House pass this legislation. We have been waiting a very, very long time. I'm from the State of Texas. There's no State in the Union that this bill is more important for. Our season is now to get highways started. And we have massive infrastructure needs, just like the rest of the country.

Tomorrow does mark the 100th day since the Senate passed the bill, and the current reauthorization will expire next week. And while I'm encouraged by the progress being made in the conference negotiations, we simply cannot afford to delay any longer for individual pleas, for individual needs. We all have needs.

This bill is not perfect. No bill we pass is perfect. But this bill is certainly needed to plan and to develop. We have to have time for the States to look at what they have available and plan for it. We cannot do this like any other bill. This is a transportation bill, infrastructure planning bill, and we simply must do something now.

In addition to it saving 1.9 million jobs, it creates a million jobs. It's a jobs bill. We've been talking about passing a jobs bill for the last almost 2 years, and nothing has passed yet. I am pleading that we all support this motion to instruct, and I encourage my

colleagues to support it and let's get this bill done.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

To not support Congressman HOYER's motion to the Senate transportation bill for which, many times it's been said, 74 Senators, including 22 Republicans, voted for, I would suggest, is to engage in nothing less than economic sabotage.

Well into the construction season, the unemployment rate in the construction industry is at least twice the national average, and another short-term extension will not bring enough certainty to an industry that is hurting as badly as this one is.

MAP-21 is the single largest jobs bill passed by either body in this Congress. In my home State of Illinois alone, MAP-21 will save or create nearly 70,000 jobs. Nationwide, the bill will save or create nearly 2 million jobs and spur 1 million additional jobs through the leveraging of transportation funds.

It is hard to understand, as we are ending the month of June and construction needs to be done all over this country, that we are still delaying the passage of a bill that would mean so much to the workers across the country and to strengthening our economy. I think that we need to support this motion right now, to support MAP-21, and to send it to the President's desk immediately.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I would say to our good friend from Pennsylvania that it is hard to believe that Chairman Bud Shuster would not be as troubled as we are by the state of the transportation bill. And he would be saying as we are: Just do it.

You have suggested any number of things where we would reach agreement, I would say to my friend from Pennsylvania, but this has been going on for almost 3 years. It was back in October of 2009 that we got a 1-month extension. Then, we extended it for 48 days; then 72 days; then 16 days; then 9½ months; then 2 months and 4 days; then 6 months and 25 days; then 6 months, and 91 days, and now we're talking about another 3-month extension.

Let's just do it. That's why there's instruction to accept the Senate bill. If we know what we need, then let's reach compromise and get it done. Because meanwhile, people are unemployed. The American people are hurting, and the American public is disgusted with the Congress.

When we had a 13 percent approval rating, I was wondering how we had so many family and friends. Well, sure

enough, now it's dipped down to single digits. Why? Because they don't see us doing anything. They don't see us compromising.

In the Senate, we have a Senate transportation bill where people as conservative as Republican JIM INHOFE, the ranking member of Surface Transportation, has approved this. It passed. Three-quarters of the Senate approved this. Why can't we just accept this and get it done?

We're talking about almost 3 million jobs that would be saved or created. We are in desperate need of jobs. There are jobs in this country, and they're going to have a lasting dividend once we improve our roads and our bridges and our public transit systems.

We need to get this done. The American people have been waiting 2½ years for this surface transportation bill. That's why the motion to instruct is so important and why I support Mr. HOYER, because this is what the American people want. And the fact is that, while it maintains current funding levels for highway and public transportation, it consolidates highway programs, establishes a national freight program, and any number of things.

We can agree it's not perfect, but it's the best we can do. And the American people deserve it.

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

I appreciate the passion from the gentleman from Virginia, and I believe he is a supporter of infrastructure, as am I. I think you were referring to the former chairman. I was just emailing back and forth to him. He sees much agreement with what we're trying to do in the House. He sees the need for reform. And as I've been going through this process, I certainly talked to him about some of the things he wishes he would have been able to accomplish. And what we're doing in this bill are things he's applauding. If any of you don't realize, the chairman is still alive and well and still consults with his Member of Congress—when I ask and when I don't ask, I might add.

Again, I have to remind my colleagues, and be respectful when I do this, when you had the majority, six times you extended without passing a bill. And you had a majority in the House and Senate and White House. And I might add that, if you would have focused the stimulus bill on an infrastructure bill instead of spending it in all different ways that didn't have the kind of impact that you thought and, in fact, didn't have much of an impact at all, I think we would see a much different economy today if we would have focused on this because I know there are jobs out there, millions of jobs, in construction and construction-related businesses where we could help by passing a bill.

□ 1410

Again, just to remind my colleagues, the House and the Senate, chairman and vice chairman, have issued a statement. We are moving in the right direction towards a bipartisan, bicameral

solution, not just a Senate solution. Again, I know that the two gentlemen, the whip and of course Mr. MORAN from Virginia, have been great defenders of the House. For us to just give in to the Senate, I don't think I've ever seen them when they were in the majority just handing it off to the Senate. So I feel positive.

Again, I supported Mr. WALZ's motion to instruct a few days ago because he said get in there, hammer this thing out; come up with a bipartisan, bicameral bill. That's why I supported that. Again, on this, I just can't support this. I have got to vote against it, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" also.

And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am a supporter of this institution. I am a supporter, as Mr. SHUSTER pointed out, of regular order. I do believe that the House has a right and a duty and a responsibility to maintain its positions—when it can get to a position.

Let me reiterate so the American people understand. Speaker BOEHNER said that the highway bill was very important to him. He wanted to see it reported out. The committee acted on a bill and never brought it to the floor.

I pause so the American people can understand, the House has been unable to take a position. Now my friend will say, oh, no, we did pass a bill, and that's correct. Admittedly, however, from everybody's perspective, it was not a full bill; it was a shell bill. It was a shell bill to go to conference. Did it have some provisions in there? Yes, it did. It had Keystone in there, which was clearly unacceptable to the President in the form that it was offered and unacceptable to the Senate in the form that it was offered.

Very frankly, my friend from Pennsylvania talks about his dad, who I know is very much alive and was a very good Member of this body. I will say that we did pass some extensions, all on a bipartisan fashion, as you well know. All on a bipartisan fashion. This was not done in a bipartisan fashion.

We could have forged a bill that would have had overwhelming support in this House, in my opinion. The Republican side of the aisle chose not to do that. And I've got a hunch that my friend sitting in the chair, Mr. SHUSTER, regrets that. He doesn't have to say anything about that, but I just have a hunch he regrets that. I regret it. I regret that we are not able to come together and reason together, but we take hard-line positions that if you don't agree with me, it's my way or no highway. That's regrettable. The American people know it's regrettable.

And I want to tell my friend from Pennsylvania, if it weren't 100 days ago, as of tomorrow, that a bipartisan—overwhelmingly bipartisan—bill was passed, and if this House had been able to pass a real highway bill, but we

didn't have that opportunity. That bill was not brought to the floor. The gentleman knows that bill was not brought to the floor. It still languishes in his committee. Or perhaps it's been reported out and may be sitting someplace else.

The fact of the matter is that this motion is designed to say to 1.9 million people who may lose their job if we don't pass a bill next Friday, in a Congress that has been mired in confrontation and unwilling to compromise, and another million people who will have job opportunities if that bill passes, it is to say, let us act. And we have a vehicle on which to act, a vehicle that enjoyed the support of all Democrats and half of the Republican Conference in the United States Senate, a bill that had agreement between Senator BOXER from California, correctly I think described as a liberal Democrat from the State of California, and JIM INHOFE, correctly described I believe as a conservative Republican from Oklahoma. They came together. They reached agreement.

I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania is probably absolutely correct; it's not a perfect bill. I don't know that I've ever voted for a perfect bill on the floor of this House, at least one that I thought was perfect. That's the nature of this body, that we come together and we compromise and everybody doesn't get what they want because maybe their region or their people or their businesses or their consumers don't see it the same way mine do. We compromise.

But the Senate bill, while it may not be perfect, enjoyed broad bipartisan compromise and support. Therefore, I think it is our best opportunity, because we've shown in this House that we have, for the last 6 months, been unable to come to agreement, and the Republican majority in this House has been unable to agree among itself to bring a full bill to the floor.

So, Mr. Speaker, that does not give much confidence not only to my side of the aisle but to those contractors, those construction workers, those States, those counties, those municipalities who know that they have to address the transportation challenges of their areas. It doesn't give them much confidence, and I've heard a lot about building confidence.

I believe that if we passed the Senate bill, we would create those jobs, retain the 1.9 million jobs, and give confidence to our economy and grow jobs. I hope that's what the other side wants to do. They talk a lot about it. And if the economy improved, of course, the administration might be advantaged as well. I hope that's not a consideration of anybody who considers these pieces of legislation. America expects us to come together and reach agreement. The Senate has done that. On this side of the Capitol, we have not. We ought to do it.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my good friend from Mary-

land's Motion to Instruct House conferees to bring up the bipartisan Senate transportation bill. In the 10 most congested cities in America—including the Washington DC region which both Mr. HOYER and I represent—drivers spend more than 40 hours a year stuck in traffic. That's an entire work week lost to congestion, yet all the Republican majority has offered in response is more partisan gridlock.

Americans are waiting for road improvements, bridge repairs, and more transit options. The American economy is waiting for more robust job growth. The nation lost 28,000 construction jobs last month and more than 2 million construction jobs since the Great Recession began.

Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower knew investing in infrastructure would create jobs and spur the economy so he created the American interstate highway system. This March, the Senate passed a bipartisan transportation bill—with 22 Republicans on board—to alleviate gridlock on our streets and in the halls of Congress. But so far, House Republicans have refused to even bring it up for a vote, for fear that it might actually pass!

A robust transportation program such as the bipartisan Senate bill helps both American commuters, and the American economy, get moving again. If we are going to create jobs and ease commutes, the Republican majority must stop idling. I urge my colleagues to support Mr. HOYER'S Motion to Instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUNNELEE). All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of my motion to instruct.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Black moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4348 be instructed to reject section 31108 of the Senate amendment (relating to distracted driving grants), other than the matter proposed to be inserted as section 411(g) of title 23, United States Code (relating to a distracted driving study).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK)

and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

□ 1420

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

We began the 112th Congress by reading the U.S. Constitution as a body, and we require that every bill cite the section of the Constitution that allows Congress to consider the legislation.

My motion to instruct simply maintains this desire of the House by protecting States' rights under the 10th Amendment. The 10th Amendment reads:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

I believe that the issue of laws related to distracted driving are best left to the States. That's why as a State senator in my home State of Tennessee I voted three times for a distracted driving law on the books today.

As a mother and a grandmother and a nurse, I strongly support absolute safety on our roadways. I also believe that there's no one in this Chamber who doesn't support safe driving laws. But this motion to instruct is not about safety; it's about the States' rights under the Constitution and stopping Federal manipulation of State law through taxpayer-funded distracted driving grants.

Now, the Senate passed a highway bill, Senate Bill 1813, that contains a provision that would grant the U.S. Department of Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood \$79 million to entice the States to enact and enforce Federal distracted driving laws, something that 39 States already have on their books—39 States have already enacted these laws.

I believe the States are great laboratories for determining what works and what does not work. That is why my motion to instruct keeps intact a study—wants a study to be conducted on all forms of distracted driving. This helps government and also the public better understand and identify the most effective methods to educate drivers and enhance States' understanding of these issues so that they can enact and tailor laws best suited to the individual needs of their States.

I'm offering a motion to instruct that simply strikes the distracted driving grant funding language contained in the Senate-passed bill, while calling for a study to be conducted on all forms of distracted driving. This helps government and the public better understand and identify the most effective methods to educate the drivers and enhance the States' understanding of these issues so they can enact and tailor laws best suited to the individual needs of their State. What is best for the State of Massachusetts may not be best for the State of Montana. And as

the 10th Amendment to our Constitution was written, these laws are reserved for individual States.

Now, just as we must provide certainty to job creators, we must provide certainty to States on the highway bill. The only way to accomplish this task is to allow for focused use of taxpayer dollars that is produced in a multiyear transportation bill that restricts the highway fund to its intended use, that is, building and maintaining America's roads and bridges. Taxpayer dollars are so precious, they should not be used on anything other than the intended purpose.

I urge my colleagues to protect states' rights and support my motion to instruct.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition to the motion.

The motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) seeks to eliminate a distracted driving grant program included in the Senate surface transportation authorization bill. I oppose this motion because it ignores the significant safety hazard that distracted driving poses to drivers, commuters, passengers, and pedestrians.

Distracted driving is any activity behind the wheel that takes a driver's attention away from the road. The rapid development and ubiquitous use of technology such as cell phones, smart phones, and in-vehicle touch screens has made routine distraction an almost commonplace occurrence in every vehicle across America.

According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, in 2010 more than 3,000 Americans were killed in crashes involving a distracted driver and approximately 416,000 additional Americans were injured.

Distractions from technology can include texting, talking on a phone, or using a navigation system or other audio or visual equipment while in a vehicle. But because text messaging requires visual, manual, and cognitive attention from the driver all at the same time, it is by far the most dangerous distraction.

The Wireless Association reported that in June 2011 more than 196 billion text messages were sent or received in the United States, which is up nearly 50 percent from just 2 years ago over the same period. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration also reported that more than 100,000 drivers are texting and more than 600,000 drivers are using cell phones at any given moment in time. Sending or receiving a text takes a driver's attention from the road for an average of 4.6 seconds, which, while it may not seem like a long time, it's the equivalent of driving the length of an entire football field, taking the driver's eyes off the road. It's not surprising that, according to research done by Virginia Tech, a texting driver is 23 times more likely to be involved in a crash than a non-distracted driver.

The proposed grant program in the Senate bill is an opportunity to address the rapidly growing problem of distracted driving and to educate the driving public about the real and immediate dangers of distraction behind the wheel.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of American lives are at stake. And these are not statistics. These are people—like 21-year-old Casey Feldman, who was struck and killed by a distracted driver as she crossed the street in Ocean City, New Jersey in 2009. It's people like 56-year-old John Sligting, who was killed on his motorcycle when a teen driver talking on her cell phone missed a stop sign in June 2007. It's people like 13-year-old Margay Schee, who was killed on her school bus when a distracted driver rear-ended that bus in September 2008.

Although some on the other side of the aisle are skeptical of seemingly every Federal program, we must avoid the temptation to eliminate programs without considering the real impacts they have on the lives of our constituents and on communities all across America.

To the point the gentlewoman, my friend from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), raised in her opening remarks, the distracted driving grant program contained in the Senate bill is merely an incentive program, not mandatory. It's an incentive for States that have already passed laws and have them on the books. Therefore, there are no sanctions if States do not pass laws or participate. There are no penalties to not participate.

So, Mr. Speaker, to put it simply, this motion represents a giant step backwards in highway safety for all of America.

I urge my colleagues to reject this motion to instruct, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

I guess I, as well as others, are here today to plead the 10th Amendment. You see, texting while driving is dangerous, and it should be stopped. Careless driving of any form is dangerous, and it should be stopped. We should be grateful for every effort to educate our drivers as to the significance of this particular effort, but the question has to be: Are the efforts only to be done in this particular body?

A driver's license is a State certificate. Driving is a State privilege. And even though Congress has, in the past, overstepped our responsibility in involving ourselves in these areas—and that was wrong—that is certainly not justification for continuing that practice ever forward. The Commerce Clause does not necessarily expand to this area. The Senators, in their wisdom, have included a provision in there dealing with this issue. It's a noble concept. It's a worthy goal.

The approval or disapproval of texting while driving is not the issue. The issue is not should it happen; the issue is who, at which level, should decide if it happens and what the consequences should be.

□ 1430

The issue is, are we the only ones who have the opportunity of breathing the air of the Potomac River, the only ones smart enough to be involved in this issue, the only ones compassionate enough to be involved in this issue. I would contend to you that those who are in our States are equally competent to handle this issue.

It's been mentioned, 39 States already outlaw texting. Ten outlaw any kind of a handheld communication while driving. Thirty-two States ban all sorts of these efforts with novice drivers. My State of Utah has moved forward in this particular area. And yet the Senate has now put in \$79 million to incentivize States to do what they're already doing.

We tried to pass a balanced budget amendment on this floor. It failed and I felt sad about that; but I realized also we can accomplish the exact same goals if we respect federalism, which, of course, was reinforced in the 10th Amendment. Federalism simply would require the Federal Government to concentrate on the core constitutional responsibilities given to us in that document and allow the States the flexibility to solve the other problems.

States do not have the kind of restrictions established in the Constitution that we have. States can be far more creative than a one-size-fits-all program from Washington. States can be much more effective in the way they run their programs. States can actually apply justice to unique circumstances within their State borders. That can never be accomplished by Washington. Our only ability is to make sure that everything is uniform. We can accomplish the same goal if we respect the authority of States.

\$79 million is a high price to pay for the arrogance that only we here in Washington can do things well. The States are doing it. Not everything has to be ordained, funded, and controlled by those who sit on this floor. The States have every competence, every ability. We should support the 10th Amendment and recognize the States should do this. They will do a better job than we.

Mr. ALTMIRE. We have no further speakers. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

The previous speaker talks about States being the innovators. I certainly agree on that.

This motion that we are talking about right now involves a State incentive program where States can qualify for Federal money for an optional grant that they may choose to participate in or not. If they do not choose to participate, they are free to pass any distracted-driver laws they wish or not.

There is nothing in what is contained in the Senate bill that in any way inhibits or prohibits or disincentivizes States from passing their own distracted-driving laws. They are still free to do whatever they want to do and go as far or not as they want to go.

All the Senate language says is that if States choose to meet the higher Federal standards, they may qualify for potential limited grant money that will be made available. No State is sanctioned for not participating.

With that, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend and colleague from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from Tennessee for yielding time and also for bringing this amendment forward to instruct the conferees on the transportation bill.

If you look at what the amendment, what the motion to instruct, is saying, first of all, we recognize that 39 States have already put laws on the books to address problems with distracted drivers. It's a national problem. But every State, just as they have the right and the responsibility to create their own laws on issuing driver's licenses, each State has their own age requirements, their own speed limit requirements. Each State has to look at the unique problems that are posed by distracted drivers within that State.

In fact, in our State of Louisiana, we have a ban on texting while driving. And the legislature has gone back and forth on other forms of whether or not you can use a cell phone with a Bluetooth or with a speaker in your car if it's enabled to do that. And so technology changes, and the local States have the ability to be flexible enough to change their laws according to how it best suits their State.

Ultimately, by having a \$79 million pot of money that would be up to the Secretary of Transportation to enforce as Federal distracted-driving laws, I think it gets away from the whole concept of the fact that States are the ones that are in charge of doing this, and the States know best what needs to happen in their States.

Driving laws in Louisiana are a lot different than they are in California or New York or somewhere else. That's what the 10th Amendment is all about. That's why you have elected officials at the State and local levels to handle the problems that are unique to each area. And the fact that you've got a \$79 million pot of money that would only be put at the discretion of the Secretary of Transportation, just for this purpose, instead of using the \$79 million to build roads throughout the country, or to allow the States to do what they think is best to improve safety in other ways, there are many things that need to be done in each of our States to improve safety on the roads.

And if a State's done a good job of addressing their texting problems and

the distracted-driving problems as it relates to cell phones and other things, somebody eating and sitting in their car, ultimately the States know best what to do. And if they've got more flexibility with the money—this isn't Washington money, by the way. They're paying into it. Every citizen back home, when they buy gasoline, is paying taxes. This is their money. It's not the Federal Government's money to say \$79 million is only available for the things that we think are most likely to increase safety, when the States know what's better. Local people on the ground, people paying those taxes know what's better to increase safety. And you're not allowing them to use that money for the things that actually would improve safety even more.

So by limiting this \$79 million to a fund that the Secretary himself in Washington would give out, let's let the States have that money back, money that they've paid in already, and let them do what they know is best to increase safety, whether they think it's putting guardrails on roads where the guardrails have broken off and they don't have the money to put that back in place, or whether it's to put railroad crossings. We have so many deaths by people who cross railroads where there's no crossing, and yet it's very expensive to build those.

States would like the ability to use the money to increase safety and stop the deaths that occur by spending it there. Yet this \$79 million isn't allowed for that.

Let the States do what they know best because it's their money. It's the people's money. It's not Washington's money. And some Washington bureaucrat who thinks he knows best how to handle a problem at a Federal level that applies to all States when it works differently in every State, the challenges, the safety challenges that face our citizens are very different in each State, especially as it relates to driving on the road.

So, again, I want to thank the gentlelady for bringing this motion to instruct. I surely support the motion and also encourage everybody else in this Chamber to support it because, ultimately, if you've got \$79 million that can be much better used to increase safety in other ways, why would you want to cordon it off and only allow it to be used for one way, when maybe 39 different States have 39 different ideas of how to do it better?

Well, we can learn from them for once instead of trying to have this top-down approach where Washington knows best. I think it could be handled much differently, much better at the local level. At the end it's their money anyway.

So I urge approval of this motion to instruct.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Yielding myself as much time as I would consume, I would, again, make the point that the program in question in no way sanctions, penalizes, disincentivizes, discourages or prohibits States from, in

any way, addressing driver safety. It in no way prohibits States from being innovative, from creating new technologies, new programs, doing things that are not recommended in the bill or this program. States are free to do whatever they want to do on this issue.

So to continually pound away at the point that we're somehow taking away the ability of States to be flexible is simply incorrect. It's not consistent with the program in question. It's not consistent with the language of the bill we are discussing.

With that, I would inquire of my friend—I have no more speakers on our side—is she prepared to close?

Mrs. BLACK. I am.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the motion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

This is a worthy goal. As I've already said, I'm a nurse. I'm a grandmother. I'm a mother. I want safety on our roads.

I have served in the State legislative body where I have voted three times on distracted driving. We did our studies, we found what the problems were in the State of Tennessee. We were able to pass laws to make the roads safer.

□ 1440

Careless driving of any form must be stopped, and I applaud the piece in the bill that will create more study so that States can have more information about just what they need to craft in their State that will be identified as distracted driving.

Obviously, distracted driving does not just mean cell phones, and it does not just mean texting. There are other forms of distracted driving—a mother turning around to correct her small child who is sitting in the back seat. I personally have seen those kinds of accidents. Someone reaching for a CD to put in one's disk, I personally have seen the devastation from that action. There are many forms of distracted driving, and this study will help us and the States and the public to understand what those forms of distracted driving are. In my motion, that is left in place.

Again, we have to be very cautious about our dollars and how it is that we hand our dollars out. I talk about this almost like legislative candy, this \$79 million, to incentivize or to entice States to do something, and 39 of them are already doing something related to distracted driving.

As a matter of fact, if we take a look at this whole discussion on the transportation bill, we know how precious every dollar is. We're talking about infrastructure and about creating jobs. This \$79 million can be best used by its intended programs, which are to build roads and bridges and to make our roads safer by making sure that our roads and our infrastructure are in the best shape. States are already doing

this job. We don't need to take \$79 million and hand it out to States—using candy to get them to do what we want them to do.

Absolutely, safety is the major issue, but States can make that decision. States have enough knowledge to know what's best for their States.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to protect States' rights and to support my motion to instruct.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CONCERN OVER RE-LICENSING THE DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, FirstEnergy, which operates the Davis-Besse nuclear power plant, has consistently misrepresented to the public structural defects in the building that shields its reactor.

Their latest fable is that cracks in the circumference of the shield building were caused by a snowstorm that occurred in 1978.

In 2002, FirstEnergy covered up information about a hole in the head of a reactor that jeopardized the safety of millions of people, for which they were fined \$28 million. FirstEnergy caused the blackout in August 2003, which put 50 million people in the dark, because they were too cheap to hire people to trim trees.

Can they be believed when they claim a snowstorm 34 years ago created cracks that appear today? Are buildings all over northern Ohio falling apart today because of the blizzard of '78, or is this just another in a series of desperate lies used to keep a plant going that should be either shut down or massively repaired?

How long before FirstEnergy's 34-year snow job is fully exposed?

THE PROGRESSIVE MESSAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

CONCERN OVER RE-LICENSING THE DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

Mr. KUCINICH. I thank the Speaker.

I spoke here a minute ago on the floor of the House concerning my deep and abiding concern about a nuclear power plant in the State of Ohio called the Davis-Besse nuclear power plant.

This power plant, from the time it was first licensed, has experienced a series of shutdowns, so much so that there was a period when the companies that originally owned it had massive losses because the plant was not up and running. They had so many difficulties that it became an embarrassment to the nuclear industry, itself.

We are now at a point when this plant is trying to get a new license for its nuclear facility. There are over 104 nuclear power plants in America. Some of them have achieved re-licensing. Others are in the process of applying.

One of the things that we have to be concerned about, because we are talking about nuclear power plants, is the structural stability of the plants, which includes the shield building and reactor, and that the structural stability of these plants is going to be assured.

□ 1450

In the case of FirstEnergy, they have a shield building, and there have been questions raised about its structural stability. Unfortunately, FirstEnergy went out of its way to tell one story to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and another story to the public. They told the public that the cracks that were seen in the shield building were not really substantive, but they told the Nuclear Regulatory Commission another story.

Understanding that we have a lack of candor on the part of a nuclear reactor permit holder here, we have to be very concerned about their public statements, about their private disclosures, and about the implications for re-licensing.

These cracks in the shield building, which are in the circumference of the building, they're telling the Nuclear Regulatory Commission the reason these cracks occurred is because there was this blizzard in 1978, where the wind direction was—if I'm correct—primarily out of the southwest, that this is responsible for the cracks. But the cracks are around the whole building. They're not able to explain that.

Nor do we know whether or not their sister reactors on the other side of Lake Erie at the Perry nuclear power plant have, in fact, been adequately inspected to see if the same winter storm adversely affected them. If the winter storm did not adversely affect them at the Perry plant, then how is it that you had cracks only at Davis-Besse? And why were the cracks around the circumference of the building, instead of just in one area where the wind was driving the snow?

In 2002, FirstEnergy covered up information about a hole in the head of the reactor.

I want to ask my friend from Minnesota if he needs any of this time right now, because I can conclude.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. I want to thank the gentleman for claiming the time. I guess I was about 4 minutes behind. And, of course, you've got to be on your toes around here.

I had come prepared to do a Special Order.

Mr. KUCINICH. I'm going to shortly yield and ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota would be able to have the balance of the time.

Mr. ELLISON. If the gentleman from Ohio wants to, we can share the time, if you'd like.

Mr. KUCINICH. I ask the Chair if it would be possible for me to have unanimous consent to yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unanimous consent is not required.

Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Minnesota will control the remainder of the hour and yields to the gentlemen from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. I would just ask for a moment to conclude here.

Why am I bringing this up about the Davis-Besse nuclear power plant? Some people would say: Why shouldn't you give FirstEnergy the benefit of the doubt?

This is a company that 10 years ago covered up information about the hole in the head of a nuclear reactor. They were this close to having a breach, a fraction of an inch from having a breach of the reactor. They had files that were in a photo, and Federal investigators weren't given access to that. It ended up where this company gets fined \$28 million because they weren't candid with the government and could have put the people of Ohio and Michigan and Indiana and Canada and the water of Lake Erie in jeopardy.

Many people remember, particularly in cities in the east, that time in August of 2003, where all the lights went out in the east. Remember, some people were sitting on their door steps for the first time with no city lights, looking up at the stars, but it wasn't particularly all that beautiful because what was not beautiful is the fact that there was this massive loss of power all over America's east coast that came about because of a series of technical glitches, the root cause of which was that this company, FirstEnergy, wasn't properly trimming trees because they didn't want to hire the people to do it.

This is the same company that's telling us the reason why they have cracks in a shield building is because of a blizzard 34 years ago. Hello.

We have to be very careful before we let a company that operates so fast and loose with the truth be in a position to have a license to continue to operate this nuclear power plant. In the alternative, they're going to have to make massive repairs. If they won't make the massive repairs, then the NRC ought to do the right thing for the

American people and have this shut down.

I do not want to see another Fukushima in the United States of America. I do not want to see the people in my district at risk. I do not want to see the people in Ohio put at risk because you've got a company like FirstEnergy operating in the shoddy way in which they operate, misrepresenting conditions to the public, and telling the NRC one thing and the people another.

I can promise you, Mr. Speaker, I intend to stay on top of this.

I appreciate the opportunity here, and I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Minnesota, the co-chair of the Progressive Caucus of the Congress, a person who has done a lot to take the message of the Progressive Caucus across this Nation in a way that's been very dynamic, the Honorable KEITH ELLISON.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. ELLISON. As I was listening to the gentleman from Ohio recite the facts and the details of this energy situation, I couldn't help but think to myself that we need massive investment in public infrastructure in this Nation. It's not simply a jobs issue, though it is a jobs issue. It's also a public safety issue.

The gentleman talked about Fukushima. That was a catastrophic event, but if we don't take good care of our Nation's infrastructure, a catastrophe will occur. I can testify to that, because I'm from Minnesota. In my State only a few years ago, we saw our bridge fall into the Mississippi River. Thirteen Minnesotans lost their lives, 100 fell into the Mississippi River 65 feet below and suffered severe back and spinal injuries.

Infrastructure, folks, is not simply a jobs issue. Infrastructure is not simply an economic issue. Infrastructure is also a public safety issue. We need to make a demand that our government focus on infrastructure investment at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I'm KEITH ELLISON. I'm the co-chair of the Progressive Caucus. I hope to be joined in this hour by other members of the Progressive Caucus. I think some members of the CBC will be joining me, as well, to talk about the situation involving Attorney General Holder.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we're the Progressive Caucus. We come with the progressive message. The progressive message is basically very simple, Mr. Speaker. It is the idea of liberty and justice for all.

Mr. Speaker, you know that every morning we in Congress come down to the well, and we're very honored to say the Pledge of Allegiance. And the progressive message of the Progressive Caucus is basically embodied in that pledge:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one na-

tion under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

We're indivisible.

□ 1500

Yes. It's true, we come in different colors. We come from different cultures. We come from different religious backgrounds. But we are one Nation. And yes, it's true that it's "liberty and justice for all." No exceptions. Everyone. Old, young, black, white, Latino, Asian, born in America, people who came here to immigrate, people of different religious backgrounds. People who are straight, gay. Americans are Americans are Americans, and they have the freedom to be who they are and have the liberty to pursue happiness as they define it and within the law and consistent with the rights of all others. But that's where it ends.

This is the Progressive Caucus, and I'm here to talk about the progressive message. And, Mr. Speaker, our email is [right down here: cpc@grijalva.house.gov](mailto:cpc@grijalva.house.gov). We encourage people to stay in touch with us because we like to hear what the people have to say. We like to hear their insights, their values, what they think is important. So we encourage people to stay in touch at cpc@grijalva.house.gov, the Progressive Caucus Web site.

Mr. Speaker, we've been here another week in Congress, another week where we are going to have serious problems going on within a short period of time. I believe today's date is June 21. Within 9 days, on July 1, what we are going to see, Mr. Speaker, is interest rates on student loans double. We are going to see an expiration of our transportation bill. And do you think we took up either one of those issues on the House floor today or yesterday or at any time since Monday, Mr. Speaker? Absolutely not.

We urge the Republican majority to think about what's going on with the American middle class. Student loan rates will double on July 1. This could affect literally thousands and thousands of American students, and yet we're not acting on these issues at all.

The Democrats have said, Yes, absolutely. Progressives have said, Yes, absolutely. We cannot let student loan rates double at a time when we see colleges all over America experiencing double-digit increases in tuition, when the price of an education has gone sky-high, outpaced inflation manyfold. And now, when the Congress tried to fix it, we're going to let it go back to the bad old days and let student loan interest rates double, costing students perhaps as much as \$1,000 a year.

And then even though the Republican majority agreed with the Ryan budget, which said we should just let the students have to pay more, they then saw the light and came back and said, Okay, we don't want the student loan rates to double either. But then, Mr. Speaker, what happened was they said, But we want to take the money out of women's health.

Of course we couldn't agree to that. We can't pit students versus women. We can't say we're going to help students but we're going to take the money away from women under the health care act, from cervical screenings and such. You can't do that. That wouldn't be right.

What if we asked the most wealthy members of our society, the richest Americans, to just do a little bit more so that students could have an affordable education? And our Republican friends said, No, never can we ask rich people to do a little bit more.

So now here we stand, Mr. Speaker, 9 days before student interest rates are about to double, and we saw no action on it on the floor this week. This is a horrible tragedy. This is a sad situation.

We lost 28,000 construction jobs last month. Congress still hasn't passed a highway bill. The highway bill is due to expire 10 days from now, 9 days from now, and our friends in the majority have not addressed this issue. This is a shame. It is a stain and it is a disgrace.

If you hold the majority in the House of Representatives, you have to focus on the needs of the people. And I hope the people are paying attention today, Mr. Speaker, because within this coming week, the student loan interest rates are due to double. Interest rates on student loans are due to double in 10 days, and the highway bill is due to expire in 10 days, but we have not touched these key issues on the House floor. And I'm just asking my Republican majority friends, why won't they pursue a "jobs" agenda instead of the "no jobs" agenda they've been pursuing.

The President laid out a great jobs bill, yet we haven't seen any action on it. Let's have a vote on it, Mr. Speaker, up or down. What is the Republican majority afraid of? Do they fear that there are a few Republicans who really believe that Americans need jobs, who will join with all the Democrats and put America back to work? Put it on the floor. I think that the American people want to vote on jobs.

So let me just say, Mr. Speaker—because I think it's so important that we have to restate certain things. If you just tuned in, student loan interest rates will double July 1 if Congress does nothing. This week, we did nothing. So the clock is ticking, and I am a little worried.

After losing 28,000 construction jobs last month, Congress hasn't passed a highway bill, and that bill is due to expire because the Republican majority won't pass a long-term transportation bill. This is a mistake, this is bad leadership, and the American people should know about it.

But, Mr. Speaker, I know you're thinking, Well, what did we do? If we didn't take care of the issues that are so pressing, what did the Republican majority do this week? They must have done something, because we were here.

Well, I'll tell you what they did. We authorized the killing of the sea lions

in the Northwest. I don't think that's a key issue we need to focus on.

We waived 39 environmental laws within 100 miles of the border. We said, Don't worry about complying anymore with 39 of the environmental laws within 100 miles of the border. So if you're within 100 miles of a border, I guess clean air and clean water just happen. But of course any 6-year-old kid knows that's not true.

What else did we do? This area within 100 miles of the border where we waived 39 environmental laws, this includes areas in Minnesota, where I'm from, like the Boundary Waters Wilderness or Voyageurs National Park. These are beautiful, pristine national treasures. And in my opinion, it's a shame to say that environmental laws would not apply there.

Thank goodness these bills haven't been taken up by the Senate because the Senate clearly knows that this is bad policy. But it didn't stop the Republican majority from pushing it because the Republican majority believes that all problems will be fixed if we don't regulate industry and if we cut taxes on the very well-to-do. They're mistaken about that, but that's what they believe. And I give them credit for saying it all the time because it gives the American people a chance to know what choices they have in front of them.

What else did we do, Mr. Speaker? We required Federal agencies to give oil companies 25 percent of all public lands they nominate for drilling. I will say that one again. The House Republican majority required Federal agencies to give oil companies 25 percent of all public lands—that's our lands, my lands, your lands, Mr. Speaker—they nominate for drilling.

So they used to say, "Drill, baby, drill; drill, baby, drill." They're not kidding about that. Even after the oil spill in the gulf, which hasn't slowed them down, they are still on this thing about letting drilling happen whenever, however, whatever they want.

I think that there ought to be some public lands that are pristine and nice for the American people. And yet the Republican majority passed a provision that required Federal agencies to give oil companies 25 percent of all public lands they nominate for drilling.

Now, if you think about that, Mr. Speaker, think about this. Regardless of the natural beauty, regardless of the environmental harm, regardless of the fishing or hunting damage, we would mandate that Big Oil gets one-fourth of whatever it wants. That is bad policy, but yet that was what was passed on the House floor this week.

What else did the Republican majority do this week, just so the American people know? We weakened the Clean Air Act protections. We required the EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency, to elevate cost concerns above all others.

So are you noticing a theme? The Republicans like to say, We have an all-

of-the-above strategy for energy. They say, We want oil; we want wind; we want biomass; we want all this, all this, all this.

□ 1510

But if you look at what they actually put on the floor and voted through with the Republican majority, they don't have an all-of-the-above strategy. They have an oil-above-all strategy. Oil above all. There is a theme here. This "oil above all" was quite unfortunate. This Congress can do better. We should be taking action now, not delaying until it is too late.

And I just want to, Mr. Speaker, this week, as we all are concerned about student loan interest rates doubling on July 1 and we are all concerned about the expiration of the highway bill, knowing that workers will be laid off if that happens, it is a shame we didn't address these critical issues facing the American people. But instead, we spent our time deconstructing environmental and health protections for the American people. I am disappointed about that, but that is what we did. And I think the American people have a right to know about it. So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell them about it.

But I would like to talk a little bit about what we have been doing not just this week, as I just have, but talk a little bit more globally about what we have been doing this whole 112th Congress, because there is a theme, undeniably, that we have been pursuing. There is a theme that we have been working on. Again, it is: cut taxes for the wealthy, leave taxes for middle class, and cut regulation for industry. Cut important environmental and health protections so that industry can keep more of the money so they don't have to spend it on making sure the air is clean and the water is clean.

I'd like to talk a little bit about America's energy future because that has been a theme on the floor we've been fighting up and down. And I mentioned I want to talk about the whole 112th Congress. Because even though that has been a recurring Republican theme, if you ask the American people what they want us to talk about, what you'll see on this chart, Mr. Speaker, is a question. And the question is simple. It simply says: Do you think the government should be doing more to help improve the financial situation of middle class Americans, should it be doing less, or do you think the government is doing the right amount to help improve the financial situation of middle class Americans?

So just to put the question out there again, Mr. Speaker, because I kind of went by quickly and the type is kind of small: Do you think the government should be doing more to help improve the financial system of middle class Americans, should it be doing less, or do you think the government is doing the right amount to help improve the financial situation of middle class Americans?

Well, this poll, pretty recent, right back in April, only a few months ago, and what Americans have said, Mr. Speaker, 67 percent of them said: do more. Two-thirds said: do more. So they don't think the government is doing enough to help improve the financial situation of the middle class. And, Mr. Speaker, they are right. Because the American people know that if we were to pass a highway bill that would help the middle class. If we would help college affordability, that would help the middle class. If we would do things like invest in our Nation's infrastructure altogether, that would help the middle class. If we would stop selling off public lands, that would help the middle class. If we would help make sure that we have sane and sensible and reasonable environmental protections like there are, but the Republicans want to get rid of, that would help the middle class. But the Republican majority, their argument is that the government should do less.

Now they say smaller government, smaller government. Lower taxes, smaller government. They say it so much that I can repeat their mantras in my sleep. They are great at repetition. But the American people say the government should be doing more to help improve the financial situation of middle class Americans. Two-thirds of them think so.

So as we can't pass the Buffett rule, we can't do anything about student interest rates, we're letting the highway bill expire, two-thirds of Americans think we should not be doing that. We should be doing more, not less. So those people who talk about smaller government and all that, they are not where the American people are.

Fifteen percent said: do less. That must be the Koch brothers or something like that. And 14 percent say: do the right amount. So about 29 percent say to do less or do nothing more and 3 percent said they didn't know. Two-thirds said the government should be doing more. And they're right, the government should be doing more. So that's why I want that point to be in front as I discuss this issue of America's energy future. We talked about energy today, and I want to discuss that a little more.

We need an energy plan, Mr. Speaker, that puts the interests of the American people ahead of the interests of Big Oil. Republicans say they want an all-of-the-above approach to energy. They say that all the time. Again, I credit them for being able to repeat the same theme over and over again. Great discipline on their part. But the only thing they've presented is an oil-above-all approach; oil above all else. Oil above wind. Oil above biomass. Oil above solar. Oil above anything. And they've proven that is their belief by the bill that we were dealing with this week.

We should never mistake the interests of Big Oil and the polluters for the

interests of the American people. We should always understand that oil is one way to power our country, and for the time being it is going to be a part of our energy portfolio. But we should not be giving them massive subsidies. We should not be giving them massive subsidies when they're making record profits. We should not relieve them of basic health and safety protections to make sure that our natural wonders don't get destroyed, our wildlife doesn't get destroyed, our recreational industries don't get destroyed.

The oil spill in the gulf is still fresh in my mind. And I'm outraged, Mr. Speaker, that BP was able to write off the cost of the cleanup. I don't think enough Americans know that BP was allowed to write off the cost of the cleanup of the gulf. In other words, they simply foisted that cost on the American people, which I think is terribly unfortunate.

So this week, the Republicans brought an energy bill to the floor that simply checks off from Big Oil's wish list. To me, it felt like if Big Oil was to have a wish list, the Republicans just played Santa Claus. And I don't think that's the right thing to do. I think what we should do is recognize the fact that petroleum will be a part of our energy portfolio, but we should minimize it. We should promote other sources—green sources of energy: wind, solar, biomass, conservation. We should be investing in innovative approaches, not just subsidizing the fossil fuel industry, as we do, to the tune of about \$110 billion every 10 years.

So as I said, Mr. Speaker, this week Republicans brought an energy bill to the floor that simply checks off from Big Oil's wish list. It weakens public health protections. It forces arbitrary giveaways of public land. As I already mentioned, it puts energy drilling ahead of all other uses of Federal land. The oil, gas, and coal industries are already getting billions in corporate welfare. They will receive at least \$110 billion in subsidies over the next 10 years. These subsidies have been won by decades of lobbying. Lobbying.

These subsidies have not been won because what they are asking Congress to do is such a great idea. They have had high-paid lobbyists come down here and work over Members of Congress to give them what they wanted. And it has accumulated to the tune of about \$110 billion a year. So they have a lot of power around here.

But I think that we would not be serving the public properly if we just turned over public lands so they can drill on them and spill on them and make all these mistakes that we ultimately have to pay for because they have won themselves tax breaks which allow them to write off the costs of these spills.

In 2011, the oil, gas, and coal industry spent \$167 million lobbying the Federal Government. That's \$167 million paid to lobbyists by the oil, gas, and coal industry. Now why, if they're right, do

they have to spend so much money trying to convince Congress they are so right? If you've got a good idea, we would be able to review the bill and vote your way, if you've got something in the interest of the American people.

□ 1520

But if you have something that's for the special interests, well, yeah, you know, you've got to pull out the guys in the monogrammed shirts and the \$1,500 suits to come tell us why we've just got to give them this loophole—which, by the way, Mr. Speaker, they always promise will bring jobs but rarely does anything other than bring them a lot more profit.

But you know what, Mr. Speaker, the renewable energy industry also needs investment, not just the oil industry, which doesn't need it. Clean energy is the fastest growing job sector in the world. America should be leading, not getting left behind. As the world is investing in new energy production methods, America is investing and putting subsidies on fossil fuels.

Now, from a scientific point of view, Mr. Speaker, we call the oil, coal, and gas industries fossil fuels. Why? Because these fuels are basically derived from just hundreds of millions of years worth of time going by and organic matter, trees from a million years ago and so forth. This is what fossil fuel is made from. But I think there's another good reason to call oil, gas, and coal fossil fuels. It's because they're the old way of doing stuff.

We need some new ways of doing stuff. We need to invest in clean energy. If we want to stay the strongest economy in the world, we need to invest in industries growing the fastest. Experts say that investing in clean energy gets more bang for the buck, Mr. Speaker, in creating jobs than the fossil fuel industry.

China has surpassed the United States in clean energy investment. China has surpassed the United States in clean energy investment, spending almost twice as much as we do, and the U.K. and Spain are not far behind.

Analysts believe that developing new clean energy techniques, like wind and solar, could support 20 million jobs by 2030 and trillions of dollars in revenue. And yet this week on the energy bill we were dealing with, that was not what we were talking about. On the land bill we dealt with, that's not what we were talking about. We are giving more and more to those who already have too much and an old industry. We need to, yes, recognize that oil is going to be part of our energy portfolio, but it shouldn't dominate it, and we need to invest in new energy where the job growth centers are.

Investing in clean energy creates three times as many jobs and more opportunities at every pay grade than traditional energy jobs. Yet we're subsidizing the fossil fuel industry six times the rate of supporting the renewable energy industry.

I offered a simple amendment. Last week, Mr. Speaker, I went to the Rules Committee and I offered a simple amendment to the Republican energy bill. It was a commonsense piece that was ruled out of order. And when I saw some of the things that were ruled in order, I was shocked. All my amendment said—that was ruled out of order and we weren't allowed to debate on the floor—is it is the sense of the Congress that the fossil fuel subsidies should be reduced to help control the budget deficit.

Now, my friends in the Republican majority are famous for harping on the deficit and the debt. They always talk about our children and our grandchildren. I don't know where they came up with that phrase, but it's remarkable to me that you can get all those politicians to say exactly the same thing all the time. I'm not saying there was some study group or poll. I'm just saying it is a remarkable coincidence.

My point is, though, you would think that if I said to you, Hey, look, let's have the \$110 billion we give every 10 years to the fossil fuel industry, let's let that be part of deficit reduction, you would think that my deficit hawk friends would be all over that. But, unfortunately, we weren't even allowed to debate that because, of course, that might put some people on the hot seat.

We all want to reduce America's deficit, the Progressive Caucus included, but we want to do it in a way that promotes green jobs, reduces our dependency on fossil fuel and hydrocarbon fuels, and increases conservation and green energy. But by maintaining these subsidies, it increases the deficit by \$110 billion every 10 years. I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, especially the fiscal conservatives, agree that \$110 billion in fossil fuel subsidies to profitable companies doesn't make any sense. We need a true all-of-the-above strategy, as President Obama has said, that invests in clean, renewable energy, not this oil-above-all bill that we saw this week. It's very sad and unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to turn our attention to another issue which I think is really important and we really need to focus some attention on, and that is the issue of Attorney General Holder.

Yesterday, Republicans on the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee voted to hold Attorney General Holder in contempt of Congress. This was a sad occasion because Attorney General Holder is a great American and deserved better treatment than he got from the Republican majority House Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Along with all Americans, I certainly mourn the loss of the Customs and Border Protection agent, Brian Terry. Mr. Terry was a public servant who deserved to live his life, and it is a horrible shame that he was killed in a gunfight in Arizona in December 2010. We all agree that the gun-walking pol-

icy, which was a policy started in the Bush administration, and that allowed thousands of guns to be bought by weapons traffickers should be investigated. This program has no signs of merit that I can see, and it is too bad.

But here's the thing. This is why it is unfair to hold Attorney General Holder in contempt. As soon as he learned of the tactic, this gun-walking thing, Attorney General Holder condemned the tactic and ordered the Inspector General to investigate. And since then, he has testified before Congress seven times and provided more than 6,000 pages of documentation as asked for.

At this point, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee was demanding a document, and the Executive, as is the tradition in every administration, said documents that basically are conversations between a client and a lawyer and basically are deliberative documents are not proper stuff for disclosure, and the President asserted executive privilege. And what happens then is the Attorney General gets hit with a contempt of Congress.

Instead of working in good faith to investigate what went wrong, it appears that Republicans on the committee, and maybe next week on the House floor, have used this strategy for political gain. Even after Attorney General Holder provided 6,000 pages of documents to Congress, House Republicans subpoenaed highly sensitive documents, including photographs of crime scenes and reports on a confidential informant, in order to score partisan political points. This is a misuse of the gavel.

And last week, they withheld funding for our Nation's law enforcement operations in retaliation. We should not withhold funding for our Nation's law enforcement operations simply to score political points. This is a mistake and it is wrong, and I just hope, Mr. Speaker, there is no one in need of law enforcement resources that doesn't get them because of this spat that the chair of the Oversight Committee has going on with Attorney General Holder.

There is an African proverb, Mr. Speaker, that I think you might appreciate. It says, when the elephants fight, only the grass gets trampled. And so when the chair of the Oversight Committee wants to fight with the Attorney General, only regular people who need law enforcement resources suffer.

So I'm sad that happened, and I hope today we can abandon this time of witch hunts. Last time, the Republicans went after President Clinton a few years ago. It didn't help them. They impeached him but couldn't convict him. It took up a lot of time. We clearly were not able to focus on the needs of the country. I hope that they learn a lesson and refocus on things like interest rates on student loans that are getting ready to go out and the transportation bill. These are things that we need to focus on, not this political stuff that they're trying

to use to position themselves for the election. That's all I want to say about that for now, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1530

I want to talk a little bit also—to change the subject, Mr. Speaker—about money and politics. The Progressive Caucus passed a resolution to support something called Resolution Week. This is when municipalities, city councils all over across America passed resolutions asking Congress to initiate a process to overturn *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*.

Now, *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* basically came to the conclusion that money was speech and corporations were people. Corporations are not people. I've never seen a corporation put on a uniform and go to war. They've been contractors, but they are people who go risk their lives. They don't have children, they don't raise families. Corporations don't die. They have limited liability.

Basically, a corporation is designed to do one thing and one thing only—make money for its owners. And yet, the Supreme Court said that a corporation is a person, and persons have the right to freedom of speech, and so any money they want to put in any campaign, they can. What this has done is really turned our elections into auctions, and the highest bidder wins. Now, this is a shame. We need to overturn *Citizens United*.

The Progressive Caucus was honored to be part of Resolutions Week, when we saw officials passing resolutions across American cities asking Congress to overturn *Citizens United*. If we're going to get a constitutional amendment to overturn *Citizens United*, we need an awesome public display, awesome amount of communities rising up and demanding that this happen. And last week, we saw cities do it.

I'm proud that my city of Minneapolis, very honored that Minneapolis passed a resolution calling for the overturn of *Citizens United*; also honored that the city of St. Paul passed a resolution to overturn *Citizens United*, honored that Duluth, Minnesota did so several months ago. Also, New York, Los Angeles—Chicago is considering a bill, and there are many, many, many more. Over 1,600 elected public officials, both local, county, State, and Federal, have joined together and said this is bad legislation, and I was very honored that the Progressive Caucus was a part of it.

By organizing from the ground up, we can restore democracy to the people, for the people, and by the people. Several Members of Congress have already introduced constitutional amendments to overturn *Citizens United*.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as you may know, the traditional method to get a constitutional amendment—and again, there are now 27 constitutional amendments, we need one more to overturn *Citizens United*—Congress will pass something, then they will send it to

the States, and two-thirds of the States need to pass it, and then the President signs it, and then it's changed. The process, however, needs to be well supported by the public. So we have tried to start this grassroots movement, joining with other leaders like Move to Amend and others, to see Citizens United overturned.

We have several Members—as many as 12 Members of Congress have introduced bills to have an overturning of Citizens United. I was very honored that we are partnering with city officials, who are the closest unit of government to the people, very honored to represent 12 cities in my own district, all great public servants there. I hope that we can work together to say that money should not overwhelm the political process.

Mr. Speaker, one city official said, look, people may think this is some big national issue, but think about this: If a wealthy individual wants to have a development in a particular part of town where the elected city council says, You know what? This is zoned for parks or residential, whatever; it's not appropriate to go here, a wealthy individual could simply dump as much money as they want to in a city race to the opponent and give money to the opponent of the people opposing this project, and then basically buy off the city council. So this is something that local officials are correctly concerned about. The bottom line, though, is that we've got to move forward, and I'm proud that the Progressive Caucus is part of this effort. So this work we did last week I thought was great.

The Progressive Caucus has come up with an important declaration. Since we have all these constitutional amendment proposals—over 12 of them—we had to come in unity some kind of way, and what we decided to do is this: all join on a declaration. And the declaration says this, Mr. Speaker:

We declare our support for amending the Constitution of the United States to restore the rights of the American people undermined by Citizens United and related cases to protect the integrity of our elections and limit the corrosive influence of money in our democratic process.

So that's what the declaration says. Over 1,600 elected officials, two State legislatures, more than 150 cities and towns, all calling for repeal and overturning of Citizens United.

If I could make just an example, we've seen outside spending on campaigns up 1,600 percent since Citizens United came in—up 1,600 percent since Citizens United. Quite frankly, it's really something. It's gone crazy, and we've got to do something about it.

You might be thinking, Mr. Speaker, well, what do we do between now and when we pass the constitutional amendment? One thing we could do today is we could pass the DISCLOSE Act. This is a piece of legislation by Representative CHRIS VAN HOLLEN—a very dynamic leader, a gentleman from

Maryland—and it requires public reporting of corporate campaign activity so that you can't have secret money.

Right now, you could have a situation where some billionaire takes their personal money, dumps it into a super PAC, and then the super PAC spends the money. We don't even know who that person is spending the money. So, under the DISCLOSE Act, we would find out the identity of some of these people. So we could do that right now. And by the way, some of the money we see creeping into American elections very well could be money from foreign sources. Senator MCCAIN very correctly pointed out that there's one wealthy individual who has been putting a lot of money into election campaigns, and he is a billionaire and owns a casino in China. He's using his wealth to influence American elections. So that's foreign money, if that's the way it is. So the thing is that we do not want people outside the United States trying to shape the elections in our country, and so this is the thing that we are moving forward.

Overturn Citizens United, amend and disclose—amend the Constitution and disclose secret donors.

I'll close this section on this point, Mr. Speaker: Corporations are not people. And in America, democracy should never, ever be for sale.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. With these last 11 minutes, I would like to take just a few minutes to talk about this college loan issue. I've talked about it a little bit already. I would like to elaborate.

College loan rates will double if Congress doesn't act by July 1. I've made that point, I'll make it again. This week, President Obama called on Congress to act. Remarkably, as I said several times tonight, Republicans in Congress are threatening to just allow the doubling of our student loan interest rates.

Americans owe more tuition debt, more student loan debt than there's credit card debt, and student loan borrowing is more common now than it would a decade ago. This is because States are sending less money to public universities, so public universities have to make up the money by increasing tuition, and that means students having to borrow more money.

At a time when the average student loan debt is about \$25,000 and tuition prices continue to rise, students are borrowing more than ever to complete their degrees. Seven million undergraduates would be affected—that's 7 million, Mr. Speaker—by a doubling of student loan interest rates, raising the cost by about \$1,000 per person. Our Nation's student loan debt burden is massive and now exceeds \$1 trillion.

After initially blocking any solutions, Republicans are finally hearing calls. As I said before, they did make an offer, a counteroffer—I think I cred-

it them for that—and they said, okay, we don't want to see a doubling of student interest rates, so we'll do something.

□ 1540

But when they came up, their pay-for, the way they want to pay for it, was to say that they wanted to cut health care services for children and breast cancer screening. So we're not going to hurt kids and women in order to help students, so we couldn't go with that deal.

We proposed that we ask the most well-to-do individuals and corporations to help. I guess what I'm saying is, if I went to a billionaire or a billionaire corporation and I said, look, we're about to see 7 million students' costs of education go up. Can you help, since you make so much? And it seems like what they're saying through their representatives is no.

This is outrageous. I think the truth is that America, a Nation that has made it possible for BP and ExxonMobil and GE and all these big corporations to do so well, should do well by America. I don't think that's asking too much.

It's not right to protect the richest people in America, and let everybody else get by the best they can. This Nation has made it possible for them to earn all that money, and I don't have any problem with people making good money. I just think that if you make good money, and you have used our police force, our military has protected you, our roads and bridges and our transit system have allowed you to move your goods and services around, our EMS system has made sure that if you get sick we'll come help you, our public schools have educated your workforce, then I don't think it's asking too much to say, put in the pot and help some kids have affordable education. I just don't think that's asking too much.

Now, somebody said to me, Well, Keith, in my day I paid my way through school. And I said, in your day school didn't cost \$28,000 a year.

I'm 48 years old. When I went to law school, I graduated and I had \$12,000 student loan debt. That's nothing compared to what students are dealing with today. They're graduating with twice that, on average.

So I just want to say, as I close out tonight, Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority, elected by the people of their districts, are here, just like the Democrats are, to discharge the duties associated with their office and, that is, to promote the general welfare and to look out for the American people. I think making sure that student interest loan rates don't double is part of that. I think that making sure we have a decent highway bill that will help pay for the construction and maintenance of our roads and bridges and transit system is part of that. And yet this week we haven't done anything to do that.

The standard conservative line on the economy right now is that the government has done too much. But, yet, as I have already proven, the American people do not agree. Two-thirds say the government needs to do more than it's doing. So now I think the government has a duty to step up.

And, no, I don't think the government is the solution to every problem. And I know my conservative friends like to mischaracterize what progressives say about that. We don't believe government is the solution to every problem, but we do believe government is part of the solution to many problems. And if you cut it back and you scale it down and you make it too small and too weak to do anything to help people, then, of course it won't be able to help people, and that's a shame. The American people have a different set of expectations.

I just want to say, as we wind up and I begin to yield back, it's time in America where we recognize that there is an important balance between the private sector and the public sector, and the market fundamentalists who occupy this House on the Republican side of the aisle must begin to recognize that government has an important role to play. And if we abandon our role, America will be poorer for it.

If we don't step up to the plate and make sure that tuition interest rates are decent and reasonable and that we're making sure that we have a decent highway system, Americans will suffer. And we cannot allow that to happen in the richest, most powerful Nation in the history of the world.

I yield back the balance of my time.

THE CONSERVATIVE CAUCUS

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time, and I appreciate you giving me a moment to set up.

I have got to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I love coming to the floor after my good friend from Minnesota. I enjoy it every single time it works out in that way because he is an able representative of the Progressive Caucus which, I would argue, sits way over on the left-hand side of the political continuum.

And I would hope today, Mr. Speaker, I will be an able representative for the Conservative Caucus, which sits over on the right-hand side of the political continuum. And we absolutely disagree about what this Federal Government ought to look like.

I want to talk primarily about the President's health care bill in the Supreme Court, a decision that's coming down next week. But I want to start with where the gentleman from Minnesota ended, Mr. Speaker, and that is to say that conservatives believe that government is not the solution to

every problem. That's certainly true. It's absolutely true.

But more importantly, there are different levels of government in this country, and we seem to forget that. Something happens, and my colleagues know this. You know, Mr. Speaker, you and I were part of the largest freshman class in modern times, and 99 of us came to this institution together and said it's not about how it has been run, but it's about how it can be run, and we can do better.

But something happens to people when they drive across the Beltway. That's that little interstate that goes around Washington, D.C. When they come inside the Beltway, something happens to them and they suddenly think they're the smartest person in the room. They suddenly think that if only all Americans would live their life the way they want other Americans to live their life, then everyone would be happier; and that's just not true.

I don't care how well-meaning anyone in this institution is, Mr. Speaker. There is not a man or a woman here that knows more about how my family should pursue happiness than my family does. There is no Member here from outside the State of Georgia who knows better about how Georgians should pursue happiness than those of us in Georgia do.

And I would say, as my friend from Minnesota finished talking about the student loan program, you may not know, Mr. Speaker—I know you all have a proud tradition of education in your home State and some very fine institutions of higher learning there. In Georgia we have what's called the Hope Scholarship. And for years and years, it allowed every single college student, college-bound student from the great State of Georgia, college graduates, B averages and above, every single one to go to State schools in Georgia for free.

You know how much Federal money we used for that program, Mr. Speaker? Zero. Zero.

Time and time again my colleagues come to the floor of this House, and they talk about what we need to do in Washington to help college students across America. Let me tell you something. You all came from your own State back home that has the power today to do those things. It does not have to happen in Washington. It can happen back home. It can happen at the city level, it can happen at the county commission level, it can happen at the State legislature level. Dadgummit, Mr. Speaker, it can happen at the family level, all of these decisions that we talk about in Washington, D.C.

And that takes us right into the health care bill, Mr. Speaker, because here's the secret. And I don't know if everybody in the House, Mr. Speaker, knows the secret and, that is, that as patently unconstitutional as the President's health care bill is, had the State of Georgia passed it for Georgians, it would have been perfectly fine. Hear that.

There are different powers that the United States Constitution allows State governments to exercise than it allows the Federal Government to exercise. The States have the power to mandate behavior. We see it regularly. We see requirements for what must be included in insurance policies, for who has insurance policies, that regulation of the individual market. But not the Federal Government.

So I want my friends in the Progressive Caucus to hear me clearly. I'm not anti-government. I want each role the government plays, I want it to play it as well as it possibly can. I want every government dollar to be spent as efficiently as it possible can. I want every government mandate to be as limited and efficacious as it can possibly be.

□ 1550

With that, Mr. Speaker, I take you back to President Bill Clinton, August 21, 1996. Why is that important, Mr. Speaker? You and I weren't even thinking about being in Congress in 1996. Why in the world is that important?

It's important because it was August 21, 1996, when President Bill Clinton signed into law Federal health care reform that passed this United States House, led by Speaker Newt Gingrich, a Republican from the great State of Georgia, 1996. Folks talk like health care reform hasn't ever come down the pike in this country, Mr. Speaker, in 1996, the House and the Senate and the President—Republicans, Democrats—all came together to pass health care reform.

Let me tell you what they passed in 1996. Here we go. It's from President Clinton's signing statement:

This Act will ensure the portability of health benefits when workers change or lose their jobs, and it will protect workers against discrimination by health plans based on their health status.

Mr. Speaker, does that sound familiar? Does it sound like the very same words that would have come from one of President Obama's speeches when he was pushing his health care bill? Why is that? Why is President Clinton speaking these same words 15 years ago, and yet there are still health care solutions that Americans are searching for? I'll tell you why.

Because, in 1996, with Republican Speaker Newt Gingrich and with Democratic President Bill Clinton, folks came together, and they solved health care problems for every single health care plan that the Federal Government had the right to regulate. Hear that: every single plan that the Federal Government had the right to regulate.

In the State of Georgia, we have an office. It's a constitutional office. It's in the Georgia Constitution. It's called Commissioner of Insurance. We all vote on it. It's a statewide-elected office. We vote on it every 4 years. That individual has the right to control State-originated insurance policies, primarily the individual market and some

of the small business market. There are those policies that are regulated by the States, and every single State can solve that problem. Then there are those policies regulated by the Federal Government, and only the Federal Government can solve that problem.

That's what we did. Mr. Speaker, in 1996, Republicans and Democrats came together, and that's what we did. Hear the words of President Bill Clinton:

This legislation will set into motion several key reforms. First, it will eliminate the possibility that individuals can be denied coverage because they have a preexisting medical condition.

Did you know that? Do you hear that, Mr. Speaker? Because I read it in newspapers all the time as if this is the first time we've ever talked about pre-existing conditions. No. On August 21, 1996, President Bill Clinton signed into law:

It will eliminate the possibility that individuals can be denied coverage because they have a preexisting medical condition.

That's true. It's the law of the land today. It was the law of the land yesterday. It was the law of the land 10 years ago for every single insurance policy legitimately regulated by the Federal Government.

Bill Clinton goes on:

Second, it will require insurance companies to sell coverage to small employer groups and to individuals who lose group coverage without regard to their health risk status.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we talk about that as if no one has ever considered this idea. Not only has it been considered, but it is the law of the land. It was the law of the land yesterday. It was the law of the land 10 years ago. It was the law of the land when President Clinton signed it into law on August 21, 1996.

Finally, Bill Clinton says:

Finally, it will require insurers to renew the policies they sell to groups and individuals.

This is from the President's signing statement in 1996.

In 1996, Mr. Speaker, we understood as a Nation there are two kinds of insurance policies in this country: those that the Federal Government regulates and those that the State regulates. Why is that important? It's important because we solved the problems that Americans asked Congress to solve in 1996 relating to those federally regulated plans. The problems that remain that Americans are crying out for solutions to are problems that can be solved any day of the week by any State legislature in the country for every single individual who lives in that State.

Mr. Speaker, that's what separates the Conservative Caucus from the Progressive Caucus. My friends in the Progressive Caucus ask sincerely, Can we come up with a solution here in Washington, D.C., that will apply to everyone in the country and put everyone under the same set of rules? And my friends in the Conservative Caucus say,

No. The Constitution recognizes there are 50 different States, and each of those States is allowed to construct its own set of rules.

Why is that important? It's important because, when it comes to the Federal law of the land as it pertains to university students today, we are arguing about whether they should have a 3.4 percent subsidized interest rate on their loans or a 6.8 percent subsidized interest rate on their loans. That's the Federal Government solution. Do you want to burden people with debt at 3.4 percent or do you want to burden them with debt at 6.8 percent? That's Washington's answer.

But, Mr. Speaker, Georgia's answer is: Let's let everybody go for free. Let's find the money elsewhere. Let's make sure everybody who wants to go to college has a pathway to college.

Mr. Speaker, when the Congress nationalizes any section of the law, they kill the innovative spirit of every single State out there. That's why in 1996 we didn't reregulate the entire market—the Constitution did not give us that authority—but we reregulated the Federal side of the market and allowed States to continue to innovate and find their own solutions in their areas.

Unless you think I'm making this up, Mr. Speaker, I've brought a little bit of the Constitution down here with me today. Here we go with article I, section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution:

The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes.

You know that phrase, Mr. Speaker. It's thrown around cavalierly all the time. It's the Commerce Clause:

The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes.

Absolutely. Unquestionably.

What's more, the 10th Amendment of the United States Constitution:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

Mr. Speaker, this is important. If you haven't gone back and if you haven't looked at your history books recently, I would encourage my colleagues to go back and do that because the only reason the Constitution was ratified in this country was because of the promise that the Bill of Rights would be ratified right behind it.

Know that.

If you dispute that, Mr. Speaker, you've got my email address. It's Woodall@mail.house.gov. My Web address is Woodall.house.gov. Let me know where you think I'm wrong, because I've gone through it over and over and over again.

The United States Constitution would not have been ratified by the States without the addition, the commitment, that the Bill of Rights would be ratified right behind it. That's

where the 10th Amendment comes from. No one was worried about State governments getting out of control in 1787. They were worried about a tyrannical Federal Government in 1787. I would say rightly so. That was their experience in Europe. Candidly, that's becoming our experience today, and I want to talk a little bit about that.

The 10th Amendment of the Constitution:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

That brings us, Mr. Speaker, right into this health care case. I want to take you, Mr. Speaker, back to the origins of this legal decision. It came out of Florida. It's called the "Vinson decision" because Judge Vinson was the lead judge, the chief judge, down in the Florida case that led to this case coming to the Supreme Court. Yet there was a dissenting opinion. It was a 2-1 decision there in Florida, and the dissenting opinion came from Judge Stanley Marcus.

This is what he said:

Because the 10th Amendment reserves only those powers not already delegated to the Federal Government, the 10th Amendment has been violated only if the Federal law at issue goes beyond the limits of Congress' power under the Commerce Clause.

Now, we just looked at the Commerce Clause:

The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes.

The dissenting judge says that the key issue is: Does the President's health care bill go beyond the limits of Congress' power under the Commerce Clause?

□ 1600

He goes on. This is from Judge Vinson, the chief judge on that case, writing for the majority:

The existing problems in our national health care system are recognized by everyone in this case. There is widespread sentiment for positive improvements. This is obviously a very difficult task. Regardless of how laudable its attempts may have been to accomplish these goals in passing the act, Congress must operate within the bounds established by the Constitution. Again, this case is not about whether the act is wise or unwise. It is about the constitutional role of the Federal Government.

That's exactly what my colleague from Minnesota was talking about earlier.

There are a lot of levers of power that I found out as a freshman when I showed up here, Mr. Speaker. You know what I'm talking about. There are lots of levers of power that we can pull here. And the question is: Who do you want in a United States Representative? Do you want someone who's thrilled about pulling every single one of those levers of power, or do you want someone who is reluctant to pull those levers of power?

And that's the funny thing about a legislature, Mr. Speaker. It rarely attracts people who want to send power

away, the folks who want to send power back to the States. That's rare. The legislatures attract people who want to amass power and use all of those levers for what they would call the power of good. That's not what our Founding Fathers intended in the Constitution.

Going back to the majority opinion in the Florida case, the Vinson case. Judge Vinson says this:

In closing, I will simply observe, once again, that my conclusion in this case is based on an application of the Commerce Clause law as it exists pursuant to the Supreme Court's current interpretation and definition. Only the Supreme Court can expand that.

Well, that's actually where Judge Vinson and I begin to disagree. I would tell you the Supreme Court doesn't have any business expanding the Commerce Clause. The folks who put together our Constitution didn't do it lightly. They did it deliberately. The Commerce Clause was drafted narrowly deliberately, and the 10th Amendment was drafted broadly deliberately. The danger that we face as a Nation is that there are well-meaning men and women in this Chamber who absolutely believe they have the answer to every problem that plagues every single American, and the temptation is to use their power as a Member of Congress to solve it. That's the temptation.

I tell folks when I'm back home in town hall meetings, I say, Don't ask me to go to Washington and legislate with my heart. Ask me to go to Washington and legislate with my head.

When I'm back at home digging into my own personal wallet, ask me to give out of my wallet with my heart. Because when I give out of the Washington, D.C., wallet, Mr. Speaker, I'm not giving out of my wallet; I'm giving out of everybody else's wallet. I'm giving out of every single wallet of every single American in this country. That is not what our Framers intended the Federal Government to do. But we're at risk.

I take you back to the dissenting opinion written by Judge Stanley Marcus. What he's talking about here is how he disagrees with Judge Vinson's conclusion that the President's health care bill is unconstitutional. In disagreeing he says this:

In the process of striking down the mandate, the majority has ignored many years of Commerce Clause doctrine developed by the Supreme Court.

Not by Congress. By the Supreme Court. It has ignored the undeniable fact that Congress's commerce power has grown exponentially over the past two centuries and is now generally accepted as having afforded Congress the authority to create rules regulating large areas of our national economy.

It has ignored the Supreme Court's expansive reading of the Commerce Clause that has provided the very foundation on which Congress already extensively regulates both health insurance and health care services.

What does that mean? It's a United States judge, an appellate court judge,

in Florida. He's a thoughtful guy. By all estimations his opinions are thoughtful opinions. And when he looks at the current state of the law in America today, he sees that over the past two centuries, Congress and the Supreme Court have so expanded what that one line in the Constitution says about regulating commerce amongst the States, they have expanded that definition to allow Congress to regulate virtually any aspect of the United States economy.

Mr. Speaker, that's frightening to me. Not because I don't enjoy the company of the good men and women who serve in this Chamber, but because, as I said when I began, these folks know nothing about happiness for my family. They know nothing about my pursuit as a Georgian of happiness, of success. And every time we pass a one-size-fits-all solution in this Congress, it kills everything else.

Here's the difference. Again, Georgia embarked on a massive project to fund free college education for all of its graduating students. It was a huge project. It cost millions upon millions upon millions of dollars, and it could have failed. Had it failed, the only people who would have been punished by its failure are the 9 million of us who live in Georgia. And then we could have looked to the other 49 States for a better solution. But, Mr. Speaker, when the United States of America's Congress fails, when it passes a one-size-fits-all solution for everybody, 315 million Americans pay the price for that, and there's no place to look then for the next innovation.

When I was growing up, Mr. Speaker, there was a saying. When something was really hard to do, folks would say, golly, that's going to take an act of Congress to get that done. I don't know if that was a saying in your part of the world, Mr. Speaker, but that's what it would be. If something was really hard to do, they would say, oh, golly, that's going to take an act of Congress to make that happen.

That was an expression, because getting an act of Congress passed is hard. So when it's really hard to get a very bad act of Congress passed, it's really hard to get that same bad act repealed, and again we've killed innovation across the country when we do it. This dissenting opinion from this very thoughtful judge suggests that Congress's power now is plenary, unlimited, to control every single aspect of economic life in this country.

I challenge you, Mr. Speaker: What aspect of your life isn't economic? What aspect of your life isn't economic? And I don't mean that doesn't have money involved, because as you know in the President's health care bill, Mr. Speaker, there is no money involved. It says, I don't care if you don't have a health care insurance policy today, you must go out and buy one. Now, I'd say there's no economic involvement there. I wasn't going to go out and buy one. It forces me to go and

do something I would not have done. That's the expanded version of the Commerce Clause as seen by supporters of the President's health care bill.

Going on again from this dissenting opinion:

Both the Supreme Court and this circuit have said in determining whether the Necessary and Proper Clause grants the legislative authority to Congress to enact a particular Federal statute, we look to see whether the statute constitutes a means that is rationally related to the implementation of a constitutionally enumerated power.

That's a lot of legalese there, Mr. Speaker, but what it means is this: They've just said the Commerce Clause allows Congress to regulate anything that has to do with money and economic activity in America. And now they're saying the Necessary and Proper Clause of the Constitution gives Congress the power to pass legislation to implement anything that's then related to any of those things.

I asked you a second ago, Mr. Speaker, what in your life doesn't have to do with money? I don't think you were able to come up with many things that didn't have some sort of economic relationship at all. But now my question, as posed by the dissenting opinion here, is what in your life has nothing to do with economic activity or money and is in no way related to anything that has something to do with economic activity or money? Because the Necessary and Proper Clause, as they say in the dissenting opinion, gives Congress the power to legislate that.

I don't want that authority here in this Congress, Mr. Speaker. I don't want that authority here. These are good men and women in this body who legislate in a thoughtful way, but they do not know what is best for 315 million Americans. The Constitution gives us limited responsibilities for which we must speak for a nation. War, for example. Trees, for example.

But I want you to read the Constitution thoroughly, Mr. Speaker, and I know you have, over and over and over again. You know as well as I do, there's not one word in there about mandating that every American citizen pay a fine if they refuse to purchase a health insurance policy.

□ 1610

I want to talk about those laws of unintended consequences a little further, Madam Speaker, because, as I said, I'm not antigovernment. Government has a role. In fact, that's where we are in America every single day, Madam Speaker. We're on that continuum between liberty and security. Liberty and security—yet you can't have both at the same time. We're always moving up and down that continuum.

If you go out here on the interstate, Madam Speaker, you can't drive 150 miles an hour. Well, you can, but you'll be punished. Why can't you do that? It's a free country. I hear people that say that all the time. Dadgummit, ROB. It's a free country. Well, it is a free country. But we have decided to trade

away, through government, our liberty of driving 150 miles an hour for the security of knowing that our children and grandchildren aren't going to die every time they get on the road. That's where we are. Every single decision of government bridges that continuum between complete liberty and complete security.

Kentucky, in 1993, began to try to provide for its citizens' security in the health care field. Again, as I told you, in 1996, the President signed into law that bill that regulates all Federal policies, but it left to the States all of those policies that are State-regulated.

Well, Kentucky tried to take some steps. They passed a health care law in 1994 that aimed to lower health care costs for all folks in Kentucky and to encourage uninsured individuals to purchase health insurance. There were some mandatory issue provisions. There were some rate regulation provisions.

This is what happened: They did the very best they could in the great State of Kentucky. But they had 43 insurance carriers in 1993. And after passing this law, they ran 41 of those out of the State. They had 43 choices that their citizens could choose from. Then they all got together and said, We want to help make it better for our citizens. And 41 of those companies said, We're not going to put it up with it. This is no way to run a business. We're leaving. From 43 insurance companies to two, this Kentucky health care law destroyed.

Well, what do you think happened? All those voters who said they wanted changes to the health care law, they weren't all that excited about the one that cost them 41 different choices. So Kentucky repealed that law, started over from scratch, and they are now growing the number of insurance companies back in that system.

That's awful for the men and women in Kentucky who had to struggle through that. But it didn't burden the other 49 States at the same time. And the men and women of Kentucky could then look to those reforms in the other 49 States to see how to improve on their health care model.

It's the law of unintended consequences, Madam Speaker. That's why it's bad to consolidate all of this authority here in the United States Congress. It's not that these men and women who work here aren't conscientious. It's not that they don't love their country. It's not that they don't love their constituents, and they do try to serve them well. It's that you cannot possibly predict every single outcome.

I'll give you one, Madam Speaker. You know, some of the President's health care law has already gone into effect. One of those provisions that's already gone into effect is mandatory issue of policies for children. But why? Because we all love children. There's not a man or a woman in this Chamber who doesn't love children, Madam

Speaker. So the President, in his health care bill, said, Well, let's make sure then that every insurance company must issue an insurance policy to every child who decides they want a policy.

Well, we've kind of gotten confused about what insurance is in this country. Think about that, Madam Speaker. Think about all the insurance policies you have in your life. Which one are you really excited about utilizing? Is it your life insurance policy, Madam Speaker? You are really hoping that day comes when your maker takes you home, and you can bring that life insurance policy to fruition? No. Is it your car insurance policy? You are really excited about getting into an accident this afternoon so you can call your insurance company and have them pay for it? That's going to be great? No. Maybe it's your homeowners insurance policy, Madam Speaker. Maybe you are hoping a fire breaks out there tonight so you can go home and call that homeowners insurance company and collect on the full value of your policy. No. Insurance is for things you hope don't happen, but you want to be ready for them in case they do.

That's not so with health insurance. How many friends or neighbors do you have who have said, You know what? I'm going to put that procedure off until I get my health insurance? That's not insurance. That's discount health care. That's prepaid health care. That's any number of things. But it's not insurance. Insurance is for things that you don't know are going to happen.

Well, going back to the President's health care bill that mandated that all children get the policies that they apply for. Well, guess what? Some children are already sick. So when they go to apply for a policy, they're not applying for insurance. They're applying for free health care.

Insurance companies aren't charitable organizations. My church is a charitable organization. The United Way is a charitable organization. Insurance companies are not charitable organizations. They are in the business of providing a service for a fee.

So when the President's health care bill went into effect—a bill that I promise you, I am as certain as I stand here today, that the President intended to be a boon for children, that he intended to be helpful for children, that he intended to provide more services for children—it shut down every single insurance company in Georgia that offered child-only policies.

When you went to buy an insurance policy after the President's health care bill went into effect, the health care bill that guaranteed that insurance companies had to issue you a policy, you found that not a single policy remained because every single insurer in that marketplace had left. Madam Speaker, that's not surprising, those laws of unintended consequences. They're undeniable. And the President's health care bill is taking us

down that road not just in child policies, not just in terms of guaranteed issue, not just in terms of the Federal mandate, but on issue after issue after issue.

The Supreme Court is going to make their decision next week. Well, they've made their decision. They're going to share it with the rest of us. But just to be clear, I hear what you might be saying: Well, Congressman WOODALL, you are one of those hardcore conservatives from the great State of Georgia. You just don't care about people. Because I hear that charge—not against me personally, but against conservatives in general. It drives me crazy. I will concede that there may be Members on the other side of the aisle who care about people as much as I do. But there is not one man or woman in this Chamber who cares about people more. Not one. All I'm saying is the Federal Government shouldn't screw it up for those people.

Because I have here, Madam Speaker, a chart of what every State in the Union was doing in 1996. This Chamber hadn't gone mad in 1996 when it decided, under a Republican Speaker and a Democratic President, to sign a health care law. It hadn't gone crazy. It chose to only regulate Federal plans because State plans were already being regulated at the State level.

Take a look: What kinds of things are you interested in? Are you interested in guaranteed issue, Madam Speaker? That guaranteed issue is when you say, I don't care if somebody's sick; you have to take them anyway. That's not a great insurance practice, but it's a heartfelt belief. It's called guaranteed issue. Well, let's see. Alaska's got it. Arizona's got it. Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, on and on and on. This isn't something that requires a Federal solution.

Are there people in this Chamber who want a Federal solution because it consolidates power in Washington, D.C.? Absolutely, there are. Are there men and women in this Chamber who want a Federal solution because they believe in their heart they care more about people than anybody else and so they want it to be their solution that people utilize? Absolutely, there are.

But hear this, Madam Speaker, and share this with your constituents back home. There is not one health care problem that the President aims to solve in his health care bill that your State legislature cannot solve itself at home today.

Madam Speaker, how many times have you heard somebody say, But I know this family, and they can't get insurance, and my heart aches for them. I hear that. I hear that regularly. And your State legislature can solve that for you today.

□ 1620

You don't need Washington, D.C.'s permission. Something happened in

this country, Madam Speaker, and it's not healthy. Folks call Washington, D.C., for solutions. I got a call the other day from a homeowners association. They said, I can't get a building permit put through the city council, and I want you to fix it for me. That's what folks believe. I get it. That is not what America is. The place to solve your city council issues is with your city council. And the place to solve your county commission issues is with your county commission. And the place to solve your State insurance regulation issues is with your State.

The President's health care bill was a solution in search of a problem that does not exist. Guaranteed issue is available today.

This chart goes on to talk about the portability issue: can you move from one insurance policy to the other without penalties. It talks about pre-existing conditions: how to deal with if you're already sick and you've gone to apply for a policy today, when will they cover that illness. Every single issue that the President's health care bill purports to solve, States have already been at work on and in many cases have those solutions already. The President's health care bill erases them all in favor of a one-size-fits-all solution.

I just want to go back for a moment, Madam Speaker, to Kentucky's experience. Thoughtful men and women, people who care about their neighbors and their communities, did the very best that they could to address their health care crisis. And in doing so, they ran from 43 insurance companies helping people in the State, down to two, because the rest of them went out of business and went home. Left the State altogether. That's not what they intended to happen, but that's what happened.

When we talk about the Supreme Court striking down the President's health care law next week—and I feel certain that it will because as I look at my Constitution, it is so patently unconstitutional to mandate that Americans engage in some activity they might not otherwise. And that's the principle on which the entire house of cards is stacked. The entire bill must be struck down.

The question is: What next? And what I want the American people to hear, Madam Speaker, is that what next is happening in your State legislature today. It was happening a year ago. It was happening 10 years ago. You do not have to have an act of Congress to have your problem solved. You can do it right there at home. And States are.

But if you call your Congressman and you ask your Congressman to solve your problem for you, I promise you your Congressman is going to go to work to do it. But when they do it, they are likely to craft something that destroys the system it was meant to save. And then where will we be as 315 million Americans?

I'll give you a little insight into just what I'm thinking, Madam Speaker. I'm not trying to associate my thoughts with the whole of the freshman class or the whole of the Congress. But there was a study out the other day where they went to the Fortune 100 companies, Madam Speaker, and they said: What are you going to do if the Supreme Court upholds the President's health care bill and all of these mandates go into effect?

Well, only 71 answered that survey. And every single one of those 71 Fortune 100 companies said: we'll do better to cancel every insurance policy we have in our company and pay the fine than we will to continue to provide insurance to our employees.

Now, you remember the promise, Madam Speaker, that the President made: if you like your insurance policy, you can keep it. Well, the insurance policy I had didn't comport with the President's bill so they canceled it altogether. I did not get to keep my insurance policy. And what 71 of the largest companies in America have said is the bill gives them every incentive to cancel every policy and dump all of their employees out into the exchange.

Now this was reported in the news as if it was some miraculous discovery. I will tell you this. This is the secret I was going to share, Madam Speaker. I don't think it's miraculous news. I don't think it's a surprise to anyone who crafted this bill. This bill was never about solving these problems that the States are already solving. This bill was never about solving problems that the States already have the ability to solve. This bill was about moving us one step closer to having the Federal Government pay for every single health care bill in this country. A single-payer system. That's what the President said during the campaign he wanted. That's what he said in his entire career he wanted. And this bill that does in fact destroy the free market health care system that we have takes us one step further in that direction. You need look no further than that Fortune 100 survey to see that.

Madam Speaker, when the Supreme Court strikes down the President's health care bill next week, I want to encourage a deliberative process in this body. There is no rush to judgment in this body. It was a rush to judgment that got us here. You have to read the bill to know what's in it. We've all been down that road; 2,000 pages that nobody had time to read. Taxes and mandates that folks are still finding out about.

Let's talk about that, because I hope, Madam Speaker, that I've laid out a fairly persuasive case that while the health care system in this country is in crisis, it is in crisis because of Federal Government intervention—not in spite of it, because of it—and that States have the ability to solve each and every one of these problems. And States are in fact providing those solutions.

So what are we getting in the President's health care bill? Is it worth it? Because I've got to be honest with you, Madam Speaker, I hope you were as surprised by this as I was when you got here.

There's a real reluctance in this town to do cost-benefit analysis. There's a real reluctance to weigh the costs and the benefits and see which side it's on. Why? Because if I'm the brilliant guy who came up with the brilliant bill, it's brilliant. And so if it costs a whole lot more than it's worth, that's going to hurt my feelings, so I don't want you to release that data. I don't want you to do that research. Let's just implement my brilliant idea and see where it takes us. Nobody wants to do the cost-benefit analysis.

Well, again, the President's health care bill, which solves absolutely nothing that States can't do on their own, and there's not going to be a single person in the President's administration that disagrees with me about that, they would prefer a Federal solution; but they know full well the States can do those things on their own.

This is what it's going to cost us: \$15 billion in taxes last year; \$30 billion this year; \$45 billion next year, all the way up to \$320 billion in new taxes in this health care bill. When the Supreme Court strikes it down next week, it's going to be a \$320 billion tax cut for American families because it's American families that are on the hook for these taxes in the President's health care bill.

I'll go on. The President said this bill is going to take premiums down for the American families. Now, Madam Speaker, I did not graduate with an economics degree, but I have ordered a lot of sandwiches at Subway. And what I have found is when I want to add guacamole to my Subway sandwich, they want to raise the price on me. And when I want extra cheese on my Subway sandwich at Subway, they want to raise the price on me. You cannot give the American people more benefits without there being a price somewhere.

So, yes, the President promised that this would bring down health care premiums. Here is his quote from June 9, 2008:

We'll bring down premiums by \$2,500 for the typical family.

That's this blue line, Madam Speaker, that I have. The President's rhetoric, We're going to bring down health care costs \$2,500 per family. The red line here is the reality, Madam Speaker. The reality is health care costs are going up. Premium costs are going up. Why? Because we've mandated that insurance companies do all these new things.

Are you following universities, Madam Speaker? There's all this heart-break down here talking about how to deal with student loan issues. Student loans are important. But what about student health care, Madam Speaker? Across the country, universities are

looking at canceling policies that they can no longer afford. They could afford them before the President's health care bill, but they cannot afford them after. Why? Because the President's health care bill with mandate after mandate after mandate does not take insurance costs down. It takes insurance costs up. And the American people pay that price.

□ 1630

It's all right here on this chart, Madam Speaker. At its core, when I talk to folks back home, folks care about access. I need access to insurance, and I don't have access. And they care about cost. I need access to health care services, but health care services are too expensive. That's what the whole health care debate was about. What can you do to help us with access? What can you do to help us with cost?

Madam Speaker, every State in the Union can provide you with access, and many of them have. And all of them will if their electorate demands it. Now, that's the funny thing about this health care bill, of course. The majority of the American people have always opposed it. There was never a time when the majority of the American people said, This is what we want. The majority of the people have always opposed it. It was Washington, D.C., that said, Well, you might not want it today, but once we implement it and force it upon you, you're going to be thrilled. You just don't know it yet. You're going to be happy.

Folks aren't happy still today.

Cost and access is what took us down this road. We see that access is within the legislative purview of every State in the Union, and we see that costs have been driven up and not down. It's not a partisan issue, Madam Speaker.

I'm from Georgia, so maybe I'm a little biased, Madam Speaker, but I'll tell you, I think Newt Gingrich has a reputation in this country. I know the Democrats do a lot of fund-raising by sending his name out as if he's a strident partisan. Well, maybe he is in other parts of the country; not in Georgia, but maybe in other parts.

It was Newt Gingrich and Bill Clinton that came together to reregulate the entire Federal health care marketplace doing away with preexisting conditions in a responsible and economically feasible way, requiring portability in an effective and economically feasible way, ensuring availability, using tools that make insurance more affordable instead of less.

Cost and access we came together on in 1996, long before my time, and implemented for every federally regulated policy in the land. What's left are those areas of State control.

Madam Speaker, I'm going to go back to the 10th Amendment because we don't spend enough time on the 10th Amendment around here:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited

by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

That is at the heart of our Republic. The Constitution lays out specific tasks that the Federal Government and the Federal Government alone must handle. And everything else, not some things else, not something else, everything else. It's not confusing.

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

And as we see in that dissenting opinion in the Vinson case, the courts have gradually acceded year after year after year to Congress's demand for more power. And as Congress has continued to legislate, courts have continued to endorse it. And then Congress legislates more, and courts endorse it more, and Congress legislates more, and you turn around and the 10th Amendment now means nothing.

What is that?

Going back to that dissenting opinion, the dissenting judge said Congress has so expanded the Commerce Clause, courts have so ruled on the Commerce Clause, that there is no aspect of economic life that Congress cannot regulate. And then he went on to cite the necessary and proper clause and said, and if there's no aspect that Congress cannot regulate, Congress can do anything that is reasonably associated, necessary, and proper to implementing that bill.

Folks, I don't think that's the America that you and I know. But no one loses their freedom overnight. You lose your freedom one fiber at a time, and you wake up one day and you say, golly, where did it go? It doesn't happen all at once. This has been time after time after time over decades. It's not a Republican problem; it's not a Democratic problem; it is an American problem.

And next week, it's happening right across the street, Madam Speaker. Right across the street, next week, nine men and women are going to reset the clock to what our Founding Fathers intended, setting limits on what the Federal Government can do in your life.

Madam Speaker, that inspires me. I'm not afraid. I'm inspired by that opportunity, that opportunity to be master of my own destiny. But I say to folks who fear that, to any of my colleagues on the left who fear the diminution of Federal power, there's a seat for you in your State legislature.

If you have the urge deep in your heart to control every aspect of an individual's life, I suggest you go back home and run for your State legislature because State powers are plenary; Federal powers are limited. And every single power not delegated in the Constitution to the United States, nor prohibited by it to the States themselves, are reserved to the States and the people.

Madam Speaker, that has always been the key to the success of this Re-

public. It has always been true that the finest innovations, the most creativity, is happening at the local level and working its way up, not happening in Washington, D.C., and working its way down.

When the Supreme Court strikes down the President's health care bill next week, Madam Speaker, Americans are not going to be without health insurance. Americans are not going to be without choices. Americans are not going to be thrown into a lawless environment. They are going to have the benefit of lower prices in the absence of the President's health care bill, of more certainty in the absence of the President's health care bill, and the authority to solve every single problem that ails them, vested in that institution closest to home, closest to the people, State legislatures across this country.

And if there's one thing I'm certain of, Madam Speaker, I've had those occasions where I have doubted the wisdom of this Congress, but I have never had an occasion where I've doubted the wisdom of the American people—not one. The American people have the authority to make these choices today. They do not need a Federal mandate to solve these problems. They don't need a Federal mandate to address these issues. They have that authority today. Our Founding Fathers made certain of it in the 10th Amendment.

And after that court case comes down next week, Madam Speaker, folks will go to work across this country, as they always have, to address the issues and concerns of the American voter, and they'll do that in all 50 of the great and independent States of this Nation.

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

CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

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

As always, I'm privileged and honored to be able to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. And having heard some of the dialogue of the gentleman from Georgia just preceding me, it transitions in a way that I think it is fitting, and his focus on the 10th Amendment and the limitations of the Constitution that don't seem to be felt by many Members of the Congress that serve over on this side as a rule and the debacle that's been brought upon us, and now we've called upon the Supreme Court to unravel, and anticipate a decision as early as next week, no longer this week, I'm told, Madam Speaker.

As I watched this administration unfold, and we're into 3½ years or a little bit more into the Presidency of Barack Obama, I'm extremely troubled by the constitutional aspects of this administration.

□ 1640

I would frame this with the understanding that the President of the United States is a former adjunct law professor at the University of Chicago who taught constitutional law. He taught constitutional law to students that were to learn about this document that I carry with me in my jacket pocket every day, this Constitution that has, as essential components, article I, article II, and article III of this Constitution.

Article I sets up the legislature—that's us, Madam Speaker, here in the House of Representatives and down the hallway to the other end of the Capitol, the United States Senate. It invests in us all legislative authority. That's article I. It sets up the legislature, and it gives us our authority. And I'll talk about that a little bit more in a moment, Madam Speaker.

Article II sets up the executive branch of government. It establishes that there shall be a President who is the Commander in Chief of all of our Armed Forces and a Vice President. Beyond that, there's not a requirement that this Congress establish any other parts of the executive branch of government. It just says that we may, not that we shall. That is in the enumerated powers that this Congress has.

The third branch of government, of course, is the judicial branch of government. It wasn't originally established for the purposes of determining the intent of the letter of the Constitution. It did emerge, and for more than two centuries the landmark precedent case of *Marbury v. Madison* has not been successfully challenged, although occasionally it's been argued. So I concede to the *Marbury* decision.

I look over to the Supreme Court and look to the United States Supreme Court to be the branch of government that determines what the laws mean, that identifies and defines the laws that we pass here. But my disagreement—although I've had some with the Supreme Court in the past, Madam Speaker—is not with the judicial branch of the government. I'm looking for them to grant us a decision next week on perhaps two large cases that have come before the Court, the *ObamaCare* case and also Arizona's SB-1070 immigration case. I'm hopeful that they will read this Constitution and understand it as I do and as most of us that take an oath to this Constitution do.

But I'm very concerned about the President of the United States, the former adjunct law professor who taught constitutional law at the University of Chicago.

When I had a speaker on this Wednesday morning at a breakfast that I host each week on Wednesdays—what goes on in that room is Members only, but it's the Conservative Opportunity Society—when the speaker that I introduced announced that he received his law degree from the University of Chicago's School of Law, it was a bit of an

apology for the President's interpretations. I'm hopeful that the very fine and excellent University of Chicago School of Law doesn't have now a bad reputation it has to peel off that comes from the interpretations of the Constitution that the President is making these days—who taught law there, of course I would remind you.

So I'm very troubled by the actions of the President of the United States. The most recent action that I'm troubled by is, let me say, the amnesty memorandum that he has directed Janet Napolitano to issue. This amnesty memorandum establishes several classes of people. One of those classes they've defined as this: if they were brought into the United States—or came into the United States is a more accurate way—if they arrived in the United States illegally from a foreign country before they were 16 years old and if they are still under 30 years old, and if they continuously resided in the United States for 5 years and if they received a high school degree, a GED, or were honorably discharged from the military—there are a couple other criteria there—then the President has directed Janet Napolitano, the Secretary of Homeland Security, who has in turn directed her subordinates—that being the Acting Director of Custom Border Protection, David Aguilar, and the Director of ICE, John Morton, and also the USCIS, Mayorkas—to recognize this memorandum and act as if the President had issued an edict that is actually a law.

Now, as Mr. WOODALL from Georgia spoke about the Constitution and what's happened to our 10th Amendment, I would suggest that the President seems to be usurping nearly all of article I, section 8 of our Constitution, the enumerated powers.

Now, I came here to speak of these enumerated powers in this way: if the President can manufacture law out of thin air—not whole cloth, Madam Speaker, but out of thin air—we get things like the immigration law that the United States Congress has established. It has defined categories of people, it has established numerous visas, it allows for the most generous legal immigration of any country in the world—and some say more legal immigrants coming into the United States every year than are allowed in all other countries in the world put together. I haven't seen that data to my satisfaction. That gets repeated here in this Congress so fairly often.

I am very confident that the United States is the most generous nation on Earth when it comes to legal immigration. A number between 1 million and 1.2 million legal immigrants come into the United States. That number of people happens to be something that would establish workers for every job that's been created for more than a decade here in the United States.

I have tracked the U.S. Department of Labor's Web site and I evaluated that, and I'll see that anywhere be-

tween 1 million and 1.2 million jobs have been created by this economy, and they're all taken up, at least in theory, by new legal immigrants.

Then we have 12 million to 20 million illegal immigrants, seven out of 12 of whom are out working, and the other five out of that 12 are presumably not working, or in the home perhaps. Those jobs are maybe not recorded by the Department of Labor because they aren't legitimate jobs from their statistical standpoint.

But imagine this, imagine an economy that generates over 1 million jobs a year, and imagine a country that would open its doors to over 1 million immigrants a year. Watch the economy create these jobs and watch those jobs being used by legal immigrants, and then turn a blind eye towards the illegal immigrants that are coming into the United States.

The people on the other side of the aisle see illegal immigrants as undocumented Democrats. It is a political equation for them. It's not an equation of what's good for America's economy, what's good for America's culture, what's good for America's society. It's what gives them political power. So they cynically turn a blind eye and encourage that laws not be enforced, erode the rule of law; and in the process of expanding their political base they're eroding the core of America and creating a greater and greater disrespect for the rule of law. That's chiseling away at one of those beautiful pillars of American exceptionalism; and the President leads the charge, Madam Speaker.

This lawless memorandum that was issued by Secretary Napolitano at the direction of President Obama has no basis in constitutional authority. The President of the United States does not have the authority to create law. He has no authority to pull it out of thin air. He cannot simply announce that he is going to require us to follow some directive, some executive edict and expect us to follow it. It is an unconstitutional overreach and a violation of the separation of powers.

Now, I have some experience with this. The President's move on this amnesty memorandum is a clear violation of the executive powers of the President of the United States. It is one of the enumerated powers that is given to the United States Congress in article I, section 8. If the President can manufacture immigration law, here's what he has done—I'll put this poster up.

Madam Speaker, this is the result of the President's action and, that is, first he created the categories that I mentioned—three or four categories of people that are classes of people. He has prosecutorial discretion to decide where they're going to emphasize the utilization of their enforcement resources. He can determine that they are going to put more people on violent criminals, more people on serious drug smugglers. I'm not sure they are, but he can determine that they are. I

haven't raised an issue with his constitutional authority to do that. I did bring an amendment a couple of weeks ago that blocked the Morton memos, which did say we're not going to enforce laws against individuals who have found themselves in the United States and haven't violated other laws.

And the President has argued before the Supreme Court that there is this careful balance, a careful balance theory that Congress has directed the executive branch to create and maintain a careful balance of various immigration laws so that the executive branch interest in the State Department and the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Commerce, those Departments find that balance so we don't over-enforce and offend our neighbors.

Congress did not direct the President or the executive branch to create or maintain any careful balance. That careful balance is a completely manufactured theory. Congress passes laws of all kinds under the authority granted to it in article I, section 8. And those directives to the executive branch are: keep your oath of office, Mr. President.

□ 1650

Executive branch, Eric Holder, keep your oath of office. And that oath for the President of the United States says, I do solemnly swear, to the best of my ability, to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, so help me God. Those were the words of Barack Obama January 20, 2009, right out here on the west portico of the Capitol. Preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States so help me God.

And intrinsic with that oath of office, a little bit later, in article II, the Constitution says of the President, he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed. That means, enforce the laws. The President must enforce the laws. He must appoint people whose job it is to enforce the laws. He must direct that they do so. They take an oath to uphold the Constitution.

Eric Holder has an obligation to enforce the law. Janet Napolitano has an obligation to enforce the law, and their oath is tied to the Constitution in the same way. They understand that when they put their hand on the Bible and raise their right hand and say, I do solemnly swear, that includes, take care that the laws be faithfully executed. That's the obligation of the executive branch of the government.

The obligation of the legislative branch of government is to pass laws that be necessary and proper. In fact, Madam Speaker, among article I, section 8 of the enumerated powers is a Necessary and Proper Clause, which says to Congress, the legislative branch to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers. That's the full list of enumerated powers that come before it in article I, section 8,

and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States or in any department or officers thereof.

The Necessary and Proper Clause includes exclusive authority to pass laws as vested in the legislative branch in government. If it's exclusive, that means the President of the United States and nobody outside this legislature can pass a law.

The President believes he can do that. He believes he can create legislation out of thin air, and he did so by the effect of his memorandum that was released by Janet Napolitano last Friday and supported in a Rose Garden speech by the President of the United States about 2:40 p.m. last Friday.

And here's what we have. As a result of that is amnesty for whole classes of people. Between 800,000 and 1.4 million people granted a legal status in this country that, as of the morning, last Friday morning, when they woke up, they were subject to being put back in the condition they were in before they broke the law, that is, back to their home country where they rightfully belong and legally could reside.

The President changed that with an unconstitutional overreach that's a violation of this separation of powers, and I'm going to ask the court to resolve this disagreement. It will take some time. It will take some money. It will take some effort and some litigation brains. They are, I believe, ready to go on this, Madam Speaker.

But here's what the result is of the President's memo, and it's this: Created those classes of people, granted them executive amnesty by memo printed by Janet Napolitano, Director of Homeland Security, and directed the Director of USCIS, United States Citizenship Immigration Services, to create a permit that would allow those formerly illegal individuals to work in the United States for the duration of this permit that he would grant.

Now, I've just looked at a couple of these things. These are created by laws, acts of Congress. This is an employment authorization card. It's just a model or a sample of one. It doesn't actually identify a real individual. And this is the size of a credit card, and it says U.S. Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Citizenship Immigration Services, USCIS.

This is what the President has directed that USCIS create to hand to these one or so million people that get their new amnesty by executive fiat. Here is your employment authorization card. This is what will be produced, not by the direction of the United States Congress, not under the authority of article I of the Constitution that established this legislature, but under the arrogant, assumed power of the President of the United States to issue a memo that he thinks he has the authority to issue.

And by the way, power in this world has historically been what you're able to assert and retain. If anyone steps up

and assumes power to do something and there's no one there to challenge them and they can get away with it, they have that power and they will hold that power, and it will be a precedent for that power until someone can challenge it and take it away from them, Madam Speaker.

And so the President has assumed this unconstitutional power to create entire classes of people, grouped in the hundreds of thousands, grant to them an employment authorization card, and grant to them a resident card.

Now, the resident card that the President has ordered USCIS to produce in an unlawful, unconstitutional fashion will likely look something like this. This is a copy of what we know as a green card. It's a lawful permanent resident card. LPR status is what we call it. It says right here, permanent resident card. And again, this is just a token individual, a model for the card.

But, Madam Speaker, they'll probably just strike out permanent resident and they might say temporary resident. It might have some kind of indication that later on he's going to make them a permanent resident.

If the President can manufacture authority to do this when it doesn't exist, if he can grant amnesty to people that fit the age categories that he says, that haven't committed violent or serious felonies, or too many strings of misdemeanors, if he can do that, then why can't he also grant amnesty to those that are over 16 when they came here, those that are over 30 today, those that have been in the United States for less than 5 years, those that may have committed felonies and he just wants to give them a pass?

We already have amnesty in this country for the President of the United States' aunt, who had been adjudicated for deportation, Auntie Onyango, and we already have the amnesty from the administration for his drunken uncle, Omar, who nearly ran over a police officer and had a 1.4 blood alcohol content. And then after he was brought to court, his punishment was to suspend his driver's license, and then the State of Massachusetts issued him a 45-day driver's license.

These laws don't apply to the relatives of the President of the United States. Apparently they don't apply to the President's preferred manufactured classes of people.

And by the way, the Constitution, according to his view, doesn't apply either to the President of the United States. This is what he has created out of whole cloth. These cards that you see here, this is a result of a deliberative act of the United States Congress.

The U.S. House of Representatives, the United States Senate have concurred that we want to give people who are in this country legally an employment authorization card when they qualify. We want to give them a permanent resident card, a lawful permanent status card, when they qualify.

And this green card, by the way, is a path to citizenship. Carrying this green card around for 5 years, being President of the United States, obeying our laws, that opens the door to United States citizenship, and after that 5-year period of time the green card can be converted, and often is, into United States citizenship.

What prevents the President from just granting citizenship to all of the people that he thinks might vote for him?

If the President has the authority to manufacture, out of thin air, this permit and this permit, Madam Speaker, under the same assumed arrogant authority, the President would be able to grant amnesty to 12 or 20 million people, instantly make them citizens, and march them off to the polls.

He's engaged in blocking the State of Florida and five other States from cleaning up their voting rolls; has sent his Attorney General, Eric Holder, to block Florida from cleaning illegals off of the voting rolls in Florida, and that's not the only State.

There's a database called the SAVE database that's in the control of Janet Napolitano, and Department of Homeland Security.

The Secretary of State of the State of Iowa, Matt Schultz, who is doing an excellent job of making sure that those of us who have a legitimate vote in the State don't see our vote diluted or offset by the vote of someone who is unlawfully in the United States, or not a citizen, or perhaps a felon, or deceased. We need voter registration lists that are free of duplicates, deceased and felons, and that certifies that they are citizens, and require a picture ID, and the Holder Justice Department, working with the assent, if not the encouragement of the Obama White House, is blocking the legitimate cleanup of the voter registration rolls in State after State after State.

□ 1700

This is the most unconstitutional reach by the executive in the history of the United States, and here are some things that the President could do if we let him assert his authority. I'll go all the way down through and just pick the most important ones.

In article I, section 8, the enumerated powers of our Constitution, the first power grants Congress, exclusively Congress, the authority to lay and collect taxes.

What if the President decided by executive fiat that he didn't want to collect taxes against people in the lowest bracket? Because, after all, that would be an income redistribution thing that he is likely to favor. Do you think those folks would feel good about the President of the United States and maybe go to the polls and vote for him?

Would that change the political dynamic in the country if they didn't have a tax liability? Probably. If that's his calculus, what prevents him from doing this? If he thinks he has the

power to lay and collect taxes, he can always absolve people of those taxes as well.

What if Mitt Romney is elected President of the United States and he decides that, in order to stimulate the economy, he would just waive the taxes on U.S. capital that's stranded overseas in the trillions of dollars? What if he waived the capital gains taxes and let those resources come back into the United States tax free to be reinvested in the economy?

Does the President have the authority to waive taxes or does the President have the authority to lay and collect them? No, Madam Speaker, he does not.

The President of the United States has the obligation to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. The authority to legislate is exclusively within the United States Congress—House and Senate—with the consent then of the signature of the President or of its overriding with his veto.

The President could, under the same rationale as he has here, lay and collect taxes or waive taxes on certain classes of people. What if he decided, I feel a little sorry for those people who I wrote into this memorandum, so I don't want them to pay taxes either. Would then America be outraged? I'd say we need to understand this Constitution better, and we will be more outraged.

What about borrowing money—that's another enumerated power—to borrow money on the credit of the United States? What if the President of the United States decided under the same authority he has assigned himself here that he is not going to pay any attention to Congress on whether we agree to lifting the debt ceiling and that he's just going to go by Executive order or by Presidential fiat and direct the Department of the Treasury to go ahead and borrow money beyond the debt ceiling this Congress has set? What would we say then, Madam Speaker?

How about this: to regulate commerce. Well, wait. They're already doing that. They're alleging that under the Commerce Clause of the Constitution that they can go ahead and declare that only one lung full of American air constitutes engaging in interstate commerce and that they can compel you to buy a health insurance policy that's written or approved by the Federal Government.

That's the decision that we expect from the Supreme Court next week. I think it's going to be a constitutional one. Barack Obama asserts that the Commerce Clause is so broad that Congress can reach across all State lines and declare that breathing one lung full of American air is enough to engage in interstate commerce, and therefore they can regulate all activities that they can declare to be interstate commerce. That means all activities whatsoever.

By the way, I will say, if the Commerce Clause is so broadened by the

consent of the Supreme Court next week, then the Commerce Clause, itself, swallows all of the enumerated powers. Everything can be regulated within the Commerce Clause.

But I'm really here to focus on the separation of powers between the legislative and the executive branches. So I take us to naturalization.

The enumerated powers grant that power of naturalization "to establish an uniform rule of naturalization" to the United States Congress exclusively, not to the President of the United States. The President has argued that the exclusive rule of naturalization includes all immigration laws, that the Congress should be able to determine that, and that there is no 10th Amendment that applies.

That's another case before the Supreme Court that I expect we will get a decision on next week. But this stretch of the rationale that the President has sent does great offense to the Constitution of the United States.

Regardless, this Congress has the exclusive constitutional authority "to establish an uniform rule of naturalization." The President can't write that. The States can't write that, but the States do have the authority to write immigration laws that mirror those of the United States Government's. The President can't write them as he intends to do. This is what he has created. Unconstitutionally, he has created these permits and these classes of people.

The President has also declared that the Senate wasn't in session when they were in session, and he committed his recess appointments. I am disappointed, frankly, Madam Speaker, that the United States Senate didn't step up and defend its authority to determine when they were in session, and to not adjourn and to be in a pro forma session. They did so so that the President could not insert recess appointments, and the President did so anyway.

If the President of the United States can declare that the United States Senate is not in session, then he can effectively abolish the United States Senate except for its being just simply a symbolic body. Now, there are countries around the world like that—in this hemisphere, I might add. I remember seeing the President of the United States in a glad double-handed handshake with one of those people a few years ago.

Then I mentioned S.B. 1070, this great overreach when the President had sent his Attorney General to sue Arizona. He was classically asked the question, Attorney General Holder, did you read the Arizona immigration bill? His answer was, No.

Congressman TED POE said, Here, you can read mine. It's only 10½-pages long. It's not that hard to study.

I'd read it. TED POE had read it. So had, I think, every member of the Judiciary Committee on our side. But the Attorney General had determined he

was going to sue Arizona because he was ordered to by the President of the United States. The announcement came in Ecuador from Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. That's how we found out. They created a whole new legal argument called the "careful balance theory" in that Congress had directed the executive branch to create and maintain a careful balance between the various immigration laws.

We did no such thing.

There is no record of this. There is no statute of this. There is no dialogue in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that would direct such a thing. They asserted it because that was the only argument they could manufacture that suited their political position.

This is not an administration of law. This is not an administration bound by it. They are not bound by the Constitution. The President, himself, has stood before this Nation multiple times and has given the lecture about the separation of powers: Congress passes the laws. The executive branch carries them out. Then the Supreme Court, the judicial branch, interprets the laws. That's the President's lecture, and he cast it all aside and asserted an executive edict that he could create these things out of thin air.

If the President can do so, then, as we go on down the line, he can regulate commerce. He can do the naturalization. The President has already stuck his nose into bankruptcies, and the secured creditors for Chrysler saw themselves aced out while the White House was the only appraiser of Chrysler motors. They wrote the terms of the chapter 11 for Chrysler, and they were the only entity that was bidding on Chrysler's assets. They set the price going in. They wrote the terms of the bankruptcy, and they offered the price on the other side of it. And what did they do? They scooped the secured creditors' assets away and handed them over to the unions.

Congress sets the terms of bankruptcy, not the White House. Again, he has crossed the line.

We go on down the line.

What if the President decided that he could establish the currency of the United States? That's exclusively the Congress as well. What if he determined the euro were going to be the currency of the United States of America? What could we do? What would our alternative be? We'd take the gentleman to the courts, and ask the courts to determine the difference. In the end, the people will decide this.

With regard to intellectual property, he could waive copyrights, trademarks, and those types of laws, or he could create tribunals or wipe them out if he is going to assert an authority to rewrite article I, section 8.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate your attention. We must keep our oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States and the separation of powers. I intend to do so. I ask for everyone's help in this whole country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1710

MANAGING OUR NATIONAL FORESTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) for 30 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to address the House on a matter of the West.

There are major fires burning across the western United States. There's tremendous property damage and tremendous damage to the environment. Habitat for endangered species is being burned up in the hundreds of thousands of acres. The species themselves are being destroyed and killed in these massive wildfires. And the Chief of the United States Forest Service says, We need to introduce fire back into our forests.

Just this week as the Chief visited in my Rayburn office with me, I said, Chief, this is what it looks like when you reintroduced fire into the forests in the West right now.

The forests are chock-full of fuel. Decades of mismanagement by our Forest Service has allowed the fuels to build up to where it's a dangerous, explosive environment. The drought which actually occurs regularly in the West has caused those buildup of fuels to be explosive in nature, and when fire gets loose, this is what it looks like.

This is the town of Ruidoso, New Mexico, in my district, and these are the flames that burn that makes it look like Hades has taken over all of New Mexico.

Is this what you intended, Mr. Tidwell? Is this what you describe as allowing fire to run its course and accomplish management objectives in your forests? You're the one responsible, sir.

Thank God for the firefighters who will come out and fight to save the community. Thank God for the men and women who will stand in harm's way to stop this. But this should not be occurring.

This is the Lincoln National Forest, and right next door, the Mescalero Apaches have about the same acreage of forests. With 14 people, they're able to clean their forests out. They're able to harvest the timber. When the fire gets to the Indian reservation, it simply drops down on the ground and becomes a grass fire, the way that fires typically ran in New Mexico and throughout the West.

History shows us that in our forests, we generally had somewhere between 50 and 100 trees per acre in the arid West on our forest lands. They are grassy savanna lands mostly with widely scattered trees. It never became more than a grass fire, but our tree rings show us that about every 8 years,

a very hot fire would come through, burning all of the grass and the underbrush, the ladder fuels, burning the small diameter trees while they are still small. But decades of putting out fires and decades of not harvesting any timber at all have allowed our forests to become explosive caldrons which are breaking into fire.

The shame is that this fire in New Mexico started as one-quarter acre, and for about a day it stayed about a quarter of an acre. And then it spread to 4 acres for the next 3 days. Still, no call for tankers, no call for those aerial drops of water or the slurry which puts out the fire. None. Not until the fourth day, late in the fourth day.

The Forest Service says they can't ask questions like this about those decisions. I think that the decisions locally are made by people who are trying to follow the policy of reintroducing fire into the forests.

Regional Forester Corbin Newman recently stated: Fire will have to take its natural course. And we're just trying to put fire back into its natural processes, he said.

This rings the same tone as was stated by Mr. Tidwell in my office this week, that we want fire to get back into the forest. Well, fire in the forest had a natural process when the forest was in balance. The forest is desperately out of balance right now.

This is not the first brush with disaster that we've had. And keep in mind that the Forest Service personnel themselves said they're worried about losing the entire town of Ruidoso, that it was at high risk, not just at risk but at high risk was their statement as we were briefed about the fire. But we had warning signs last year.

This is what it looked like last year in Ruidoso. High winds and a small fire began to throw embers throughout the town, and you can see the little spots of fires over and through the mountains that are in and around Ruidoso. We began to sound the alarm at that point to our Forest Service: Please clean the fuels out. We can't stand for this to run wild. This year, it has run wild and destroyed 242 homes in this area, and more outbuildings, more structures, beyond just the loss of homes.

This is not necessary. All that is required is for us to manage the forests properly. It's a call that is going out from the people who live in the forests throughout the West. They're watching their wilderness areas, they're watching the forest lands burn to charred masses, and the Forest Service personnel themselves, the specialists, are telling me that trees will not grow here for another 100 to 150 years.

How is it managing our forests to burn the trees for 150 years? How is that good for the environment? How is that good for the species? And how is it good for the people who live in this area?

Shame on you, Forest Service. Shame on you for dictating policies to

local managers who know better. Shame on you, Mr. Newman and Mr. Tidwell, for saying that we're going to reintroduce fire into our forests and let it run its natural course.

The forest in and around Lincoln County, some has been cleared and harvested. We're not saying to clear-cut our forests. What we're saying is that a balanced thinning program will go through and leave widely spaced trees.

This is similar to how it looks on the Mescalero Reservation and also it's similar to how it looks out at Fort Apache in Arizona.

Last year, the Wallow fire burned 500,000 acres in the Wallow area, the Wallow fire, in Arizona and New Mexico, but when it got to Fort Apache, it simply fell down on the ground and stopped right there because they had thinned their forest.

This is what a forest should look like in the West. There's not enough rain and not enough nutrients to support 2,500 trees per acre. This is the way forests looked in the West when fire had its way, when fire ran its course. Instead, our forests today are densely packed, 2,500 trees per acre, and this is the outcome when you see that. That's what the U.S. Forest Service looks like in most places, a deep contrast to what it should look like. And it is into this forest that the head of the Forest Service, the Chief of the Forest Service, is saying that we're trying to reintroduce fire into the wilderness and into our forests. It's a misguided approach. That idea that we're going to reintroduce fire is playing Russian roulette with our national forests and our wilderness. It's a game that is not working out too well.

We have two major fires in southern New Mexico right now. We have the Little Bear fire in Ruidoso, but over in the Gila we've got 300,000 acres of land that has burned there, a strong mix or combination between the Gila wilderness and the Gila National Forest. Again, it started as a small fire. It started as a small fire, and the Forest Service releases say that they are monitoring it, that it's achieving its management objectives. I'm sorry, but management objectives of using fire in drought-stricken areas of the West, in forests that are chock-full of fuels, is misguided at the very least.

The people who live and have lost much have suffered deeply. The Forest Service needs to be responsible for those losses. But additionally, they should be responsible for the loss in tax base to the local communities. They should be responsible to local homeowners whose value of their homes is going to be depreciated for decades. Those people who have moved close to the national forests want to be there with that natural beauty. Instead, they're going to be faced with a brush pile that doesn't grow trees for the next 100 to 150 years, according to their specialists.

□ 1720

So what are we to do? Are we to stand by and allow our forests to burn

because of policies that originate in Washington? Are we to put at risk the lives of local people? Are we to put at risk the property values of local people? Or are we to call on common sense, just a pragmatic understanding that you cannot use fire to achieve the balance when the forests are full of fuel?

We have deep disagreements with our Forest Service on their policies. We have deep love for the people who manage the forest out in the field and for the firefighters who risk their lives. We're thankful every day that they're there 24 hours a day around the clock, 7 days a week, away from their families to protect us. But they should not have to protect us in this fashion.

It's expensive. It's expensive in the loss of our forests. It's expensive in the dollar cost of the fire. This fire in Lincoln County was running about \$2 million a day to try to put it out. The one on the other side of the State in the Gila was running about \$1 million a day.

But that is not the only problem that we face. Now that the trees are gone, when it rains, the rainwater is going to rush off the hills into the valleys; and it's going to rush down the valleys, and we're going to see flooding.

If you go to the Web page that we have for our congressional office, you will be able to see a dramatic video called the Dixon Apple Orchard flood. That's up now to just above the Santa Clara pueblo in northern New Mexico. People from that pueblo were waiting for the water that they knew would come, and they videoed several different spots. So take a moment and look at that, if you would, to see now the next calamity that is going to face New Mexico. Because when you burn the trees, there's nothing now to stop the water from rushing off the hill. It is going to carry topsoil with it. It's going to carry rocks and boulders, and it's going to flood towns completely off the face of the Earth.

One of the people fighting the fire out west in the Gila said that that area would have some of the most dramatic flood potential that he had ever fought fires in; that is, the canyons are so steep and so deep, and they come together, nine canyons come together, at Glenwood. All of that water is going to be pouring through the small town.

Mogollon, New Mexico, sits at right at the mouth of one of those canyons. It has high, high, steep canyon walls on both sides of it. It's at the bottom of the V. And those communities that have existed for decades—Santa Clara, which has existed for hundreds of years, is going to face flooding, not because of anything they've done, but because of the way that the Forest Service has managed its lands, the way that the Forest Service has managed those resources that we asked for them to take care of so that we all might enjoy the benefits and the beauty of our Nation's landscape. Yet we're not going to be able to see that, and we are going to

be exposed to floods for decades to come.

What kind of sense does that make from Washington? People across America are beginning to say that our government is broken. They're saying it's broken because of policies that result in fires, like the one that we just showed the picture of. People are saying that this is not responsible, that a government who would say that we're going to reintroduce fire into the forest with this kind of result, what kind of responsibility is that? That's the question that we're here tonight to ask.

It's not reasonable to expect people to just stand back and say nothing. So we are accepting an invitation to speak at a public rally where people are going to express their concerns, their fears, and express their losses in this fire, a fire that we've had decades to prepare for.

Several years ago, we had a fire on the backside of Capitan Mountain, just in this same area. And the local forest supervisor said, Well, it was a small fire, 15 acres, and it didn't justify bringing in air tankers and more resources. It blew out of control and became a 58,000-acre fire.

It's that mindset that we're not going to address the fire situation totally that is putting the West at risk right now. In Colorado, in that fire, we actually lost the life of a citizen who couldn't get out of her cabin.

When are we going to start managing properly? That is the question that lies before us all—us as a Nation, us as a Congress, and the U.S. Forest Service and the head of the Agriculture Department, who manages them.

It's a tragedy, what's going on in the most pristine parts of our country, wilderness areas where fields have been allowed to burn and where we're going to see the absolute destruction. It's not a matter of if our forests will burn; it's simply a question of when they're going to burn.

Now, we can manage differently and we can manage better, but we absolutely have to make the commitment that we're going to give up the policies that are failing and move into a new thought process.

In visiting with the head of the U.S. Forest Service this week, I asked about a policy that used to exist to put out fires. It was called the 10 a.m. policy. That is, if we see a fire running at any time today, we're going to put it out by 10 a.m. tomorrow; and if we don't get it out by 10 a.m. tomorrow, we're going to put it out by 10 a.m. the next day.

The head of the Forest Service, Mr. Tidwell, said, yes, it was very successful; in fact, he said it was too successful. Too successful? How can you be too successful in putting out these fires? Too successful? That was his statement. Yes, it worked too well. Well, Mr. Tidwell, I want it to work too well because I don't want the forest to look like this. I don't want our communities to be greatly at risk.

This is your standard operating practice. This is the outcome. I want you to

go back to the 10 a.m. policy that says, Put it out by tomorrow at 10 a.m. Then let's go in and let's start clearing our forest and cutting the fuels out. Let's start actually managing those forests, and then we'll stop burning them up. Then they'll be healthy forests, widely spaced trees. They will have enough nutrients. The bark beetles won't be able to get into them because they will be big, healthy trees.

Right now, the bark beetles are killing millions of trees across the West because they're starved for nutrients. They're like children that don't have enough nutrition. They're weak. They're spindly. They're susceptible to not only fire, but disease and insects. And all of our specialists tell us, but we don't make a change.

We've got many mountain communities in New Mexico. All of them face this same risk. We're not going to stand idly by while our chief U.S. forester says it's time to reintroduce fire back into our forests. I'm sorry. I disagree with the concept that our wildernesses will become charred stumps, that our national forests will not grow trees for 100 to 150 years because the heat of these fires calcify the soil sometimes as deep as 3 feet. It turns it almost into a glass, where the trees can't get root. Only the grass and small shrubs that are able to get some rain at the top of the surface will penetrate this.

We've got an area like that close to Cloudcroft, New Mexico. There was a very hot fire in the early fifties. It still is only shrubs. We haven't grown that forest back. So I believe when the specialists tell me it's going to be 100 to 150 years, I have seen at least 50 in that one forest myself. So I know that they're saying partial truths, and I think it to be complete truths.

Why are we accepting this management process on our Nation's forests? It doesn't make sense. It is extremely costly to people. It's extremely costly to the government. We can and should use the resources of this country better and more fairly. We should allow our species to have forests to live in, not to burn them out and not to burn the species up.

The spotted owl lives in this area, and you can see what's happening to his habitat. You can see what's happened to the spotted owls who were actually here. They don't exist anymore. The Fish and Wildlife Service in the past has said that this fire runs less risk to the spotted owl than logging. How can you say that this is less dangerous than doing this?

□ 1730

The logic is completely missing. Actually, the spotted owl thrives in these circumstances. The Mescalero tell us that they have numerous pairs that are coming back into the reservation because they have widely spaced trees. The spotted owl actually roosts in the tree, uses its altitude to glide off, catch its prey, and come back up. It cannot

do that in this forest, and it can do it in this forest.

So every argument that we are being faced with right now does not make logical sense as we talk about the policy here in Washington, D.C. It's a discussion that has now started in earnest in the West. The Eastern States, number one, don't have a problem with the drought. And number two, they don't have as much public land as we have in the West. It is the West that is burning up. It is us in the West.

I'm the chairman of the Western Caucus, and we are taking the lead in voicing our complaint, our frustration, and our fears for the population because of the management of the forest in the West. Again, our highest compliments to the foresters who live and work in the West. It is not them. It is the policies coming from Washington, D.C. It's the culture, it's the thought process that somehow tries to justify the actions which are causing these monstrous, massive fires.

We need to stop it today. We need to stop it now. We need to manage properly for the future so that all might enjoy these precious resources.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP of New York (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. CLARKE of New York (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of pressing business.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 25, 2012, at 2 p.m.

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 Alexander, Jason Altmire, Justin Amash, Mark E. Amodei, Robert E. Andrews, Steve Austria, Joe Baca, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Tammy Baldwin, Ron Barber, 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, Suzanne Bonamici, 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" Conolly, 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. Guterrez, 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 Lamborn, 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, Steven 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 Robyal-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, Robert L. 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:

6555. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule — Acibenzolar-S-methyl; Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0674; FRL-9349-3] received May 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6556. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Partial Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans: Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R10-OAR-2012-0112; FRL-9674-2] received May 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6557. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico: Albuquerque/Bernalillo County; Fees for Permits and Administrative Actions [EPA-R06-OAR-2007-0154; FRL-9672-7] received May 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6558. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Small Container Exemption from VOC Coating Rules [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0073; FRL-9677-3] received May 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6559. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Agency, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts and New Hampshire; Determination of Attainment of the One-hour and 1997 Eight-hour Ozone Standards for Eastern Massachusetts [EPA-R01-OAR-2011-0879; EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0076; FRL-9675-9] received May 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6560. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the South Coast Air Quality Management District Portion of the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Rule 1315 [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0140; FRL-9669-8] received May 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6561. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 2012 Memorial Day Tribute Fireworks, Lake Charlevoix, Boyne City, Michigan [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0337] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6562. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes to Standard Numbering System, Vessel Identification System, and Boating Accident Report Database [Docket No.: USCG-2003-14963] (RIN: 1625-AB45) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6563. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone for Margate Bridge, Intracoastal Waterway; Margate, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0069] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6564. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation: Intracoastal Waterway, Chesapeake, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0330] received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6565. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmit-

ting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; James River, Hopewell, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0292] received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6566. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Manchester Harbor, Manchester, MA [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0344] received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6567. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Niantic River, Niantic, CT [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0305] received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6568. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Patapsco River, Northwest and Inner Harbors, Baltimore, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0101] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6569. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; St. Croix River, Stillwater, MN [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0226] received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6570. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorage Regulations; Wells, ME [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0231] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6571. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Lake Washington Ship Canal, Seattle, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0362] received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6572. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Spa Creek and Annapolis Harbor, Annapolis, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2011-1120] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6573. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Coast Guard Exercise, hood Canal, Washington [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0283] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6574. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area, Tidell Waterfront Property, Willamette River, OR [Docket No.: USCGF-2011-0254] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 697. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5973) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-545). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. REED, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. STARK, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 5986. A bill to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act to extend the third-country fabric program and to add South Sudan to the list of countries eligible for designation under that Act, to make technical corrections to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States relating to the textile and apparel rules of origin for the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement, to approve the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. LUJÁN):

H.R. 5987. A bill to establish the Manhattan Project National Historical Park in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Los Alamos, New Mexico, and Hanford, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CUELLAR (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 5988. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a cooperative agreement for a park headquarters at San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, to expand the boundary of the Park, to conduct a study of potential land acquisitions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 5989. A bill to increase access to community behavioral health services for all Americans and to improve Medicaid reimbursement for community behavioral health services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself, Mr. YODER, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. SCHILLING):

H.R. 5990. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain farm rental income from net earnings from self-employment if the taxpayer enters into a lease agreement relating to such income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HECK (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

H.R. 5991. A bill to promote the development of renewable energy on public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 5992. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to place certain lands in Skagit and San Juan Counties, Washington, into trust for the Samish Indian Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. CAMPBELL):

H.R. 5993. A bill to prohibit the use of funds available to the Department of Defense or an element of the intelligence community for the purpose or which would have the effect of supporting, directly or indirectly, military or paramilitary operations in Syria by any nation, group, organization, movement, or individual; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 5994. A bill to provide a demonstration project under which Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries are provided the choice of health benefits coverage and access to a debit style card for the purpose of purchasing qualified health benefits coverage and paying for other health care expenses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DICKS:

H.R. 5995. A bill to designate and expand wilderness areas in Olympic National Forest in the State of Washington, and to designate certain rivers in Olympic National Forest and Olympic National Park as wild and scenic rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ALTMIRE:

H.R. 5996. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, in coordination with the Secretary of Education, to carry out a 5-year demonstration program to fund mental health first aid training programs at 10 institutions of higher education to improve student mental health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. TURNER of New York, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H.R. 5997. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to codify authority under existing grant guidance authorizing use of Urban Area Security Initiative and State Homeland Security Grant Program funding for enhancing medical preparedness, medical surge capacity, and mass prophylaxis capabilities; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 5998. A bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to revise the operations of the United States Preventive Services Task Force; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 5999. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide specially adapted housing assistance to blind veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. AKIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JONES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. HARPER):

H.R. 6000. A bill to require verification of the immigration status of recipients of Federal benefit programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 6001. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from granting a work authorization to an alien found to have been unlawfully present in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 6002. A bill to amend the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 with respect to maintenance providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. HAHN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CLARKE of Michigan):

H.R. 6003. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to prevent terrorism, including terrorism associated with home-grown violent extremism and domestic violent extremism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 6004. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to give preference to local contractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 6005. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a deduction for qualified long-term care insurance premiums, use of such insurance under cafeteria plans and flexible spending arrangements, and a credit for individuals with long-term care needs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 6006. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit States the option to provide Medicaid coverage for low-income individuals infected with HIV; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HALL (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 6007. A bill to exempt from the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 certain water transfers by the North Texas Municipal Water District and the Greater Texoma Utility Authority; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HOCHUL:

H.R. 6008. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that a State participating in certain grant programs takes into

consideration the training received by a veteran while on active duty when granting certain State certifications or licenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LABRADOR (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 6009. A bill to establish a program that will generate dependable economic activity for counties and local governments containing National Forest System land through a management-focused approach, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 6010. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the income limitations for the student loan interest deduction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 6011. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve Medicare benefits for individuals with kidney disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. JONES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LONG, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. HEINRICH):

H.R. 6012. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide to owners of certain intellectual property rights information on, and unredacted samples and images of, semiconductor chip products suspected of being imported in violation of the rights of the owner of a registered mark or the owner of a mask work; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 6013. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the time period for contributing military death gratuities to Roth IRAs and Coverdell education savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. TIPPTON, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. HEINRICH):

H.R. 6014. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants for States to implement minimum and enhanced DNA collection processes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CRITZ, and Mr. HOLDEN):

H.R. 6015. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the enforcement of employment and reemployment rights of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KELLY:

H.R. 6016. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for administrative leave requirements with respect to Senior Executive Service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FALCOMAVAGA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Res. 698. A resolution recognizing the significance of the 30th anniversary of Vincent Chin's death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H. Res. 699. A resolution congratulating the University of Washington Huskies Men's Crew Team on winning the 110th Intercollegiate Rowing Association Championships (IRAs); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H. Res. 700. A resolution recognizing the 40th anniversary of the enactment of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in Federally funded education programs or activities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 5986.

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

Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 5987.

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

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 5988.

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

The U.S. Constitution Article I, Section 8: Powers of Congress Clause 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 5989.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 5990.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 5991.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 5992.

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

As described in Article 1, Section 1 "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress."

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 5993.

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

This legislation refers to the authorities of the US Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution and as such is Constitutional.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 5994.

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

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DICKS:

H.R. 5995.

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

Article I, section 8 and Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. ALTMIRE:

H.R. 5996.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 5997.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States, which grants Congress the power to provide for the common Defense of the United States, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States, which provides Congress the power to make "all Laws which shall be necessary and proper" for carrying out the constitutional powers vested in the Government of the United States.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 5998.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 5999.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AKIN:

H.R. 6000.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 & 4 of the U.S. Constitution dealing with the ability to regulate interstate commerce and exclude illegal aliens.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 6001.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution of the United States:

[The Congress shall have Power] To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 6002.

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

The attached bill is constitutional under Article I, Section VIII:

"The Congress shall have power to . . . regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes".

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 6003.

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

This bill, the Empowering Local Partners To Prevent Terrorism Act of 2012, is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 6004.

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

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 6005.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 6006.

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

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

Article I, Section 1;
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; and
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 6007.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Ms. HOCHUL:

H.R. 6008.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14:

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 6009.

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

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 6010.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution, its subsequent amendments, and as further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 6011.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 6012.

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

Article 1, Section 8:

“To regulate Commerce with foreign nations,” “to promote the Progress of Science and useful arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries.”

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 6013.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 6014.

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

The Katie Sepich Enhanced DNA Collection Act is constitutionally authorized under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. The Necessary and Proper Clause supports the expansion of congressional authority beyond the explicit authorities that are directly discernible from the text. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 6015.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. KELLY:

H.R. 6016.

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

Article I

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 25: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 139: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 191: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 324: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 371: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 409: Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 420: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 451: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 458: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 459: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HANNA, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, and Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 687: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. AUSTRIA, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 718: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. AMODEL.
H.R. 750: Mr. MICA.
H.R. 860: Mr. CLAY and Mr. HALL.
H.R. 890: Mr. POSEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mrs. ADAMS.
H.R. 891: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 942: Mr. PAUL, Mr. WOMACK, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 1050: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 1111: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 1116: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1182: Mr. MICA.
H.R. 1259: Mr. BARTON of Texas.
H.R. 1325: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1342: Mrs. CAPPES.
H.R. 1370: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. DENT, and Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 1416: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 1464: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1475: Mr. KILDEE and Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 1489: Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 1612: Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 1653: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 1704: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 1755: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1756: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 1802: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1860: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 1903: Mr. SABLAN and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1956: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 2010: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2032: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 2040: Mr. WEST and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2069: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2139: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ROKITA, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 2140: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2206: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 2236: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 2242: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2325: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 2335: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 2479: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2492: Mr. YODER and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2494: Mr. TURNER of New York.
H.R. 2497: Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 2637: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 2730: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 2741: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 2746: Ms. WOOLSEY and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 2794: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 2969: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 2978: Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 2989: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3015: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 3040: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 3044: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 3086: Mrs. CAPPES and Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 3102: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 3179: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 3187: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3197: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 3269: Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 3337: Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 3423: Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 3461: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 3496: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3510: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 3591: Mr. ANDREWS and Ms. HOCHUL.
H.R. 3627: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. HALL.
H.R. 3643: Mr. FLORES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. QUAYLE.
H.R. 3658: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SCHILLING, and Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 3661: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. HECK.
H.R. 3679: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 3729: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3767: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 3798: Mr. STARK, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3824: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 3826: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3839: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4070: Mr. HIMES and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 4085: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4104: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 4115: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 4156: Mr. WALDEN and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 4164: Mr. AMODEL.
H.R. 4180: Mr. BONNER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 4190: Mr. MORAN and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4215: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 4235: Mr. NUGENT and Mr. WEBSTER.
H.R. 4238: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 4259: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 4269: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 4277: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 4309: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 4322: Mr. CANSECO.
H.R. 4350: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 4367: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4372: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 4385: Mr. MICA, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. STUTZMAN.
H.R. 4402: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H.R. 5186: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 5284: Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 5542: Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 5545: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H.R. 5647: Mr. TONKO and Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 5746: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 5749: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 5781: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 5796: Mr. KING of New York, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 5822: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H.R. 5840: Mr. RIVERA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 5864: Mr. LEVIN.
 H.R. 5865: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 5871: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 5893: Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. TOWNS, and Mrs. BONO MACK.
 H.R. 5895: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. STARK, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. RICHMOND.
 H.R. 5905: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. FARR, Ms. CHU, Mr. BACA, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 5910: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. AMODEI.
 H.R. 5912: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 5924: Ms. BUERKLE.
 H.R. 5925: Mr. JONES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 5943: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 5948: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 5953: Mr. NUGENT and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
 H.R. 5955: Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 5976: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 5983: Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. AUSTRIA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. GIBBS.
 H.R. 5984: Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. AUSTRIA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. GIBBS.
 H.R. 5985: Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. AUSTRIA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. GIBBS.
 H.J. Res. 86: Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.J. Res. 111: Mr. MORAN and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. FORBES.
 H. Con. Res. 119: Mr. FILNER.
 H. Con. Res. 127: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TURNER of New York, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 134: Mr. PITTS.
 H. Res. 609: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H. Res. 618: Mr. MORAN, Mr. BACA, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Mr. AUSTRIA.
 H. Res. 663: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MICA, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H. Res. 676: Mr. SARBANES.

H. Res. 687: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. TOWNS.
 H. Res. 689: Ms. HOCHUL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COSTA, Mr. STARK, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. HAHN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FARR, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

AMENDMENTS

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

H.R. 5973

OFFERED BY: Mr. CRAVAACK

AMENDMENT No. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the amendments made by section 11016 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246; 122 Stat. 2130).



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 2012

No. 95

Senate

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TOM UDALL, a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's opening prayer will be offered by Rev. Ronald McCrary, Deputy Director of Chaplaincy Services at the Cobb County Sheriff's Office in Marietta, GA.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, from whom we come and to whom we belong, may Your kingdom come. Use our law-makers today to do Your divine will on Earth, as it is in Heaven. Give them Your wisdom so that justice rolls down like water and righteousness like a mighty stream.

This we pray, in the matchless Name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable TOM UDALL led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUYE).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 21, 2012.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM UDALL, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, it is my honor to introduce to the Senate Rev. Ron McCrary, who just gave the prayer on the floor of the Senate. He is here with Chaplain Black.

Reverend McCrary is a great individual from my home county, Cobb County, GA. He is the chaplain to the Cobb County Board of Commissioners, the fourth largest county in Georgia. He is chaplain of the Police Officers Standards and Training facility in Georgia, which covers 40,000 law enforcement offices. He is a great preacher, a great leader, and a great chaplain. He was recommended to me by Sheriff Neil Warren, the sheriff of Cobb County, who because of his graciousness allowed Ron to come and be with us today.

Ron is a father, a minister, and a great witness. He witnessed as an athlete through the Campus Crusade for Christ and Athletes in Action. He witnessed as a pastor by ministering churches. He witnessed to the community by delivering great sermons—one of them about voting, in honor of Coretta Scott King, delivered in 2006 at the Turner Chapel in Marietta, where he empowered everyone to honor Coretta Scott King's life's work by making sure they participated in the political system.

It is an honor and a privilege for me to welcome and host Rev. Ron McCrary of Cobb County, GA, and the Cobb County Sheriff's Department.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM AND MODERNIZATION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 250, S. 1940. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion. The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 250, S. 1940, a bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the time until 11 this morning will be equally divided and controlled. At 11 o'clock a.m., we will begin up to 10 rollcall votes. We will complete the farm bill today in the early afternoon. We also hope to have a cloture vote on the motion to proceed to the flood insurance bill today.

WORKING TOGETHER

Mr. President, we come here and lament all the bad things happening in the Senate. It is not out of order once in a while to talk about some of the good things happening in the Senate. I think we should look at it as if, as difficult as it has been to get things done, we are making progress. We had that postal bill, which was good work on behalf of the Senate. The highway bill worked out extremely well. We have this 5-year farm bill—very difficult, but it is now near passing, which is good for the country.

We have to make sure before the end of the month we finish our work on the Flood Insurance Program, which is so extremely important to the country. With the construction picking up a little bit everywhere, we have to make sure when a loan is to close it can be

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4379

closed. Thousands of them each day cannot be closed unless we do a renewal of the Flood Insurance Program.

I had a meeting with the Speaker on Tuesday, with Senator BOXER, chairman of the committee, Chairman MICA, her counterpart in the House, and Senator INHOFE, and we are making progress on the highway bill. I feel good about that. Whether we get it done remains to be seen. But the House, in an overwhelming vote yesterday—totally bipartisan or they could not get the 384 votes—instructed the conferees to come back with the bill by tomorrow. Contentious issues have been resolved, and I believe we have a shot at getting the highway bill done. That would be good for the country and good for the Senate.

So I appreciate everyone working together. As the Republican leader and I have talked, as difficult as it is to work out agreements on the bills I have just mentioned—including the farm bill—it is good for the Senate.

I appeared before a committee chaired by Senator CARPER, and there as the ranking member was Senator COLLINS. They both indicated today before everybody that the spirit on the Senate floor was good yesterday.

That is because everyone can feel we are accomplishing something. Some of the votes were difficult, and some we all wish we had not taken because they were tough votes. But that is what the Senate is all about. So I feel comfortable with the last bit, that we are trying to work together for the good of the country.

I have said lots of times, if we are able to accomplish good as a body, everyone can take credit for it. We can go back to our States and claim we are part of a victory for the country. But if we do not get it done, we are part of the blame and people can go home and lament the fact that we have not been able to get our work done. People point fingers at us: Why can't you get more done?

So, hopefully, this summer, which started yesterday—in fact, today is the longest day of the year—will bring good tidings to the Senate.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

TRADITIONAL SENATE OPERATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, before the majority leader leaves the floor, let me just say I agree entirely that the Senate, it seems to me, is sort of getting back to operating the way the Senate traditionally has. I think the way Senator ROBERTS and Senator STABENOW have handled the farm bill has been exemplary. Members on both sides have gotten opportunities to offer amendments. We have had a lot of votes, but it is an important bill.

So I commend all of those who have been involved in beginning to work us back in the direction that I think most of the Senate would be comfortable with.

I also want to thank my friend, the majority leader. He has a tough job setting the agenda and deciding how to go about moving legislation. I think the way we have handled the farm bill and other measures to which he has referred in recent months has been a very important step in the right direction.

STUDENT LOAN RATES

Mr. President, 3 weeks ago today, Republican leaders in the Senate joined Republican leaders in the House in calling on the President to resolve a pending increase in student loan rates.

Drawing on some of the President's own ideas, we proposed multiple good-faith solutions to this problem before it is too late. We have been waiting ever since for the President's response. He has actually been missing in action. He has yet to offer a concrete solution. So you can understand our surprise upon learning this morning that the President plans to call on Congress later today to do something about student loan rates.

Mr. President, the Republican-led House of Representatives already passed a bill that would solve the problem. As I said, Republican leaders in the Senate have been on record supporting multiple—multiple—good-faith solutions to this problem for literally weeks. It is actually the Democratic-led Senate that has failed to act, and the President who has failed to contribute to a solution. The reason is pretty obvious.

It was reported yesterday that the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee is launching a Web site with a student loan countdown clock aimed at raising money off this issue. The implication is that Republicans are the ones dragging their feet.

As for the President? Well, this is just another sad example of the election-year strategy of deflection and distraction—deflection and distraction.

College graduates are struggling to find work and pay their bills in the Obama economy. He would like them to believe it is somebody else's fault.

Latinos are struggling with high unemployment. He would like them to believe the Republicans are the problem.

Middle-class moms are struggling to make ends meet. He wants them to think we are engaged in some phony war on women.

The President does not have a positive message to send to any of these folks, so he is cooking up false controversies to distract them from his own failure to turn the economy around.

Well, on the student loan issue, we could solve this problem in a sitting. Republicans have acted quickly, and on a bipartisan basis, to help prevent these rates from going up. We have passed a bill out of the House. We have reached out to the President. We have proposed multiple—multiple—solutions.

The only reason this issue is not already resolved—the only reason—is that the President wants to keep it

alive a little while longer. He thinks it benefits him politically for college students to believe somehow we are the problem.

It is time to stop playing games. It is time for the President to act.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, good morning to you. Good morning to my colleagues.

PTC FOR WIND ENERGY

I am here again on the Senate floor to urge all of my colleagues to vote for an extension of the production tax credit for wind energy, otherwise known as the PTC.

Today, as I have been doing, I will focus on an individual State. I am going to look at the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and show all of us the promise it holds as a wind energy manufacturing hub, as well as the negative effects that will occur if we do not extend the production tax credit.

Pennsylvania has a strong blue-collar background and an extraordinary number of highly skilled workers. With those factors, those positive elements in Pennsylvania, it has seamlessly transitioned into a wind energy powerhouse.

Look at this map I have in the Chamber of the State of Pennsylvania. You will see, from Philadelphia to Rockwood, from Pittsburgh to Scranton, there are wind projects all over the State. Those wind projects have created good-paying jobs and stability for Pennsylvania families.

Pennsylvania, as I have alluded to, has long been a center of manufacturing in the United States, and the wind industry has taken note.

You can see these green circles on this map. Each one of those indicates a manufacturing facility that makes parts for wind turbines in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. That represents over 20 plants and hundreds of employees in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I would suggest that the State of Pennsylvania is only beginning to realize its potential when it comes to the wind energy industry.

My colleagues know I have been on the Senate floor talking about the economic benefits of wind energy. I want to highlight what has happened in Pennsylvania.

If we look at this chart, in Pennsylvania, the wind energy industry supports 4,000 jobs. There are 180,000 homes that are powered by wind, and there is a conservative \$1.4 million in property taxes from wind projects that go to local communities.

So this is an important set of numbers. It is money, particularly on the

tax side, that helps local communities pay for basic services, and it is critical in this time of decreasing local and State budgets.

If we think about it, all of these figures—the jobs, the revenues, the investments—are prime for significant growth going forward. But that future and that growth are going to be threatened unless we act, unless the Congress acts to extend the production tax credit.

Just last week, Gamesa—which is a global leader in the manufacturing of wind turbines—announced it is ending the development of the Shaffer Mountain Wind Farm, which is in north-eastern Somerset County. This project would have ultimately ended up with 30 new wind turbines, and it was planned to come online in 2013. That is just 6 months from now. But because of the uncertainty tied to Federal policies, such as the production tax credit, Gamesa has sidelined this project.

In short, our inaction is costing this community jobs, this Commonwealth of Pennsylvania jobs. It does not make any sense in the current economic environment we now face and as our Nation is desperately focused on becoming more energy independent.

The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette made the point that this is the third wind project under development that has been stopped—all in the last month—just because of the uncertainty we have created here by not extending the PTC. These are on-the-ground examples of how congressional inaction is costing American jobs and investment.

I know the Acting President pro tempore knows this is not a partisan or regional issue. There is strong bipartisan support for extending the production tax credit, and the wind industry has a presence in almost every single State in our country. So if we look at the overall picture, this is not the time for companies such as Gamesa to grow, reluctant to invest in the future. So we have to expand the PTC. It will incent this industry to continue its rapid growth, and it will build a strong foundation for a 21st-century clean energy economy.

So I am again on the floor urging my colleagues to work with me to extend the wind production tax credit as soon as possible.

As I close, I want to highlight an event that is on Capitol Hill today where Members, staff, and others can learn more about the potential of wind energy, as well as other types of renewable and energy-efficient technology.

That event is the 15th Annual Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency EXPO. It is underway all day in the Cannon Caucus Room on the House side.

The bipartisan Senate Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Caucus, which I cochair along with Senators LIEBERMAN and CRAPO, is an honorary cohost of the event. I encourage all of us to go over there, look at the technologies. They are awe inspiring. They

are awesome. They are truly the future. When we implement policies that will help these technologies penetrate all of these various markets, we are going to continue to be a leader in the clean energy economy.

So I will be back next week to talk about the wind production tax credit. I will be here every day until we pass it and extend it.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN of Ohio.) The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

AGRICULTURE REFORM, FOOD, AND JOBS ACT OF 2012

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 3240, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3240) to reauthorize agriculture programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, before reading our order of amendments, I wish, one more time, to say thank you to everyone. We have had two very productive, hard-working days. I thank my ranking member for his incredible leadership and all our staffs.

Today, we have an opportunity to show that the Senate can come together—and we have been doing that—to pass a significant piece of public policy for Americans. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the previous order, the amendment votes occur in the following order and that all other provisions of the previous order remain in effect: Boxer amendment No. 2456; Johanns No. 2372; Toomey No. 2247; Sanders No. 2310; Coburn No. 2214; Murray No. 2455; McCain No. 2162; Rubio No. 2166.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 2456

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2456.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] proposes an amendment numbered 2456.

The amendment is as follows:

On p. 1009, after line 11, add the following:
SEC. 122 . . . REQUIREMENTS FOR AERIAL OVERFLIGHTS OF AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS TO PROTECT PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, pursuant to her responsi-

bility to protect public health and safety, shall only conduct aerial overflights to inspect agricultural operations if the EPA Administrator determines that aerial overflights are more cost-effective than ground inspections to the taxpayer and the Agency has notified the appropriate State officials of such flights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, on the amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, Senator JOHANNNS has an amendment which would stop the EPA from ever using any kind of airplanes—including manned small planes, which is all they do use—to check on serious pollution spills.

I wish to say this is about life and death. I hope the Senate will support the Boxer amendment and vote no on the Johanns amendment because the Boxer amendment says the EPA can only use these overflights if it has to do it to protect the health and safety and if it has been approved by the State.

This pollution could cause serious illness, and they want to make sure they can track the plume. We have heard of cryptosporidium, E. coli, and giardia. That is what we are talking about—terrible bacteria that sometimes comes from animals.

In 1993, at least 50 people died from the bacteria cryptosporidium in Milwaukee, and it came from animal waste. The EPA has never used a drone, and they don't plan to, but don't stop them from using small aerial oversight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNNS. Mr. President, given the EPA's recent track record with agriculture—if not downright contempt for it—farmers and ranchers simply don't trust the EPA. They could have done this program right and reached out to the congressional delegations in Nebraska and Iowa and said: Here is what we are doing. Here is the plan. They did not.

I found out about this accidentally. I have requested information—in fact, our entire delegation has—and the administrator has been nonresponsive. That is why the amendment is here. It is an amendment based on a lack of trust for the EPA. This maintains the status quo. This will change nothing. It will rubberstamp what they are doing.

I ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment and support the next amendment, which I will call up in due time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. JOHANNNS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll. This is a 60-vote threshold.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 158 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Akaka	Gillibrand	Pryor
Baucus	Hagan	Reed
Begich	Harkin	Reid
Bennet	Inouye	Rockefeller
Bingaman	Kerry	Sanders
Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Schumer
Boxer	Kohl	Shaheen
Brown (OH)	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Cantwell	Leahy	Tester
Cardin	Levin	Udall (CO)
Carper	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Casey	Manchin	Warner
Coons	Merkley	Webb
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Franken	Nelson (FL)	

NAYS—48

Alexander	DeMint	McCain
Ayotte	Enzi	McCaskill
Barrasso	Graham	McConnell
Blunt	Grassley	Moran
Boozman	Hatch	Murkowski
Brown (MA)	Heller	Nelson (NE)
Burr	Hoeven	Paul
Chambliss	Hutchison	Portman
Coats	Inhofe	Risch
Coburn	Isakson	Roberts
Cochran	Johanns	Rubio
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Conrad	Kyl	Snowe
Corker	Landrieu	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	Lugar	Wicker

NOT VOTING—5

Johnson (SD)	Menendez	Toomey
Kirk	Shelby	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for passage of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 2456 TO S. 3240 VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I was unavoidably detained and unable to vote on the Boxer amendment No. 2456 this morning. If I had been present, I would have voted in favor of this amendment. It is important that the use of overflights to monitor compliance with the Clean Water Act be limited to circumstances where ground inspections of large industrial agriculture operations would not be as cost effective or sufficiently protective of public health and safety. •

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

AMENDMENT NO. 2372

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2372 and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. JOHANNIS] proposes an amendment numbered 2372.

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from conducting aerial surveillance to inspect agricultural operations or to record images of agricultural operations)

On page 1009, after line 11, add the following:

SEC. 122 . PROHIBITION ON AERIAL SURVEILLANCE OF AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not conduct aerial surveillance to inspect agricultural operations or to record images of agricultural operations.

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, low-altitude surveillance flights over farmers' and ranchers' private property has caused bipartisan concern, and it is happening—EPA is flying these flights. Senator NELSON and I and the entire Nebraska delegation wrote to Administrator Jackson saying, "What is going on? What are you doing?" Their response was kicked down to the Regional Director. It was incomplete. It was totally unacceptable.

This is not about drones, this is about flights over feed lots, trying to determine if there is a violation and then pursuing that action. What we are asking for is for the public to be advised of what they are doing. Until that happens, this amendment simply says: Stop. You can't do this anymore until you let us know how you are using this information and for what purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JOHANNIS. I ask for support of the amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, may I be recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, this amendment is very serious. It is about life and death. It is true that on occasion EPA will use small manned aircraft to inspect a bacteria spill.

Let me recall for you: Wisconsin, 1993, at least 50 people lost their lives from the bacteria cryptosporidium from animal waste. When you are following a plume, the way to do it is from the air. It is much more expensive in many cases to do ground inspection. EPA estimates that on-the-ground inspection may cost \$10,000, but it could cost \$2,500 to survey the same area by air.

This is life and death. We are talking about E. coli. We are talking about giardia and cryptosporidium. We are talking about the health and safety of the American people that is compromised from these kinds of animal waste.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 159 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Graham	Murkowski
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Hagan	Paul
Begich	Hatch	Portman
Blunt	Heller	Pryor
Boozman	Hoeven	Risch
Brown (MA)	Hutchison	Roberts
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Chambliss	Isakson	Schumer
Coats	Johanns	Sessions
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cochran	Kyl	Snowe
Collins	Landrieu	Tester
Conrad	Lee	Thune
Corker	Lugar	Toomey
Cornyn	McCain	Vitter
Crapo	McCaskill	Wicker
DeMint	McConnell	

NAYS—43

Akaka	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Inouye	Reed
Bingaman	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Blumenthal	Kerry	Rockefeller
Boxer	Klobuchar	Sanders
Brown (OH)	Kohl	Shaheen
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Carper	Levin	Udall (NM)
Casey	Lieberman	Warner
Coons	Manchin	Webb
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden
Franken	Mikulski	
Gillibrand	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2247

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2247.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), for himself, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. SESSIONS, proposes an amendment numbered 2247.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reduce unnecessary paperwork burdens on community water systems)

On page 1009, after line 11, add the following:

SEC. 122 . CONSUMER CONFIDENCE REPORTS BY COMMUNITY WATER SYSTEMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) community water systems play an important role in rural United States infrastructure; and

(2) since rural water infrastructure projects are routinely funded under the rural development programs of the Department of Agriculture, Congress should strive to reduce the regulatory and paperwork burdens placed on community water systems.

(b) METHOD OF DELIVERING REPORT.—Section 1414(c)(4)(A) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300g-3(c)(4)(A)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking "The Administrator, in consultation" and inserting the following:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, in consultation”;

(2) in clause (i) (as designated by paragraph (1)), in the first sentence, by striking “to mail to each customer” and inserting “to provide, in accordance with clause (ii) or (iii), as applicable, to each customer”;

and (3) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) MAILING REQUIREMENT FOR VIOLATION OF MAXIMUM CONTAMINANT LEVEL.—If a violation of the maximum contaminant level for any regulated contaminant has occurred during the year concerned, the regulations under clause (i) shall require the applicable community water system to mail a copy of the consumer confidence report to each customer of the system.

“(iii) MAILING REQUIREMENT ABSENT ANY VIOLATION OF MAXIMUM CONTAMINANT LEVEL.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—If no violation of the maximum contaminant level for any regulated contaminant has occurred during the year concerned, the regulations under clause (i) shall require the applicable community water system to make the consumer confidence report available by, at the discretion of the community water system—

“(aa) mailing a copy of the consumer confidence report to each customer of the system; or

“(bb) subject to subclause (II), making a copy of the consumer confidence report available on a publicly accessible Internet site of the community water system and by mail, at the request of a customer.

“(II) REQUIREMENTS.—If a community water system elects to provide consumer confidence reports to consumers under subclause (I)(bb), the community water system shall provide to each customer of the community water system, in plain language and in the same manner (such as in printed or electronic form) in which the customer has elected to pay the bill of the customer, notice that—

“(aa) the community water system has remained in compliance with the maximum contaminant level for each regulated contaminant during the year concerned; and

“(bb) a consumer confidence report is available on a publicly accessible Internet site of the community water system and, on request, by mail.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1414(c)(4) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300g-3(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “mailing requirement of subparagraph (A)” and inserting “mailing requirement of clause (ii) or (iii) of subparagraph (A)”;

and (2) in subparagraph (D), in the first sentence of the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “mailing requirement of subparagraph (A)” and inserting “mailing requirement of clause (ii) or (iii) of subparagraph (A)”.

(d) APPLICATION; ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall promulgate any revised regulations and take any other actions necessary to carry out the amendments made by this section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes of debate.

Senator TOOMEY.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, water systems are currently required to mail reports every year that detail in great

specificity all the minute trace chemicals that are inevitably in the water supply. This is at a great cost and it is a problem, particularly for rural water systems. What my amendment would do is permit the water companies, provided there are no violations, to inform their customers in each and every monthly bill that they can obtain this information on the Web site. There are absolutely no changes whatsoever in water standards, of course, and every company would still have to mail these detailed reports if the water failed to comply with the State or Federal standards. This is a way we can free up tens, even hundreds of thousands of dollars in unnecessary mailing costs and make that available for infrastructure investment.

I am happy to yield to my colleague, the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. This is very simple. This is the information age. In my rural State of Oklahoma, sometimes they have to drive 30 miles to a post office. This will make it a lot easier as an accommodation and nothing is lost.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today our families receive in the mail just once a year a report about the safety of the water their kids drink every single day. The Toomey amendment repeals that important right to know. There are 70 regulated dangerous contaminants in our water. For example: arsenic, benzene, vinyl chloride, asbestos, cadmium, mercury, radium, and uranium. Some of these dangerous toxins are deemed unsafe at any level. Yet under Toomey you would no longer receive that information.

Senator TOOMEY says go to the Web site. One thousand water districts have no Web site. And right now, under the current right-to-know law, the Governor can say he waives this requirement for the small rural districts.

Please vote no. Our people have a right to know what their kids are drinking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. TOOMEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 160 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Alexander	Hagan	Murkowski
Ayotte	Hatch	Nelson (NE)
Barrasso	Heller	Nelson (FL)
Blunt	Hoeben	Paul
Boozman	Hutchison	Portman
Brown (MA)	Inhofe	Pryor
Burr	Isakson	Risch
Casey	Johanns	Roberts
Chambliss	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Coats	Kohl	Sessions
Coburn	Kyl	Shelby
Cochran	Leahy	Snowe
Collins	Lee	Thune
Corker	Levin	Toomey
Cornyn	Lugar	Udall (CO)
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
DeMint	McCain	Webb
Enzi	McCaskill	Wicker
Graham	McConnell	
Grassley	Moran	

NAYS—41

Akaka	Feinstein	Murray
Baucus	Franken	Reed
Begich	Gillibrand	Reid
Bennet	Harkin	Rockefeller
Bingaman	Inouye	Sanders
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Boxer	Kerry	Shaheen
Brown (OH)	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cantwell	Landrieu	Tester
Cardin	Lautenberg	Udall (NM)
Carper	Lieberman	Warner
Conrad	Menendez	Whitehouse
Coons	Merkley	Wyden
Durbin	Mikulski	

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. STABENOW. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 2310

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 2310.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for himself and Mrs. BOXER, proposes an amendment numbered 2310.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To permit States to require that any food, beverage, or other edible product offered for sale have a label on indicating that the food, beverage, or other edible product contains a genetically engineered ingredient)

On page 1009, after line 11, add the following:

SEC. 12207. CONSUMERS RIGHT TO KNOW ABOUT GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOOD ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Consumers Right to Know About Genetically Engineered Food Act”.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) surveys of the American public consistently show that 90 percent or more of the people of the United States want genetically engineered to be labeled as such;

(2) a landmark public health study in Canada found that—

(A) 93 percent of pregnant women had detectable toxins from genetically engineered foods in their blood; and

(B) 80 percent of the babies of those women had detectable toxins in their umbilical cords;

(3) the tenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States clearly reserves powers in the system of Federalism to the States or to the people; and

(4) States have the authority to require the labeling of foods produced through genetic engineering or derived from organisms that have been genetically engineered.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) GENETIC ENGINEERING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “genetic engineering” means a process that alters an organism at the molecular or cellular level by means that are not possible under natural conditions or processes.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term “genetic engineering” includes—

- (i) recombinant DNA and RNA techniques;
- (ii) cell fusion;
- (iii) microencapsulation;
- (iv) macroencapsulation;
- (v) gene deletion and doubling;
- (vi) introduction of a foreign gene; and
- (vii) changing the position of genes.

(C) EXCLUSIONS.—The term “genetic engineering” does not include any modification to an organism that consists exclusively of—

- (i) breeding;
- (ii) conjugation;
- (iii) fermentation;
- (iv) hybridization;
- (v) in vitro fertilization; or
- (vi) tissue culture.

(2) GENETICALLY ENGINEERED INGREDIENT.—The term “genetically engineered ingredient” means any ingredient in any food, beverage, or other edible product that—

(A) is, or is derived from, an organism that is produced through the intentional use of genetic engineering; or

(B) is, or is derived from, the progeny of intended sexual reproduction, asexual reproduction, or both of 1 or more organisms described in subparagraph (A).

(d) RIGHT TO KNOW.—Notwithstanding any other Federal law (including regulations), a State may require that any food, beverage, or other edible product offered for sale in that State have a label on the container or package of the food, beverage, or other edible product, indicating that the food, beverage, or other edible product contains a genetically engineered ingredient.

(e) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this section.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall submit a report to Congress detailing the percentage of food and beverages sold in the United States that contain genetically engineered ingredients.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, this amendment is cosponsored by Senators BOXER and BEGICH and is supported by over 40 pro-consumer organizations throughout the country, including Public Citizen, U.S. PIRG, the Center for Food Safety, and many others.

This is a very conservative amendment. It says the American people should have the right to know what is in the food they and their children are eating and if that food contains genetically engineered products.

This amendment grants States the authority to label genetically engineered food. It is not a mandate. It grants States that right—something

which, by the way, is now taking place in 49 countries throughout the world. If the people in England, Germany, France, and dozens and dozens of other countries have labels allowing their people to know if they are eating food with genetically engineered products, States in the United States should have that right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask for a “yes” vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, first I want to thank the Senator from Vermont for his wonderful leadership on so many issues in this bill. I must, reluctantly, ask for a “no” vote.

Consumers certainly need to have available information. We need to make sure it is accurate, according to the FDA, after they determine that.

I would make one other point: American farmers are feeding the world, with 7 billion mouths to feed. This is harder every day. Science and innovation are very important to that.

Recently, I talked with Bill Gates, with the Gates Foundation, for example, which is doing incredible work around the globe: with drought-resistant crops in Africa, with innovative rice in the Philippines and Bangladesh, and so on.

This is an issue that needs to be thoroughly studied to make sure we are not hurting those efforts. I know the chairman of the HELP Committee has asked that we not do this. It is within his jurisdiction.

Madam President, I yield time now to Senator ROBERTS.

Mr. ROBERTS. Very quickly, we all wear coats and ties in this body. This amendment would put us in lab coats. Don't wear a lab coat. Vote “no” on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 73, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 161 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Akaka	Cardin	Leahy
Begich	Feinstein	Lieberman
Bennet	Inouye	Manchin
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Merkley
Boxer	Kerry	Mikulski
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Murkowski

Murray	Sanders	Whitehouse
Reed	Tester	Wyden
Rockefeller	Udall (NM)	

NAYS—73

Alexander	Franken	Moran
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Nelson (NE)
Barrasso	Graham	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Grassley	Paul
Bingaman	Hagan	Portman
Blunt	Harkin	Pryor
Boozman	Hatch	Reid
Brown (MA)	Heller	Risch
Brown (OH)	Hoeven	Roberts
Burr	Hutchison	Rubio
Carper	Inhofe	Schumer
Casey	Isakson	Sessions
Chambliss	Johanns	Shaheen
Coats	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Coburn	Klobuchar	Snowe
Cochran	Kohl	Stabenow
Collins	Kyl	Thune
Conrad	Landrieu	Toomey
Coons	Lee	Udall (CO)
Corker	Levin	Vitter
Cornyn	Lugar	Warner
Crapo	McCain	Webb
DeMint	McCaskill	Wicker
Durbin	McConnell	
Enzi	Menendez	

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT NO. 2214

Mr. COBURN. I call up amendment No. 2214 on behalf of myself and the Senator from Colorado, Mr. UDALL. I ask unanimous consent that we be given 3 minutes for each side to be divided between myself and Senator UDALL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN], for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. BURR, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. MORAN, proposes an amendment numbered 2214.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the use of public funds for political party conventions, and to provide for the return of previously distributed funds for deficit reduction)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROHIBITING USE OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUNDS FOR PARTY CONVENTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 95 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking section 9008.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of chapter 95 of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to section 9008.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENTS TO CANDIDATES.—The third sentence of section 9006(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “, section 9008(b)(3).”.

(2) REPORTS BY FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.—Section 9009(a) of such Code is amended—

(A) by adding “and” at the end of paragraph (2);

(B) by striking the semicolon at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraphs (4), (5), and (6).

(3) PENALTIES.—Section 9012 of such Code is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking the second sentence; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(4) AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENTS FROM PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY MATCHING PAYMENT ACCOUNT.—The second sentence of section 9037(a) of such Code is amended by striking “and for payments under section 9008(b)(3)”.

(C) RETURN OF PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED MONEY FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Any amount which is returned by the national committee of a major party or a minor party to the general fund of the Treasury from an account established under section 9008 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 after the date of the enactment of this Act shall be dedicated to the sole purpose of deficit reduction.

(D) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to elections occurring after December 31, 2012.

Mr. COBURN. I yield 1½ minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

I rise in support of this important amendment.

I would also like to note that this provision is included in a larger bill I introduced this week to reform our Presidential public financing system. I would welcome support for that broader initiative.

This is a bipartisan short-term step we can take to preserve more money for publicly funded candidates who are running for President instead of using that money to fund what we know now as expensive parties in our conventions. So I would urge a “yes” vote. This is a way to get our fiscal house in order. It is a small step, but it is an important step.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his leadership in this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, 99 percent of the American public has no idea that when they check the box, we are going to take actual American taxpayer dollars and subsidize party conventions for candidates who have already been decided.

If we are going to lead as a body on starting to solve some of our problems, this is where we should start. This is \$34.6 million that gets doled out that is not spent in the best interests of the American public but spent in the best interests of the politicians for the American public. It needs to be changed. It has no effect on security. It has no effect on the present allocation that was made in January to each party. If we cannot do this, this little simple thing of leading by example, then our country is doomed because that means we cannot solve the very significant problems in front of us either.

I would appreciate your support and vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I yield back all time.

Mr. COBURN. I 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 amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MCCASKILL). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 162 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Akaka	Franken	Moran
Alexander	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Ayotte	Graham	Murray
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson (FL)
Begich	Harkin	Paul
Bennet	Hatch	Portman
Bingaman	Heller	Pryor
Blumenthal	Hoeven	Reed
Blunt	Hutchison	Reid
Boozman	Inhofe	Risch
Brown (MA)	Inouye	Roberts
Brown (OH)	Isakson	Rubio
Burr	Johanns	Sanders
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Carper	Kerry	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Shelby
Chambliss	Kohl	Snowe
Coats	Kyl	Stabenow
Coburn	Lautenberg	Tester
Cochran	Leahy	Thune
Collins	Lee	Toomey
Conrad	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Corker	Lugar	Vitter
Cornyn	Manchin	Warner
Crapo	McCain	Webb
DeMint	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Durbin	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Menendez	Wyden
Feinstein	Merkley	

NAYS—4

Boxer	Mikulski
Landrieu	Rockefeller

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 2455, AS MODIFIED

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 2455 and ask that it be modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

The clerk will report.

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] proposes an amendment numbered 2455, as modified.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the Office of Management and Budget, the President and the Department of Defense to submit detailed reports to Congress on effects of defense and nondefense budget sequestration for fiscal year 2013)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REPORTS ON EFFECTS OF DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE BUDGET SEQUESTRATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The inability of the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction to find \$1,200,000,000,000 in savings will trigger automatic funding reductions known as “sequestration” to raise an equivalent level of savings between fiscal years 2013 and 2021.

(2) These savings are in addition to \$900,000,000,000 in deficit reduction resulting from discretionary spending limits established by the Budget Control Act of 2011.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall report upon the impact of sequestration of funds with respect to a sequestration under paragraphs (7)(A) and (8) of section 251(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a) for fiscal year 2013 on January 2, 2013, using enacted levels of appropriations for accounts funded pursuant to an enacted regular appropriations bill for fiscal year 2013, and estimates pursuant to a current rate continuing resolution for accounts not funded through an enacted appropriations measure for fiscal year 2013 as the levels to which the sequestration should be applied.

(B) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) Each account that would be subject to such a sequestration.

(ii) Each account that would be subject to such a sequestration but subject to a special rule under section 255 or 256 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (and the citation to such rule).

(iii) Each account that would be exempt from such a sequestration.

(iv) Any other data or information that would enhance public understanding of the sequester and its effect on the defense and nondefense functions of the Federal Government including the impact on essential public safety responsibilities such as homeland security, food safety, and air traffic control activities.

(C) CATEGORIZE AND GROUP.—The report required under this paragraph shall categorize and group the listed accounts by the appropriations Act covering such accounts

(2) REPORT BY THE PRESIDENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, or by October 30, 2012 whichever is earlier, the President shall submit to Congress a detailed report on the sequestration required by paragraphs (7)(A) and (8) of section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a) for fiscal year 2013 on January 2, 2013.

(B) ELEMENTS.—The reports required by subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) for discretionary appropriations—

(I) an estimate for each category, of the sequestration percentages and amounts necessary to achieve the required reduction; and

(II) an identification of each account to be sequestered and estimates of the level of sequestrable budgetary resources and resulting outlays and the amount of budgetary resources to be sequestered and resulting outlay reductions at the program, project, and activity level, using enacted levels of appropriations for accounts funded pursuant to an enacted regular appropriations bill for fiscal year 2013, and estimates pursuant to a current rate continuing resolution for accounts not funded through an enacted appropriations measure for fiscal year 2013;

(ii) for non-defense discretionary spending only—

(I) a list of the programs, projects, and activities that would be reduced or terminated;

(II) an assessment of the jobs lost directly through program and personnel cuts;

(III) an estimate of the impact program cuts would have on the long-term competitiveness of the United States and its ability to maintain its lead on research and development, as well as the impact on our national goal to graduate the most students with degrees in in-demand fields;

(IV) an assessment of the impact of program cuts to education funding across the country, including estimates on teaching jobs lost, the number of students cut off programs they depend on, and education resources lost by States and local educational agencies;

(V) an analysis of the impact of cuts to programs middle class families and the most vulnerable families depend on, including estimates of how many families would lose access to support for children, housing and nutrition assistance, and skills training to help workers get better jobs;

(VI) an analysis of the impact on small business owners' ability to access credit and support to expand and create jobs;

(VII) an assessment of the impact to public safety, including an estimate of the reduction of police officers, emergency medical technicians, and firefighters;

(VIII) a review of the health and safety impact of cuts on communities, including the impact on food safety, national border security, and environmental cleanup;

(IX) an assessment of the impact of sequestration on environmental programs that protect the Nation's air and water, and safeguard children and families;

(X) assessment of the impact of sequestration on the Nation's infrastructure, including how cuts would harm the ability of States and communities to invest in roads, bridges, and waterways.

(XI) an assessment of the impact on ongoing government operations and the safety of Federal Government personnel;

(XII) a detailed estimate of the reduction in force of civilian personnel as a result of sequestration, including the estimated timing of such reduction in force actions and the timing of reduction in force notifications thereof; and

(XIII) an estimate of the number and value of all contracts that will be terminated, restructured, or revised in scope as a result of sequestration, including an estimate of potential termination costs and of increased contract costs due to renegotiation and reinstatement of contracts;

(iii) for direct spending—

(I) an estimate for the defense and non-defense functions based on current law of the sequestration percentages and amount necessary to achieve the required reduction;

(II) a specific identification of the reductions required for each nonexempt direct spending account at the program, project, and activity level; and

(III) a specific identification of exempt direct spending accounts at the program, project, and activity level; and

(iv) any other data or information that would enhance public understanding of the sequester and its effect on the defense and nondefense functions of the Federal Government including the impact on essential public safety responsibilities such as—

(I) homeland security, food safety, and air traffic control activities;

(II) an assessment of the impact of cuts to programs that the Nation's farmers rely on to help them through difficult economic times; and

(III) an assessment of the impact of Medicare cuts to the ability for seniors to access care.

(3) REPORT BY THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than August 15, 2012, the Secretary of Defense shall report on the impact on national defense accounts as defined by paragraphs (7)(A) and (8) of section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a) using enacted levels of appropriations for accounts funded pursuant to an enacted regular appropriations bill for fiscal year 2013, and estimates pursuant to a current rate continuing resolution for accounts not funded through an enacted appropriations measure for fiscal year 2013 as the levels to which the sequestration should be applied.

(B) ELEMENTS OF THE DEFENSE REPORTS.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) An assessment of the impact on ongoing operations and the safety of United States military and civilian personnel.

(ii) An assessment of the impact on the readiness of the Armed Forces, including impacts to steaming hours, flying hours, and full spectrum training miles, and an estimate of the increase or decrease in readiness (as defined in the C status C-1 through C-5).

(iii) A detailed estimate of the reduction in force of civilian personnel, including the estimated timing of such reduction in force actions and timing of reduction in force notifications thereof.

(iv) A list of the programs, projects, and activities of the Department of Defense that would be reduced or terminated and the expected savings for each program, project and activity.

(v) An estimate of the number and value of all contracts that will be terminated, restructured, or revised in scope, including an estimate of potential termination costs and of increased contract costs due to renegotiation and reinstatement of contracts.

(vi) An assessment of the impact on the ability of the Department of Defense to carry out the National Military Strategy of the United States, and any changes to the most recent Risk Assessment of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff under section 153(b) of title 10, United States Code, arising from sequestration.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the 60-affirmative threshold be waived, since it is my understanding that we will adopt this by voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, the amendment we are going to vote on is bipartisan, fair, and it will make sure Congress gets a report on the impact of all aspects of the scheduled automatic cuts. We all agree the bipartisan sequestration agreed to in the Budget Control Act is a terrible way to cut spending. It was included as a trigger in order to bring both sides to the table ready to compromise.

I am hopeful we can get together and get the bipartisan deal required to replace these automatic cuts responsibly and fairly. But as we work toward that we all should know exactly how the administration would enact sequestration if we don't get a deal.

I was very proud to work with Senators MCCAIN, LEVIN, and THUNE to come together on a bipartisan com-

promise to make sure Congress has the information we all need on sequestration from the painful cuts to the Defense Department, border security, food safety, education, and programs for middle-class families, on which the most vulnerable Americans depend.

So I thank all my colleagues for working with me on this bipartisan compromise, and I thank the families and advocates who called and wrote letters urging us to examine all aspects of sequestration.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, if sequestration comes to pass at the end of this year, many of us believe it could derail the economic recovery and do immense damage to important programs throughout the government, making our Nation less safe and our government less responsive to the needs of the people we serve.

But at this point, while our concern is deep and widespread, it is not specific. We know only in the most general terms what impact sequestration might have. And while that is enough to encourage many of us to seek the compromises needed to avoid sequestration, the Congress and the American people deserve a more complete picture of what we face.

That is why I am a cosponsor of the amendment offered by Senators MURRAY and MCCAIN, which would help give us and all Americans that more complete picture.

I thank Senator MCCAIN and Senator MURRAY for the leadership and hard work, on a bipartisan basis, that produced this amendment. It deserves broad bipartisan support, and not only because it will provide valuable information to us and our constituents. We must find ways to work across party lines more often and compromise for the common good. I hope this amendment can serve as one step toward the larger and more difficult compromises we must accomplish to avert the deep and lasting damage of sequestration.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, it is my understanding that Senator MCCAIN will not speak at this time, so I urge a "yes" vote on this voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2455) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, given the work that has been done, I wish to thank Senators MURRAY and MCCAIN for their efforts. Senator MCCAIN will not be offering his amendment, just for the information of the Senate. So we will move on now to the Rubio amendment, when Senator RUBIO is prepared.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on an amendment I have introduced—with a dozen cosponsors to require the Secretary of Defense to provide to Congress a detailed

report by August 15, 2012, on the impacts on national security of the automatic budget cuts, also known as sequestration. These cuts will be imposed upon the Defense Department 6 months from now unless Congress acts.

My amendment makes no changes to the Budget Control Act and should be non-controversial. It simply requires the Secretary of Defense to detail for us the implications of these cuts so that we may consider legislative options. My colleagues are well aware of how budget sequestration became the law of the land, of the failure of the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, and of the enforcement mechanism of automatic cuts. But none of us fully understand the specific consequences of the across-the-board spending reductions should they be triggered on January 2, 2013.

We know from statements and testimony from the Secretary of Defense and high-ranking DOD and military officials that the impact of sequestration on the Department of Defense would be disastrous. I need not remind my colleagues that one of government's foundational responsibilities is to defend the Nation. Our constituents entrust us to do so. Allowing budget sequestration to occur in the Department of Defense would dramatically increase risk to our national security and undermine our ability to protect our interests at home and abroad.

I agree that our current fiscal climate demands that we reduce annual deficits and pay down the massive Federal debt. I also recognize that the demands placed on our Armed Forces are beginning to diminish at least insofar as current operations in Afghanistan are concerned. The administration and the Congress have acknowledged as much, reducing war funding by almost half since 2011. The President's withdrawal plan for Afghanistan will reduce that funding need even further. In addition, the President has already put in place a plan to cut the defense budget by \$487 billion over the next 9 years.

I have reluctantly supported these planned cuts in the interest of deficit reduction, and we have scrutinized their impact on the Armed Forces. Many of my colleagues on the Senate Armed Services Committee joined me in expressing concerns to the Secretary of Defense about significant troop reductions in the Army and Marine Corps, major program curtailments, and proposed base closures.

Army Chief of Staff GEN Odierno told us that his service could perform its mission with 80,000 fewer troops. Commandant of the Marine Corps General Amos echoed those sentiments when describing his plan to reduce by 20,000 marines. My point is that the Department of Defense has already undertaken major budget reductions which will impact our forces for a decade or longer. While I do not agree with every reduction proposed by the administration, I acknowledge that we all need to tighten our belts and that the Defense Department is not sacrosanct.

It is in the context of the nearly \$½ trillion of reductions that have already been levied against the Defense Department that we should consider the impact of additional automatic budget cuts. Budget sequestration would cancel an additional \$½ trillion from the defense budget and would do so in a thoroughly arbitrary and destructive way. It is one thing for the Department to make planned reductions to troops, equipment, training, and operations, and to keep these reductions synchronized; it is quite another to apply an across-the-board percentage reduction to every defense program. The law does not provide flexibility; it dictates that budget sequestration must be applied in equal percentages to each "program, project, and activity." That means equal percentage cuts in every research project, weapons program, and military construction project. Assuming military personnel accounts are exempted, we understand that cut to be about 14 percent. A 14-percent cut in a military construction project would render it unexecutable. How can you buy 86 percent of a building or 86 percent of an aircraft carrier? This is the danger of sequestration. The law mandates that cuts be taken equally across every budget line. It is absolutely senseless and will have enormous primary and secondary effects.

As an example, hundreds, perhaps thousands, of contracts for services and equipment will have to be renegotiated. Contracts with specific delivery quantities will have to be rewritten to reduce the quantities, which will increase the cost per unit to the government. More likely, management decisions will be taken out of the hands of managers and put into the hands of lawyers, as companies sue the government for breach of contract and termination costs. Legal proceedings could stretch out over years, at enormous expense to the taxpayer. "Savings" from budget sequestration would be consumed by the cost of implementing it. Maybe we should think of sequester as an earmark for lawyers.

Beyond the cost of implementing a dysfunctional system for budget cutting, the impact of sequestration on the capability of the Armed Forces would needlessly increase risk to national security. I am very concerned about the recent decision by the administration to apply sequestration to accounts supporting our military operations in Afghanistan. In November 2011, I was assured by the Secretary of Defense that this account would not directly be affected. Now, the Department is conceding that funds we are using to defeat our enemies and to build a secure and self-sufficient Afghanistan will be subject to immediate reductions. Despite this potentially grave risk to our military forces engaged in combat, the Department cannot tell me with any assurance to what extent our deployed forces will be affected. We must have a detailed assessment of the impact of these mandatory

cuts to the support of our forces engaged in hostilities on behalf of our Nation.

We know that the President has decided to exempt veterans programs from budget sequestration but to include war funding under sequester. This demonstrates that the administration is actively deliberating the implementation of the Budget Control Act, which makes it all the more surprising that the President is reluctant to provide even a preliminary estimate of the impact of sequestration. If the President is making decisions regarding sequestration, why not reveal the impacts to Congress and the public?

The leaders of the Department of Defense have consistently stated that threats to the national security of the United States have increased, not decreased. Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta said that these automatic reductions would "inflict severe damage to our national defense for generations."

General Odierno testified that sequestration would force the Army to cut an additional 100,000 troops, half of which would come from the Guard and Reserve on top of the 80,000 soldiers already planned to be separated from service. General Odierno stated that the damaging effects of sequestration would force the Army to "fundamentally re-look [at] how we do national security."

The Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Greenert, testified that the Navy fleet would shrink from 285 ships to 230 to 235 ships, well below the 313 ships the Navy has said it requires. The Navy will be forced to absorb a cut equivalent to the entire annual shipbuilding budget. According to the Vice Chief of Naval Operations, "The force that comes out of sequestration is not the force that can support the current [defense] strategy."

Chief of Staff of the Air Force GEN Schwartz testified that sequestration "would slash all of our investment accounts, including our top priority modernization program such as the KC-46 tanker, the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, the MQ-9 remotely piloted aircraft, and the future long-range strike bomber."

We would be left with a much more expensive, much less capable national defense program.

The irony in all this is that defense spending is not the reason we are in a fiscal mess. The United States spends about 20 percent of its annual budget on national defense. Since one of the principal responsibilities of government is to protect the Nation, I consider this amount to be quite modest. The real driver of our national debt is mandatory spending, which consumes 58 percent of the annual budget and is projected by the Office of Management and Budget to be over 62 percent by 2017—growth of almost a percentage point per year. However, under budget sequestration, half of the total amount of cuts would be levied from defense and the other half from all other government programs. Let me repeat that.

Defense is 20 percent of the budget but will take 50 percent of the cuts. It simply doesn't make sense.

In addition, these cuts will impact jobs in the defense industry as well as countless counties and towns around the country at a time when millions of Americans are still seeking employment. I appreciate the work of my friend Senator AYOTTE to bring this issue of industrial and economic impact to the forefront.

We must receive a clear assessment from the Department on the extent of the risk to our military operations in Afghanistan, to our military programs, and to readiness here at home if the automatic cuts are allowed to occur. Only when we have a clear picture of the impact of current law will we be able to consider alternatives to sequestration that reduce the deficit but do not imperil our Nation's security.

Some have suggested that the Congress wait until after the election to address possible alternatives to sequestration. Mr. President, we all know that nothing good happens in a lame-duck session. We cannot wait for an election to muster the courage to make difficult budget decisions. This amendment to the farm bill is meant to inform the debate about the perils we face if we do not take action.

I thank my colleague from Washington, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, there is nothing pending now on the Senate floor other than the farm bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. REID. We are in between votes; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Correct.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1940

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that upon disposition of S. 3240, which is the farm bill, the Senate proceed to the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 250, S. 1940, which is the flood insurance bill; further, if cloture is invoked on the motion to proceed, notwithstanding cloture having been invoked, it be in order for the majority leader to lay before the body the House message with respect to S. 3187.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, if I might indicate to colleagues, we have one final amendment, the Rubio amendment, and Senator RUBIO will be coming to the floor shortly. Following his amendment, we will then be going to final passage.

I do want to take a moment to thank the leader. In the midst of an extremely demanding schedule, with things that need to get done in the Senate, he has given us this opportunity to complete this work. We will talk more about who has been involved

in it later, but with all the demands of the Senate—whether it be flood insurance or addressing the concerns of student loan interest rates, the issues of small business and jobs and a whole range of issues that are very important for us to get done—our leader, with the support of the Republican leader, has been willing to allow us to move through 73 amendments. Now, I would note that we started with the possibility of 300, so 73 is certainly better than 300, but we know it was a major piece of work, and we very much appreciate our colleagues coming together to get this done.

Let me remind everyone that 16 million people work in jobs related to agriculture and our food systems, and they are watching us to see if we do the right thing and to see us work together to get this done and to create economic certainty for them and food security for our Nation. So I just would like to thank our leaders for their patience and willingness to stand with us.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I have come to the floor to speak in favor of Senator RUBIO's amendment No. 2166, the Rewarding Achievement and Incentivizing Successful Employees Act, known as the RAISE Act. It is a catchy title, and sometimes here in Congress catchy bill titles can be very misleading. Sometimes the bill title means the exact opposite of what the bill would do, such as the Employee Free Choice Act, which actually would have taken away the right to make a free choice through a secret ballot. But in this case, I congratulate my colleague Senator RUBIO for a title that conveys precisely what the amendment aims to do.

The RAISE Act would allow employers to give employees raises, bonuses, incentive payments, and other monetary rewards whenever they are earned, whether the union boss approves or not. As all of us know, we are in extremely difficult economic times. Unemployment has been above 8 percent for over 40 months, now and a striking number of individuals are dropping out of the workforce altogether. When we do recover, as I know we will, we are likely to face a skills gap that will further hamper hiring and growth. One of the keys to our economic recovery is the health of small businesses.

For small businesses to reach their full potential, and grow into job-creating machines, they need the flexibility to maintain and attract the key employees who will get them there. Any small businessperson will tell you that their employees are their most important asset. They literally make the difference in whether the business succeeds or fails.

Once your company is unionized, you learn one way or another that it is now an "unfair labor practice" under section 8(a)(5) of the National Labor Relations Act to give an employee a raise or a bonus or an incentive or even a gift card for a job well done without the approval of the union boss. All

compensation issues must be negotiated with the union, which allows the union to take credit for securing the raise. We have come across scores of cases where employers wanted to thank employees for good customer service, impressive sales growth, or attract employees to fill a critical manpower shortage, and the National Labor Relations Board, NLRB, penalized the employer for it. In a time of global competition, the last thing we need is a Federal agency punishing companies for trying to perform better by rewarding employees.

Believe it or not, there is opposition to this amendment. At least four of our largest labor unions—AFL-CIO, AFSCME, SEIU, and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters—have opposed allowing employers to give raises.

Critics of this bill have said that if employers want to be able to reward employees beyond the union-approved wage floor, they can negotiate that provision into their contract. This is true. An employer can make the ability to incentivize employees one of their "asks" in negotiations, and they probably have to give up something else in order for the union to agree to that. But it is also true that getting such a provision in the bargaining agreement is not enough to protect employers from a charge of unfair labor practice from the NLRB. In my research on this issue, I came across several cases where employers had negotiated a raise clause, but since the collective bargaining agreement expired and was in renegotiation, the NLRB ruled that the provision did not apply.

Let me cite an example from just a few years ago. A Montana water and mineral drilling company had negotiated a contract clause with their union to ensure that union-negotiated wages were only a floor and superior wages could be given with or without the consent of the union. When the company's orders increased, the company wanted to share the profits and decided to give employees unilateral raises, increase the per diem for meals, and raise the clothing and safety allowance reimbursement by 167 percent. But the union objected, and the NLRB agreed and stopped the raises. Why? Because although the company had negotiated the right to give raises, they were currently in the process of renegotiating their collective bargaining agreement and there had been no explicit extension of the clause allowing for superior wages and benefits. *O'Keefe Drilling, Case 19-CA-29222(2005)*

Unfortunately, this is not an isolated case. NLRB has repeatedly punished employers in similar situations.

An Oregon newspaper publisher had historically offered commission for sales of certain long-term advertisements. As it was adapting to having an online edition, it decided to qualify internet ad sales for commissions, as well, and added signing bonuses for new advertising clients. Although the newspaper had specifically negotiated for a

contract provision allowing it to pay wages in excess of the established wage, the bargaining agreement was in renegotiation. The NLRB sided with the union. *Register-Guard*, 339 NLRB 353 (2003)

The fact that raise provisions are negotiated into union contracts negates another criticism I have heard about this proposal. Some say that it would allow an employer to favor employees based on gender or race. This is entirely false—all race, sex, national origin and religion Federal discrimination statutes are and would remain in full effect.

I would like to share a few more examples of why this legislation will not just benefit American workers but everyone who relies on the services they provide. For example, there is a great deal of concern about the quality and availability of health care services in this country. You would think that any Federal agency would congratulate hospitals that strive to improve the service they provide. Unfortunately, that was not the case in these two examples.

During the nationwide nursing shortage we experienced in the last decade, a nonprofit New Mexico hospital was desperate for nurses. It was concerned about the ability to provide care and comply with mandatory staffing levels, so the hospital decided to offer \$8000 signing bonuses and \$2000 relocation bonuses. These generous bonuses were available for new applicants as well as current nurses—union members—who transferred to fill critical needs. But the union objected and the hospital was ordered to stop offering bonuses. *St. Vincent Hospital*, Case 28-CA-19039(2004)

In another case, a Brooklyn hospital was concerned about poor reviews of their nursing staff from patient satisfaction surveys, which had been an ongoing problem. The hospital decided to reward its best nurses, so it honored high-performing nurses with a breakfast, a pin, and gave them \$100 gift cards since it was the winter holiday season. Unfortunately, the union objected to this honoring of exceptional nurses and filed charges with the National Labor Relations Board. Although these nurses earned \$67,000 to \$150,000 a year, the NLRB found that the gift card was not a one-time, de minimis gift but, rather, should be considered compensation and should have been a subject of negotiation with the union. The hospital was banned from giving such bonuses again. *Brooklyn Hospital Center*, Case No. 29-CA-29323(2009)

Clearly something has gone very wrong here, and I want to thank Senator RUBIO for offering us the ability to make it right. The ability to reward and incentivize employees is critical to the success of any enterprise. Instead of fixating on who gets credit for anything beneficial, our national labor-management policy should be to strengthen unionized and nonunionized businesses and encourage job creation. This will be good for all Americans, no matter what their union membership status.

I urge the Senate to support the Rubio amendment and adopt this commonsense change to allow American companies and their employees to thrive.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I see Senator RUBIO is on the floor, and

I will now defer to him to offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

AMENDMENT NO. 2166

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 2166.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. RUBIO] proposes an amendment numbered 2166.

Mr. RUBIO. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the National Labor Relations Act to permit employers to pay higher wages to their employees)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ PAYMENT OF HIGHER WAGES.

Section 9(a) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 159(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” after “(a)”; and
(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) Notwithstanding a labor organization’s exclusive representation of employees in a unit, or the terms and conditions of any collective bargaining contract or agreement then in effect, nothing in either—

“(A) section 8(a)(1) or section 8(a)(5), or

“(B) a collective bargaining contract or agreement renewed or entered into after the date of enactment of the RAISE Act, shall prohibit an employer from paying an employee in the unit greater wages, pay, or other compensation for, or by reason of, his or her services as an employee of such employer, than provided for in such contract or agreement.”.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, this amendment would amend the National Labor Relations Act to allow employers to give merit-based compensation increases to individual employees, even if those increases are not part of the collective bargaining agreement. Essentially, this will make the union contract wage a minimum, while giving employers the flexibility to reward diligent employees for their hard work. The bottom line is that today, if you work at one of these firms and the employer wants to give you a raise, they can’t do it because it goes against the collective bargaining amount. So this amendment would allow them to do that.

That is a brief explanation of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, this amendment is a solution in search of a problem. I don’t know—have any of my colleagues here had unionized businesses come to them complaining that they can’t give a raise? Have any of my colleagues ever heard of that—they have complained they can’t give a raise?

The fact is collective bargaining agreements already provide—many of them—for merit-based performance in-

creases. That is part and parcel of a lot of the agreements today. So what this amendment basically does is it undercuts the National Labor Relations Act. That is exactly what it does. If you think we should do away with the National Labor Relations Act and all the benefits and all the protections it has both for businesses and for workers, this is your amendment right here. Quite frankly, I can’t think of anything that would be more disruptive of a workplace than this amendment. When a business and workers have agreed on a collective bargaining agreement, this would destroy that kind of comity in the workplace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time has expired.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I disagree. And I know we are now going to vote on this matter, so I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 163 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Alexander	DeMint	McCain
Ayotte	Enzi	McConnell
Barrasso	Graham	Moran
Blunt	Grassley	Paul
Boozman	Hatch	Portman
Brown (MA)	Heller	Risch
Burr	Hoeben	Roberts
Chambliss	Hutchison	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johanns	Snowe
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Corker	Kyl	Toomey
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	Lugar	Wicker

NAYS—54

Akaka	Hagan	Murray
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Inouye	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Pryor
Bingaman	Kerry	Reed
Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Reid
Boxer	Kohl	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Landrieu	Sanders
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Casey	Lieberman	Tester
Conrad	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Coons	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Webb
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Under the previous order, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

2501 PROGRAM

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam President, I have filed an amendment relating to the Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Program that I would like to bring to Senator STABENOW's attention.

As the Senator knows, the Outreach and Assistance to Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Program, also known as the "2501 Program," helps our Nation's historically underserved producers gain access to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's credit, commodity, conservation, and other programs and services.

The program provides competitive grants to educational institutions, agriculture extension offices, and community-based organizations to assist African-American, Native American, Asian-American, and Latino farmers and ranchers in owning and operating farms and participating in USDA programs. The Outreach and Assistance to Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Program has served more than 100,000 rural constituents in over 400 counties and more than 35 States.

In my State many farmers and ranchers have benefited from projects funded through the 2501 Program.

I will just mention a few.

The New Mexico Acequia Association uses a 2501 grant to improve the sustainability and economic viability of small-scale agriculture among the farmers and ranchers who are part of the historic acequias and community ditches in New Mexico. With this funding the association supports centuries-old irrigation systems and agricultural traditions.

The Northern New Mexico Outreach Project, run by the New Mexico State University Cooperative Extension Service, is also working in my State to develop an education network system between northern New Mexico Hispanic and American Indian farmers and ranchers.

And with the help of 2501 funding, the Taos County Economic Development Corporation is revitalizing ranching and farming traditions that support the cultures of the area, utilizing new technologies and marketing opportunities.

Thanks to the efforts of the committee, the Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Program can now also extend benefits to veterans.

My amendment would have provided additional funds to support the traditional and new constituencies of the program by increasing direct funding for the program to \$150 million over 5 years.

It would continue assistance to disadvantaged farmers and ranchers. And ensure that veterans are fully able to benefit from the program.

The committee mark of the Agriculture Reform, Food and Jobs Act of 2012 includes \$5 million in annual mandatory funds for the Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Program and \$20 million in annual discretionary funds for the program.

I hope that the Senator and her committee will work with me and with the Appropriations Committee to ensure adequate funding is allocated to the 2501 Program through the Appropriations process in the coming years.

Ms. STABENOW. I want to begin by thanking the Senator from New Mexico for his thoughtful work on this issue. This is an important program, and I commend the Senator for offering his amendment. As we move forward, I am happy to work with the Senator to engage the Appropriations Committee to provide adequate annual funding for the program in the coming years.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I thank the Senator. I am certain she is aware that the USDA's Office of Inspector General released a preliminary audit report in May finding a level of mismanagement of the 2501 Program within the Office of Advocacy and Outreach, or OAO. The report found that OAO officials had not adhered to the agency's draft policies and procedures and did not carry out proper documentation during the selection of 2012 grant recipients.

The OAO has had an immediate and deliberate response to the report. The previous manager of the Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Outreach Program has been replaced, the office is putting in a more long-term staff, and the 2012 applicants and grant recipients are being reevaluated.

As the Senator knows, the 2501 Program is vital to ensuring that historically underserved farmers and ranchers have access to USDA programs. And, with the new mission to also serve veteran farmers and ranchers, it is more important than ever that the outreach program be properly administered.

I look forward to working with the Chairwoman and the committee in its oversight role to ensure that the Outreach and Assistance to Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Program is properly and effectively administered.

Ms. STABENOW. I, too, am concerned by the recent administration of the program, and I thank the Senator for addressing some of those issues in his amendment. I am hopeful that the positive steps already taken by the Office of Advocacy and Outreach will ensure the 2501 Program's continued success. I know that the Senator will continue to monitor this situation closely, and I look forward to working with him to ensure that the office fully complies with the recommendations of the OIG report and that the most qualified applicants are awarded grants.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I thank the Senator. In closing, I would like to thank the Senator, the members of the Senate Agriculture Committee, and dedicated staff for all of the efforts to negotiate a good farm bill, one that provides significant savings and eliminates antiquated subsidies but seeks to ensure a sound future for agriculture and access to healthy food for families across the Nation.

Madam President, I rise today to discuss the farm bill. First, I wish to thank Senator STABENOW and Senator ROBERTS for their efforts in crafting a bill that will strengthen our agricultural and rural economy as well as one which reflects fiscal realities. Chairwoman STABENOW and Ranking Member ROBERTS reached across the aisle. They relied on common sense and they found common ground, with compromise and with a focus on results. They, and the members of the Agriculture Committee, worked together and created this bipartisan legislation.

We all know how important this bill is for the 16 million Americans whose jobs are in agriculture and for the consumers who depend on safe, affordable food. It is also important for the families who need nutritional assistance and for the prudent stewardship of our lands. The importance of this legislation cannot be understated.

Like so many New Mexicans, farming and ranching are in my blood. My grandmother drove cattle through New Mexico in the late 1800s. Ranching and farming is a part of my heritage, and of New Mexico's. And it is vital to our economy. More than 20,000 farms are in New Mexico.

The people in my State know that ranching and farming is hard work. The only thing one can count on is uncertainty. It is a uniquely risky business, vulnerable to calamities of weather, subject to global fluctuations in prices and unfair competition. But, American agriculture is the world's leader. It is second to none. It is crucial to our economy and to our national security.

This legislation is truly a reform bill. It is the most significant reform of our agriculture policy in decades. For years, Congress has reauthorized confusing and inequitable farm subsidies, and the public looked on in wonder. The subsidies have in some part helped to keep sectors of US Agriculture vibrant, but, there have been blatant inefficiencies and waste. The rules surrounding direct payments is one example. Such rules do not even require that the recipient grow the covered commodity to receive their payment. The result is an inequitable flow of Federal funds. This hinders new producers and short changes producers who were not lucky enough to own "base acres" when they were identified in the 1980s.

For decades, farm bills have come and gone without the subsidy reforms Americans have been calling for. But Chairman STABENOW and Ranking Member ROBERTS have taken that unprecedented bold step. Their bill ends direct payments and other major subsidies once and for all.

The 2012 Senate farm bill offers a more equitable insurance that producers buy into. It is not mandatory, but it is a sound safety net that will support American producers.

Chairman STABENOW and Ranking Member ROBERTS also set new precedent in turning more attention to

crops historically left on the sidelines. Their bill boldly supports fruits, vegetables, nuts and other products so important to creating healthy living. The bill promotes access to nutritious food through farmers markets and locally grown produce. And it strengthens specialty crop provisions. My State is justly famous for its green chile. This bill will help chile and other specialty crops find export markets. And it provides for more research to keep these crops vibrant and competitive.

This legislation will create a more even playing field for dairy farmers, providing a safety net that has no regional or size bias. The bill also continues essential support for livestock producers. In my State, ranchers face grave threats from severe drought and fires and from the continued loss of grazing lands.

This farm bill streamlines and consolidates programs and it reduces the deficit by over \$23 billion. Let me repeat: \$23 billion in deficit reduction. That is twice the amount recommended by the Simpson-Bowles commission.

This is a strong bill overall. It is not perfect. It consolidates and simplifies conservation programs. But, unfortunately, there are significant cuts in funding. There are cuts in programs that protect watersheds, grasslands, soil, and habitats. These are programs that producers depend on. There are cuts in programs to restore forage, ensure compliance with environmental laws, and maintain healthy soil. It is truly unfortunate to lose such vital funding.

The farm bill covers a very large canvas and addresses many diverse needs. There will be, and should be, healthy debate.

I want to speak today about three specific amendments that I believe will improve this bill.

First, I have filed an amendment to restore mandatory funds for the Outreach and Assistance to Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Program. Thanks to the efforts of the committee, this program can now extend benefits to veterans. My amendment would ensure that the necessary funds are there. This program has helped our Nation's historically underserved producers for over 20 years by providing better access to Department of Agriculture credit, commodity, and conservation services and by providing technical assistance. It has worked and it deserves continued support.

The Outreach and Assistance to Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Program has served more than 100,000 rural constituents in over 400 counties and more than 35 States. With adequate funding, it can also provide critical support for veteran farmers and ranchers.

Specifically, my amendment would restore direct funding to \$150 million over 5 years.

It would continue assistance to disadvantaged farmers and ranchers and

ensure that veterans are fully able to benefit from the program.

Second, I have proposed an amendment for rural development funding for frontier communities. Across our Nation, including in my home State, there are many very small, very rural communities with a population density of less than 20 people per square mile. These are great communities, proud communities, with rich histories. But, they have a hard time competing for rural development loans and grants. Often, they don't have the personnel. They don't have the resources. But, their need is just as great as that of larger communities.

My amendment would create a set-aside for frontier communities allowing them to access USDA funds targeted for these very small, very rural communities. It would allow the USDA to reach our Nation's most rural and underserved communities. The set-aside would be a minimum of percent of rural development programs and it would allow frontier communities to qualify for up to 100 percent grant funding, with no minimum grant or loan requirement.

My amendment would also create a grant program for technical assistance and planning for frontier communities, making sure that funding goes as far as possible. Financing for this program would be from overall rural development funding of no more than 5 percent.

And, third, I have filed an amendment for a rural development set-aside for community land grants. These land grant Mercedes are part of a unique and important history in the southwest dating back to the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. These were grants of land made by the governments of Spain or Mexico to entire communities.

These community land grants have a history of loss of land, a history of manipulation and unkept commitments, and a recognized need for increased economic opportunities. My amendment proposes to respond to this unfortunate history. Rural development assistance is crucial to these unique communities.

I wish to again commend my colleagues for this bipartisan legislation. It will continue building our economy by providing jobs and by providing the certainty that producers need for innovation and growth and by providing for the safest, healthiest, and most abundant food supply in the world.

Mr. KOHL. Madam President, I rise to support and encourage passage of this farm bill.

Farm bills are difficult measures to shepherd through this chamber. There has never been—and never will—be a 'perfect' one in the eyes of every Member of this body. But American agriculture needs a new farm bill and this one deserves our support for a variety of reasons.

For starters, it delivers over \$23 billion dollars in savings at time when our Nation's balance sheet needs it most.

It improves nutrition programs by curbing fraud and improving program integrity. Hungry Americans—many of whom are children—need a food safety net when times are tough. These changes support that safety net and deliver more accountability to taxpayers.

This bill also responds to concerns articulated by dairy farmers who are hugely important to me and to Wisconsin. Long-time farm policy observers know of my enduring interest in dairy policy. The MILC program, which I co-authored with several of my colleagues in this chamber, was the first comprehensive safety net for American dairy producers. It provided payments in time of low prices and cost the government nothing when we had robust dairy prices. Dairy farmers today face new and different challenges. In recent years they have seen situations where, despite robust milk prices, their input prices dramatically escalated and their margins evaporated. The dairy policy embodied in this bill recognizes that challenge and establishes margin protection insurance. Participants will be given the option to choose the level of margin protection that makes the most sense for their dairy operations.

I supported a number of amendments to this farm bill. Among them were modifications to enhance rural development and programs for beginning farmers. Farm bills touch our Nation in many different ways, and these are two areas that merit more attention and continued diligence. I also opposed a number of amendments because I feared they would undermine agriculture exports, our ability to innovate, and our organic agriculture sector.

Finally, I want to congratulate the chair and ranking member of the Senate Agriculture Committee for their diligent work. It takes an enormous amount of effort to move a farm bill. They worked hard to find consensus and deserve our thanks. I also want to acknowledge with thanks their staff, including Cory Claussen and Jonathan Coppess of the majority and Eric Steiner from the Republican staff. They worked very hard on a variety of topics, including the dairy provisions.

I encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I support passage of the 2012 farm bill, S. 3240, the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2012.

I have made it a priority to keep Pennsylvania's agricultural industry and our rural economies strong to support Pennsylvanian families.

Agriculture is the Commonwealth's largest industry. Pennsylvania's farm gate value that is cash receipts to growers, in 2010, was \$5.7 billion. Agribusiness in Pennsylvania is a \$46.4 billion industry, and 17.5 percent of Pennsylvanians are employed in the food and fiber system. What does this mean?

It means that the Senate MUST pass this farm bill, that the House must pass a farm bill, and that the President

must sign a farm bill into law before it expires at the end of September.

The farm bill creates economic opportunities in our rural areas and sustains the consumers and businesses that rely on our rural economy. When the cows need to be milked, dairy farmers go out to the barn and do their jobs. We should follow their example and reauthorize the farm bill in a responsible way that helps contribute to deficit reduction.

If passed into law, this farm bill would reduce the deficit by approximately \$23 billion through the elimination of some subsidies, the consolidation of programs, and producing greater efficiencies in program delivery.

Dairy is the Commonwealth's No. 1 agricultural sector. The dairy industry annually generates more than \$1.6 billion in on-farm cash receipts, which represent about 42 percent of Pennsylvania's total agricultural receipts.

I introduced two dairy bills this Congress: the Federal Milk Marketing Improvement Act, S. 1640, and the Dairy Advancement Act, S. 1682. These bills are aimed to ensure that farmers receive a fair price for their milk to increase price transparency, to protect against price volatility, and to encourage processor innovation.

I am concerned that while the proposed dairy program to manage the Nation's milk supply will reduce the volatility of dairy farming, that program will discourage innovation and exports, as well as send the wrong signals to our trading partners.

I secured language which requires USDA to thoroughly examine if the dairy market stabilization program is working, and if it is not working, make recommendations on how to fix it. This bill also contains my amendment to codify the frequency of dairy product reporting that is important for the dairy industry to make business decisions. It would also require USDA to examine whether it would be practical to move to a two-class system for milk that could help to simplify the Federal milk marketing orders.

Dairy farmers deserve the best dairy program possible. The Senate bill contains many improvements that I support.

Making risk management and crop insurance products work better for Pennsylvanians, especially small farmers, specialty crop farmers, and organic farmers is very important.

This bill contains language similar to an amendment that I offered during the Agriculture Committee's markup that would help to improve crop insurance for organic farmers.

Providing funding through risk management, conservation, and agricultural marketing agencies to underserved States, the Agricultural Management Assistance, AMA, Program helps to make the farm bill more equitable among regions.

I sincerely appreciate the chairwoman's and ranking member's work to enhance the Agricultural Manage-

ment Assistance Program, including support for organic transition assistance.

The improvements in this bill to crop insurance delivery are critical.

We have worked to address the unique concerns of specialty crop farmers and beginning farmers—and we have done so in a bipartisan way.

Specialty crops are very important to Pennsylvanian agriculture.

After working with the chairwoman and ranking member, I was able to ensure improvements in promotion programs within the farm bill and direct USDA to assess the feasibility of allowing organic producers to participate in an organic foods promotion program.

The Specialty Crops Research Initiative, SCRI, Specialty Crops Block Grant Program, and Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Snack Program all advance the specialty crops industry, playing a key role in ensuring that this important agricultural sector receives continued acknowledgement in the farm bill. These programs remain strong under this bill.

In addition, the Nation's organic industry has grown exponentially from \$3.6 billion in 1997 to \$29 billion in 2010, with an annual growth rate of 19 percent from 1997 to 2008. In 2008, Pennsylvania was ranked sixth in number of organic farms with 586 and third in sales at \$212.7 million.

Through research, we develop more efficient and effective farming methods. Research also helps producers maintain a competitive edge in the global market by fighting threatening diseases and pests.

I am pleased that the farm bill invests in relevant and targeted research and maintains the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service programs that work to eradicate the invasive species that threaten our Nation's forests and farms.

The U.S. Forest Service's State and private forestry programs are essential for assisting forest landowners in managing threats and enhancing stewardship. I am pleased that the farm bill continues the Forest Stewardship Program, FSP, so that forest owners can create long-term management plans with the technical assistance of State forestry agency partners.

I am also grateful to the chairwoman and ranking member for working with me to fix USDA's Biopreferred Program to even the playing field for Pennsylvanian forestry products. Revenues from Pennsylvania's forest products industry exceed \$5.5 billion annually. Over 10 percent of the State's manufacturing workforce is involved in the forest products industry.

I am appreciative to the committee for the inclusion of my provision directing USDA to work with the Food and Drug Administration toward the development of a standard of identity for honey, a tool which will promote honesty and fair dealing and serve the interest of consumers and Pennsylvania's honey industry. The majority of

our honey is imported, but because there is no standard, contaminated, low-quality honey continues to pass through customs and undercut our domestic product. Pennsylvania is a major player in the honey industry. Honey bee pollination can be directly attributed to the production of about \$60 million of agricultural produce in Pennsylvania annually.

I am committed to keeping Pennsylvania's rural communities strong and support rural development programs that provide access to capital for rural businesses to provide economic opportunities and create jobs. A rural community's viability in attracting and keeping businesses is often directly related to the condition of its infrastructure and facilities. USDA's rural development programs empower rural communities, transform local economies, and preserve the quality of life in small towns across the Commonwealth. A rural economic development program that saves and creates jobs in rural economies and improves rural life is extremely important for Pennsylvanian families.

I introduced the Growing Opportunities for Agriculture and Responding to Markets, GO FARM, Act, which will help to enhance local food systems and encourage production of food for local communities. The GO FARM Act would provide loans to third parties to lend to producers growing products for local markets. In addition to the GO FARM Act, I support increasing the availability of healthy foods, addressing the issue of food deserts and developing and improving local food systems.

Farmers are the original stewards of the land and continue to lead the charge in protecting our natural resources. I believe the voluntary conservation programs in the farm bill provide important tools to help farmers comply with Federal and State regulations while keeping farmers in business. I am committed to making conservation programs more efficient, effective, and relevant to farmers.

Conservation programs are an extremely important resource for many Pennsylvanian farmers. I worked with my Senate colleagues to support enhancements to conservation programs through this process in an effort to ensure that these remodeled programs would better serve the needs of Pennsylvanians.

Pennsylvania's watersheds contribute more than half of the fresh water flowing to the Chesapeake Bay. While Pennsylvania does not border the bay, activities in the Commonwealth profoundly affect the bay's health. The bay, the largest estuarine ecosystem in the U.S., and its tributaries, such as Susquehanna and Potomac Rivers, are important to the region's economy, culture, and outdoor recreation.

Under the 2008 farm bill, the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Initiative, CBWI, provided essential support to farmers facing Federal and state regulations

concerning water quality and helped to meet demand for conservation programs. In advance of the Agriculture Committee's consideration of the 2012 farm bill, I introduced the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Fairness Act, which among other things reauthorized the CBWI, because I know Pennsylvania farmers used this program very well.

I am grateful that the 2012 farm bill contains portions of this legislation which are aimed at equipping farmers with the tools necessary to better meet water quality goals. However, in this bill, CBWI is not continued. Due to the committee's desire to reduce the number of conservation programs, the farm bill consolidates four different programs into one that will provide competitive funds to regional partnerships and will also provide conservation funding directly to producers. CBWI was one of the programs that got folded into this new program.

I worked very closely with other Senators from the watershed to strengthen the conservation title to better benefit our region. Together we secured significant policy improvements. The current bill focuses on the most critical conservation areas and will help farmers in the Chesapeake Bay watershed participate in conservation programs so that they can help the region meet water quality standards.

Pennsylvania's agricultural producers and forestland owners use the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, EQIP, to implement conservation practices, which might otherwise be cost prohibitive, to protect valuable natural resources.

Further, the Farmland Protection Program, FPP, protects prime farmland from development. FPP should remain a permanent easement program to keep working lands preserved as farm land; should keep State, local governments, and nongovernmental organizations as partners; and should certify successful entities like the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture's Bureau of Farmland Protection to improve the efficiency of this program. We worked very hard to make improvements to FPP during the last farm bill and those developments continue.

While I do not mention all of the farm bill conservation programs, I do believe that each serves an important purpose.

Ending hunger remains one of my top priorities, as it cuts across all of the major challenges we face as a country. There is no better opportunity to strengthen nutrition policy and programs than through a well-crafted farm bill.

The Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program, SNAP, is the Federal Government's primary response to the food insecurity experienced by so many people. SNAP is an integral part of the overall safety net, which enables people to get back on their feet.

Similarly, The Emergency Food Assistance Program, TEFAP, enables

food banks, shelters, and other providers to deliver necessary food packages and meals to people with emergency food needs. The Senior Farmers' Market Nutrition Program and the Commodity Supplemental Food Program also provide vital food resources to low-income seniors who are often not helped by other food assistance programs. I support these programs as they assist the most vulnerable of our society—children, seniors, and families experiencing food insecurity.

As Congress works to authorize the 2012 farm bill, I will continue to fight to protect the needs of Pennsylvanians.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to pass this farm bill.

Mr. REED. Madam President, the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2012, also known as the farm bill, makes some strides in reforming agriculture policy and subsidies. However, in my view, these reforms are not sufficient. Moreover, the bill contains cuts to nutrition and conservation programs and changes to eligibility for rural communities that when taken together make it worse than current law. As such, I will oppose the bill, although I do so reluctantly.

Indeed, despite my conclusions, I commend Chairwoman STABENOW for crafting a bill that delivers \$23.6 billion in taxpayer savings over 10 years, cracks down on abuse, and eliminates egregious payments to nonfarmers, millionaire farmers, and farmers for crops they aren't growing.

The bill also makes several positive changes to programs important to my home State of Rhode Island that help small farms, farmers markets, and local food production. Rhode Island is a model example of the small and local farm movement. Since 2002, the number of farms has increased from 858 to 1,220 farms, whereas the average farm size in the State has actually decreased from 71 to 56 acres. That is why I am pleased that the bill includes many measures from Senator SHERROD BROWN's Local Farms, Food and Jobs Act that I cosponsored and increased funding for specialty crop block grants to support research and promotion of fruits, vegetables, and other specialty crops.

The bill also initiates new hunger-free communities incentive grants by providing funding of \$100 million over 5 years for a national pilot to incentivize the purchase of fruits and vegetables at farmers markets by SNAP participants. A similar privately funded program has already been successfully implemented in Rhode Island where every \$5 in SNAP benefits spent at a farmers market allows low-income individuals to receive an additional \$2 in fruits and vegetables. It is good to see the ingenuity of our States replicated at the national level in ways to help low-income families have access to nutritious local foods.

Another positive measure is the enhancement of the Farmers Market and Local Food Promotion Program to aid

direct producer-to-consumer marketing channels and local food sales to retailers and institutions. The bill also doubles mandatory funding for this program.

However, as a recent Washington Post editorial stated, "The current bill achieves some reform. There is still much more to be done."

While the current bill cuts direct payments by \$44.6 billion, it restores \$28.5 billion of those cuts by creating a new market-based program called Agriculture Risk Coverage and adds an additional \$5 billion for crop insurance.

Indeed, many of the reform measures in the bill do not go as far as those in the Lugar-Lautenberg Fresh Act of 2007, which I cosponsored during the last farm bill debate.

At the time, that measure would have increased funding by \$2.5 billion for nutrition programs, SNAP, and specialty crops, and \$1 billion more for conservation programs. In contrast, the Senate bill we are currently debating cuts SNAP by \$4.5 billion and conservation programs by \$6.4 billion.

The nutrition cuts are particularly challenging for Rhode Island, where roughly 1 in 6 people receives SNAP benefits and the unemployment rate remains at a too-high rate of 11 percent, the second highest in the country.

SNAP usage is unfortunately very high right now as Americans are struggling along with the economy to get back on track. No one wants to see such a high need, but at the same time SNAP assistance is the lifeline for these families to be able to put food on the table. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle shouldn't be trying to cut these funds; they should be working with us instead of thwarting our efforts to pass meaningful jobs bills that could help many of these SNAP beneficiaries find work and lessen their need for assistance.

That is why I cosponsored and voted in favor of Senator GILLIBRAND's amendment that would have restored the nutrition cuts, which the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, estimates would result in an average benefit cut of \$90 per month for 500,000 households nationwide. According to RI Department of Human Services, approximately 20,000 households could see an average SNAP cut of \$95 per month if the cuts were implemented.

The Gillibrand amendment was paid for by reducing the subsidies that the Federal Government pays the crop insurance companies for administration and operating expenses and lowering their guaranteed rate of return from their current level of 14 percent to 12 percent. That is certainly a reasonable rate of return in this economy.

I was very disappointed that this amendment was not agreed to as this proposed cut of \$4.5 billion starts us down the wrong path in future farm bill negotiations with the House, which is expected to have even deeper SNAP cuts in their bill.

Another provision I am concerned could negatively impact Rhode Island is the change in the definition of rural that could decrease the eligibility for Rhode Island communities to be able to apply for loans and grants under Rural Development programs. I appreciate Chairman STABENOW and Ranking Member ROBERTS working with Members from affected States to include in the managers' package a 3-year grandfathering of existing communities and an important stipulation that thereafter communities shall remain eligible unless ruled otherwise by the Secretary of Agriculture. However, the change in the definition does not completely remove the uncertainty for Rhode Island rural communities to be eligible in the future as they look to make needed improvements to their water and waste disposal systems or community facilities.

We need to help out the small farmers and businesses in this country, not continue to help the large, wealthy farmers. And we certainly should not pay for expansive farm programs by placing additional burdens on those who are struggling to make ends meet.

It is for these reasons that I am unable to support this bill in its current form. While I fear the bill will only get worse as negotiations begin with the House, I certainly hope the matters that I have raised can be addressed during that process.

Mr. LEVIN. I am pleased to vote for passage of the Agriculture Reform, Food and Jobs Act. The bill before us makes important reforms to farm programs by helping agricultural producers manage their risk, invests funding to protect our natural resources, and provides food assistance to families in need.

America's agricultural economy is responsible for 16 million jobs. There are over 2 million farms in this country that contribute nearly \$80 billion to the Nation's economy. Americans and people all over the world depend on America's farms to feed their families. So passage of a farm bill that protects the food supply, gives farmers the support they need, and combats hunger is of high importance.

I want to congratulate Senator STABENOW, the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee and my Michigan colleague, for managing this important legislation so skillfully.

This bill marks important change in how we assist our Nation's farmers. Instead of making direct and counter-cyclical payments to farmers, sometimes for crops they haven't even grown, this bill ends those practices and instead focuses on working with farmers to manage risks.

My home State of Michigan is second only to California in the number of crops grown and second to none in tart cherry production. Unusually warm weather in March resulted in an early bloom for many of our fruit crops, including tart cherries. These crops were then heavily damaged by a series of freezes during April and May.

I visited a cherry orchard in northern Michigan last month and viewed the damage. The damage from these freezes is severe; many trees and entire orchards will bear no fruit at all. Growers still need to maintain their orchards, spraying for bugs and disease, but can expect no payment for their crop. I am particularly concerned about tart cherry growers as they cannot currently purchase crop insurance.

The bill we are voting on today directs the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Board to develop new crop insurance policies for underserved crops, including specialty crops like cherries. The bill also increases funding to help develop these policies. These new policies are sorely needed in Michigan.

The bill also includes \$58 billion over a 10-year period for conservation programs that protect our Nation's waters, soil quality and wildlife habitats, prevent erosion, and help alleviate other natural resource problems. These programs have benefitted Michigan by protecting sensitive lands and waters and preventing polluted runoff and sediments from getting into our precious Great Lakes, where they can create problems such as harmful algae blooms. Preventing runoff and controlling erosion can also lower costs for water treatment and dredging of Great Lakes harbors. To create a more efficient system for accessing and implementing these conservation programs, the bill consolidates more than 20 existing programs into 10 programs.

One new program in the bill, the Regional Conservation Partnership Program, in particular could benefit the Great Lakes. This program would provide funding through a competitive process for conservation projects that improve soil quality, water quality or quantity, or wildlife habitats on a regional or watershed scale. Because the Great Lakes region already has a regional plan in place, our region should be able to effectively compete for the \$250 million in annual funding that would be provided for this program. We have made some solid progress in cleaning up our Great Lakes and other waters in Michigan, but there is still much more to be done. The conservation funding provided in the farm bill would help with the efforts to protect and restore the Great Lakes, as well as protect sensitive lands and wildlife, conserve open space and forests, and provide economic benefits.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, as is evident from the amount of debate and attention devoted to it, the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2012 is an enormously important piece of legislation for our Nation, as it certainly is for my State of Iowa. Although the measure is commonly referred to as the farm bill, that name captures just a fraction of what it contains to benefit all Americans and millions of others around the world.

Despite the severe economic challenges over the past half decade, agriculture and agriculture-related jobs

and economic activity have been a real source of hope, opportunity, and recovery. That is especially so in my State, where agriculture generates about one of every five Iowa jobs and about a fourth of our State's economic output.

Iowa is well known, of course, for its distinctive farm state and smalltown character and for producing corn, soybeans, hogs, cattle, eggs, and other commodities. We have enjoyed tremendous benefits from greater diversification in agriculture and the rural economy. Take for example the boom in biofuels such as ethanol and biodiesel and in wind power.

It is critical for us to enact this bill in order to continue and enhance the contributions of agriculture and agriculture-related industries to our Nation's economy, to jobs, and to meeting ever-growing global demands for food, fiber, and energy.

I commend Chairwoman STABENOW and Senator ROBERTS, the ranking Republican member, for all of their hard, conscientious, and successful work on this bill. I also thank them for their efforts to take into account and reflect in this bill the circumstances, views, and needs of both rural and urban America as well as the various regions and types of agriculture across our Nation. I certainly appreciate their task. This is the eighth farm bill I have worked to enact, starting as a member of the House Agriculture Committee. Since 1985 I have served on the Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee and am proud to have been the chairman of that committee during the writing and enactment of the most recent two farm bills.

This legislation, approved by our committee in April, is a sound, balanced, and bipartisan bill crafted under budget conditions that have necessitated difficult decisions, judgments, and compromises. According to scoring by the Congressional Budget Office, this measure will reduce spending over the next 10 fiscal years by more than \$23 billion from budget baseline levels.

The spending reductions in programs encompassed in this bill thus appear to be several billion dollars larger than the automatic spending cuts slated to begin in January of next year under the sequestration mechanism in the Budget Control Act of 2011. Hence, this farm bill is a serious, good-faith effort going significantly beyond the minimum to reduce our budget deficits and curtail our Nation's debt. Again, these spending reductions will have very real impacts, and frankly I regret them and their consequences. We are not a Nation investing too much in the future of our Nation's agriculture and food system, in fighting hunger and malnutrition, in conserving our Nation's soil, water, and other resources for future generations, in securing our future with renewable energy and biobased materials, or in strengthening and growing jobs in our Nation's small towns and rural communities. Unquestionably, because of our Federal budget

situation and choices that have been made in dealing with it, there is less money to respond to national needs and priorities in the Federal policies and programs covered in this bill.

Given the budgetary hand dealt it, the Agriculture Committee, with the bipartisan leadership of our Chairwoman and Ranking Member, reported a bill combining budget savings with genuine reforms throughout its various titles. The most significant reform—in fact, pivotal reform—lies in the substantial changes in the commodity and farm income protection programs.

To help farm families and rural communities survive and manage the inevitable vagaries of weather and markets, the new farm bill continues a strong system ensuring a degree of stability and protecting against significant losses in farm income. The legislation contains major reform in terminating the existing direct and countercyclical Payments Program and replacing it with the Agriculture Risk Coverage, or ARC, program. ARC is designed to compensate for a portion of farm revenue losses and to supplement the revenue insurance policies that farmers typically rely upon to manage risk.

Because farm income protection based on revenue accounts for the fact that farm income is the product of crop yield times its price in the market, ARC is an improvement over the direct and countercyclical payments program in current law. Direct payments are made in fixed amounts according to each farm's base acreage and program payment yields, which in general were established decades ago. Consequently, the direct payments do not accurately reflect or respond to existing economic circumstances in agriculture because they are made without regard to a farm's current planted acres of crops or to whether crop prices and yields are high or low. The existing countercyclical payment program compensates for a portion of losses when the national average price of a covered commodity falls below a statutory target price. But the countercyclical program's target prices are well below current market prices and costs of production for commodities, and of course, a price-based system does not account for yield losses.

Agricultural producers have been divided over the direct payments since they were adopted in the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 as a replacement for the then-existing target price income protection system. Supporters of direct payments note that they are considered not to be production or trade distorting and that they provide income assistance to farmers who may not benefit much from other commodity programs or crop insurance.

From their beginning, I believed that the direct payments were not sound policy. Within a few years, after they were enacted during a period of strong commodity prices, the direct payments proved inadequate to protect farm in-

come in the face of a sharp falloff in commodity prices, and so we had to resort to enacting ad hoc emergency legislation to make up for the shortcomings of the direct payments.

To restore better protection against farm income losses, I introduced legislation in November 2001 to create a new countercyclical target revenue program. As chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I was pleased that we then reinstated a countercyclical income protection program in the 2002 Farm Security and Rural Investment Act. In 2007 and 2008, with the leadership of Senator DICK DURBIN and Senator SHERROD BROWN, I was pleased that we included the Average Crop Revenue Election, or ACRE Program, in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008. ACRE is, of course, the forerunner of the ARC program in the pending new farm bill.

The reform and evolution reflected in this new farm bill is very greatly facilitated by the significant improvement and strengthening of the Federal Crop Insurance Program. Crop insurance, particularly the revenue policies, are now vitally important to agricultural producers, their lenders and creditors, and to the rural economy. So it is an important feature of this bill that it further strengthens and improves the Crop Insurance Program, building upon the Agriculture Risk Protection Act of 2000 and additional improvements in the past two farm bills.

The pending bill also continues a strong conservation title with highly effective programs and funding for them, along with extensive reforms, streamlining, and updating of their structure and functioning. The Department of Agriculture's conservation programs have an outstanding record of success in helping America's farmers and ranchers produce an abundant supply of food, fiber, and fuel, while conserving and protecting our Nation's soil, water, wildlife, and other natural resources. Again, I very much regret that budget circumstances have imposed spending reductions in the conservation title of this bill. There is far more conservation work to be done and demand for USDA conservation assistance than can be met with existing levels of funding. But, as I have noted, these funding reductions are the reality for the crafting of this bill.

In the past two farm bills, as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I made a very strong push for strengthening the full range of USDA conservation programs and for increasing funding to respond to the need and demand for conservation assistance to farmers and ranchers across our Nation. In the 2002 and 2008 farm bills, we very substantially increased our Federal investment in agricultural conservation, building upon successes in preceding farm bills, especially owing to the leadership of the former chairmen of the Senate Agriculture Committee, Senator LEAHY and Senator LUGAR.

For many years, I have emphasized the necessity of promoting and assisting sound conservation practices on land in agricultural production, often referred to as "working lands". Agricultural producers are striving to produce much more food in the coming decades to nourish billions more inhabitants of the the Earth. If we hope to produce more and more food in the coming years, it is critical to conserve the underlying resources that support agricultural production.

My objective has been to enact and invest in programs that compensate and assist agricultural producers for their costs, foregone income, and environmental benefits associated with adopting and maintaining practices that protect and sustain soil, water, wildlife, and other resources. In the 1990 farm bill, the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act, we included the Agricultural Water Quality Incentives Program, which I had authored, to provide incentive and cost share payments for practices addressing water quality issues in agricultural production.

In the 1996, 2002, and 2008 farm bills, we substantially expanded and improved conservation programs covering land in agricultural production. I am especially proud of the Conservation Stewardship Program, CSP, which I authored and worked successfully to include in the 2002 farm bill, where it was then named the Conservation Security Program. CSP now has enrolled nearly 50 million acres of agricultural land across our Nation, including crop land, pasture land, range land, and forest land.

CSP and the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, EQIP, both focus on promoting and supporting conservation on land that is in agricultural production. They are not land-idling programs. Agricultural producers voluntarily enroll in CSP and EQIP because they are committed to good stewardship and these programs help them fulfill that commitment. CSP and EQIP also help farmers and ranchers to take voluntary action to solve environmental and conservation challenges and thereby avoid regulations. Participants in both programs contribute their own money, time, and effort, so the Federal funds leverage a significant amount of added private money. The level of interest in and demand for both EQIP and CSP greatly exceeds the funding now available and that which is provided in this bill.

To be clear, America's farmers and ranchers have done a tremendous amount of excellent conservation work. Even so, they know that a good deal more conservation work is needed, and they are dedicated to carrying it out. Providing them assistance through the several USDA conservation programs included in this farm bill is a tremendously important investment in conserving and protecting our Nation's vital natural resources for future generations.

This agriculture and food legislation also continues, with reforms and spending reductions, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP, and related programs that help low-income families put food on their tables. No title of this bill is more critical to those who rely upon its benefits, nor is any title more important to our Nation in meeting our responsibilities to our fellow citizens. We hear criticisms of Federal nutrition assistance, but let us not forget that the vast majority of Americans who receive this help are children, seniors, people with disabilities, or working families. Indeed, recent years have shown how vitally important SNAP and related nutrition assistance are to enabling working families and especially the children in these families avoid hunger and malnutrition.

The reforms in this bill reduce Federal spending by limiting eligibility and benefits. I regret that our budget circumstances have led to this outcome, but again I give credit to Senator STABENOW and Senator ROBERTS for holding these cuts to nutrition to much lower levels than other proposals that have been made, including the budget resolution adopted in the House of Representatives. It is also gratifying that this body has in recent days rejected several amendments that would have drastically reduced food assistance for the most vulnerable Americans.

Because the nutrition title in this bill is responsibly and carefully crafted, it continues important reforms and improvements that I am proud we were able to enact in the most recent two farm bills. In the 2002 legislation we restored certain benefits for legal immigrants, restored a portion of benefits that had been cut in previous legislation, increased incentives for work, simplified and increased integrity in nutrition assistance, increased emergency food assistance, dedicated mandatory funding to the Farmers Market Nutrition Program, and adopted a pilot program I authored to provide free fresh fruits and vegetables to children in schools. In the 2008 bill we likewise included key improvements to nutrition assistance, such as further restoring previously cut benefits, encouraging savings by recipients, adopting a pilot program of incentives for healthier eating through SNAP, improved benefits for families with high childcare costs, expanded the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program to a national program, dedicated mandatory funding for community food projects, increased mandatory funding for the Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program, allowed a preference for purchasing locally produced food for child nutrition programs, and dedicated mandatory funds to the Farmers Market Promotion Program.

To promote energy efficiency on farms and in rural businesses and the production and use of renewable energy and biobased products, this legislation

extends, improves, and strengthens programs in the energy title in the 2002 and 2008 farm bill. I am proud to have included the first farm bill energy title in the 2002 legislation, to strengthen and expand the energy title in the 2008 bill, and to continue the energy title as a prominent part of this bill. And thanks to the cooperation of Senators STABENOW, ROBERTS, LUGAR, and CONRAD, we were able to dedicate about \$300 million in new funding to these critical energy initiatives in the bill reported from the Agriculture Committee.

In March of this year, I introduced S. 2270, the Rural Energy Investment Act of 2012, in order to extend the programs in the energy titles of the 2002 and 2008 farm bills and to provide mandatory funding for the energy title of this new farm bill. So I am very pleased that it includes a strong energy title and dedicates mandatory funding to it.

The bill continues the requirement I authored and we enacted in the 2002 farm bill for Federal departments and agencies to purchase biobased products and to create a "BioPreferred" labeling program to encourage private markets for biobased products. Also included in this bill are grants to assist pilot-scale biorefineries and loan guarantees for commercial biorefineries.

This bill appropriately continues the Biomass Research and Development Program, which is a joint initiative of USDA and the Department of Energy that awards grants for research on the full spectrum of bioenergy supply chains, from biomass feedstock development and production, to harvesting and handling, to biomass processing and fuels or products manufacturing.

The Rural Energy for America Program, REAP, the most popular program in the energy title because it provides direct financial support to many farmers, ranchers, and rural small businesses for rural energy systems or energy efficiency projects, is also continued. And this bill extends the Biomass Crop Assistance Program, BCAP, that supports establishment of biomass crops for bioenergy use and provides cost-share payments for harvest and delivery of biomass to user facilities in the initial years.

I am also very pleased that the bill continues, improves, and strengthens a number of initiatives that we included in previous farm bills to assist and promote opportunities for farmers and good nutrition for consumers through farmers markets and increased local production and marketing of food.

In this bill, the Farmers Market Promotion Program is renamed as the Farmers Market and Local Food Promotion Program, and it provides competitively awarded USDA grants to improve and expand farmers markets, roadside stands, community-supported agriculture marketing, and other direct producer-to-consumer marketing, including funding for mobile electronic benefits transfer technology. The grants may also be used to help develop

local systems focused on serving low-income communities. This bill increases the mandatory funding dedicated to the program to a total of \$100 million.

The bill also extends and increases funding for community food projects through grants to nonprofit organizations to be used in improving access to healthy, nutritious food in communities, which can include assistance to farmers markets and other local food marketing systems. We included \$5 million a year in mandatory funding in the 2008 farm bill, and this bill doubles that to \$10 million a year.

For the Hunger Free Communities Initiative, the bill dedicates \$100 million in new mandatory funding for incentive grants to support increased purchase of fruits and vegetables by families participating in SNAP in underserved communities.

To help farmers cover the cost of obtaining certification as qualified organic producers, the bill includes an increased level of mandatory funding, and it continues and funds the organic research and extension initiative. Also continued are the program of block grants to the States to assist fruit, vegetable, and horticulture crop producers and a special program supporting research projects focused on helping these producers. The bill continues the initiative I was pleased to include in the 2008 farm bill to provide cost-share assistance through EQIP to farmers who are making the transition to organic food production.

Mr. President, these are only some of the important features in this new farm bill. It is a strong bill, with substantial reforms and continued progress toward improved food, agriculture, conservation, energy, and rural policies for our Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 10 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on passage of S. 3240, as amended.

The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I thank my colleagues for their patience and for supporting this bipartisan effort on the agriculture reform, food, and jobs bill.

I thank Senator REID for his incredible patience and willingness to give us this time, and the Republican leader for joining in that effort as well. I especially thank my ranking member Senator ROBERTS for long hours and hard work on this bill to get to this point. It has been truly a partnership. Senator ROBERTS is my friend and my partner in this effort, and I am very grateful.

I have said all along in this debate that there are 16 million people in this country whose jobs depend on the strength of the American agricultural economy and our food systems. The agriculture reform bill is about standing up for our Nation's farmers, our small businesses, our manufacturers, our exporters, and others whose livelihood depends on us getting the policy right.

This represents significant reform. It cuts subsidies, it cuts the deficit, and it creates jobs. We are ending direct payments and three other subsidy programs that pay farmers regardless of losses or whether they are even planting a particular crop. We are putting in place the most significant payment reforms ever.

I thank Senator GRASSLEY for his tenacity and Senator JOHNSON for his partnership in that effort as well. We are cutting Federal spending by \$23 billion by streamlining and consolidating programs. Therefore, we are going to have an opportunity to vote on \$23 billion in deficit reduction—probably the only opportunity to vote on debt reduction in a bipartisan way on the floor of the Senate in the next number of months.

We are eliminating more than 100 authorization programs and streamlining others, strengthening crop insurance, consolidating conservation programs and innovative energy programs, and we are continuing the critical work around nutrition to give temporary help to families who have fallen on hard times. We are also creating more opportunities for families to buy healthy, local food and the opportunity to put fresh fruits and vegetables in our schools and on our tables.

Agriculture is one of the few parts of our economy where we are running a trade surplus, and we need to recognize it is also a job creator. The men and women who work hard from sunrise to sunset to give us the bounty of safe, nutritious food that we put on our tables deserve the certainty of this bill. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on a very important bipartisan effort and yes to the 16 million men and women who bring us the safest, most affordable, most reliable food system in the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, when you go back home or if you conduct a press conference or if you have any contact with anybody about what we are doing here in Washington, the No. 1 question is: Why can't you all get along? Why can't you quit pointing fingers of blame? Why can't you end the rhetoric? Why can't you work together? Why can't you get something done?

We knew we had something special when we had a farm bill and the current farm bill was going to expire and you would go back to a farm bill that nobody wanted, or the 1949 act, which is ridiculous, and that we had to move. Farmers and ranchers and their lenders and everybody concerned with agribusiness knew we had to have a farm bill.

We went to work and we got a 16-to-5 vote out of committee, it was bipartisan, and we did it in 4½ hours. That set a record. I don't know of any time where in an Agriculture Committee, House or Senate, that it has been moved in 4½ hours.

Now 2½ days, with 73 amendments, opening it up to everybody regardless of circumstance, regardless if they voted for the bill or not? That is what we have accomplished—2½ days, 73 amendments. It is what can happen if we break the logjam of partisanship and work together to get something done. A tremendous amount of credit goes to the leadership of the Senator from Michigan. I feel very privileged to have worked with her and to work with her staff. They have been like Musketeers, every night, every morning, meeting: What can we do; how can we fix this?

It has worked. So after 2½ days and 73 amendments I thank you all for your patience. If anybody did not get an amendment, I am terribly sorry, I don't know how I missed you; consequently, on that side as well.

Let me say again, \$23 billion provided in deficit reduction through reduced mandatory spending. The chairwoman is right, this is probably the only time on the Senate floor we will actually have a reduction in Federal spending and make our deficit contribution.

This is a good bill. Is it the best possible bill? No, it is the best bill possible. We should move it and we should vote for it. I urge you to vote for it.

I yield.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, the Republican leader and I have spoken privately. We would be remiss if we did not say something to the entire Senate about how we feel about this bill and the leadership that was shown by these two fine Senators. Also behind the scenes—we know how hard they worked to get where we are—we have had such good staff involved. These staff people are not fighting with each other. They have causes they are trying to protect for their Members but they do it in a way that is cordial. There has been nothing but courtesy shown for weeks.

I have managed quite a few bills in my day. This is a difficult bill to have in the position we have it in now. I hope our friends in the House see what we have done. We are working together. I know they can. I cannot say enough—although I will try—to applaud and compliment Senator STABENOW and Senator ROBERTS. They are both my friends but my view of them has risen appreciably in their legislative methods of getting this done.

They have done it on their own. Senator MCCONNELL and I have done what we can, but we have been bystanders to much that has gone on. It has been the work of these two fine Senators and the cooperation of every Member. I am grateful we are at the point where we are today—2 o'clock. We are going to be able to finish this bill and it is 2 o'clock in the afternoon, not in the morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Let me echo the remarks of my good friend. This bill

has been handled in a way entirely consistent with the norms and traditions of the Senate. Members have had an opportunity to express themselves in a whole variety of ways, both relevant to the amendments and a few not relevant to the amendments. Senator STABENOW and Senator ROBERTS have worked together very skillfully. This is one of the finest moments in the Senate in recent times in terms of how you pass a bill.

I think we are all feeling good about the way this has been handled. I think we are moving back in the direction of operating the Senate in a way that we sort of traditionally understood we were going to operate the Senate.

I also thank my good friend, the majority leader. I think this has been a good cooperative effort, to have a process that respects the traditions of the Senate. This is a very fine day in the recent history of the Senate. Again, my congratulations to the chairman of the committee and the ranking member. They did a fabulous job.

I yield the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? All time is yielded back?

The question is on passage of the bill, subject to a 60-vote threshold.

Ms. STABENOW. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 164 Leg.]

YEAS—64

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Alexander	Franken	Moran
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Murray
Baucus	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Hagan	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Harkin	Reid
Bingaman	Hoeben	Roberts
Blumenthal	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Blunt	Inouye	Sanders
Boxer	Johanns	Schumer
Brown (MA)	Johnson (SD)	Shaheen
Brown (OH)	Kerry	Snowe
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Kohl	Tester
Carper	Leahy	Thune
Casey	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coats	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Collins	Lugar	Warner
Conrad	Manchin	Webb
Coons	McCaskill	Wyden
Durbin	Menendez	
Enzi	Merkley	

NAYS—35

Ayotte	Crapo	Kyl
Boozman	DeMint	Landrieu
Burr	Graham	Lautenberg
Chambliss	Hatch	Lee
Coburn	Heller	McCain
Cochran	Inhofe	McConnell
Corker	Isakson	Murkowski
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Paul

Portman	Rubio	Vitter
Pryor	Sessions	Whitehouse
Reed	Shelby	Wicker
Risch	Toomey	

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for passage of the bill, the bill (S. 3240), as amended, is passed.

The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion upon the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act, or the 2012 farm bill, represents the most significant reform of U.S. agriculture in decades. This bill is the product of many months of policy discussions and late night deliberations guided by the steady leadership of Chairwoman STABENOW and Ranking Member ROBERTS. I commend their efforts in successfully navigating this bill. All Americans stand to benefit from their hard work and commitment to reform agriculture policy and strengthen our rural communities.

There is a reason why people across the country—farmers and business owners, faith leaders and county commissioners—have been paying attention to what we are doing.

This bill benefits all Americans, including in Ohio, where 1 in 7 jobs is related to the food and agriculture sector. From making the farm safety net more fiscally responsible, ensuring communities have access to broadband, protecting nutrition and conservation programs, to strengthening initiatives for healthy, nutritious food—this legislation touches all Ohioans.

Also, at a time where there is too much gridlock, this bill is a welcome change.

Many thanks to Leader REID and Senator MCCONNELL for their patience, their cooperation, and for allowing time for proper consideration of the farm bill.

Many of the policies I proposed as legislation and worked to include in this farm bill were made at the suggestion of Ohioans. Traveling across the State on my “Grown in Ohio” listening tour, I learned what is working and what needs to be changed from people whose primary job is to grow our food, feed the hungry, and run small businesses and small towns. Thanks to the many Ohioans who have shared their opinions, ideas, and provided feedback over the past several months. This farm bill is better because of their involvement.

This legislation would not have been possible without the dedicated work of the Senate Agriculture Committee’s leadership of Chairwoman STABENOW, Ranking Member ROBERTS, and that of its members. In particular, I enjoyed the opportunity to work with a number

of my Agriculture Committee colleagues. Their willingness to reach across party lines ensured that this bill had a much-needed dose of Midwestern pragmatism. I would like to thank Senators THUNE and GRASSLEY, as well as Senators HARKIN, NELSON, LUGAR, JOHANNIS, KLOBUCHAR, and CASEY. Their continual engagement in the farm bill process has made a stronger product and I am grateful for their efforts.

The 2012 farm bill has been many months in the making and was made possible by the work of Senate staff, often in a bipartisan manner. Mike Seyfert, Joel Leftwich, and Tara Smith of Ranking Member ROBERTS’ staff were invaluable resources in this process, as well as Jared Hill for Senator GRASSLEY and Lynn Tjeerdsma with Senator THUNE, whose work with my staff was indispensable.

I was continually impressed with the open and collaborative nature of Senator STABENOW’s staff. This farm bill was written in a unique and challenging process—all of which made the efforts by Chris Adamo, Jonathan Coppess, Joe Shultz, Tina May, Brandon McBride, Jacklyn Schneider and others to remain engaged and open to suggestions all the more invaluable. Their hard work has not gone unnoticed.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on S. 3240, legislation to reauthorize the farm bill. It is important to reflect on the process and the debate we just had, as well as consider the final product. First, I wish to commend Chairwoman STABENOW and Ranking Member ROBERTS for their diligent efforts in bringing this bill to the Senate floor for consideration and debate. It is no small achievement and there have been countless hours expended by Members and staff on this very important effort. However, in spite of this, as I weigh the bill and its impact on the State of Georgia and the Southeast, I am truly disappointed that I am not able to support it.

This bill does include significant reform with the elimination of direct payments and it makes several improvements to crop insurance. I have always been an advocate of risk management delivered through the private sector. However, the bill establishes a one-size-fits-all program rather than recognizing the limitations of crop insurance for certain regions of the country, namely, the Southeast, and whether the new commodity title program, the Agriculture Risk Coverage, ARC, program can work as a safety net for crops other than corn and soybeans. Leaving producers without an effective safety net provides very little protection and certainty for those outside of the Midwest.

A good idea often stumbles by asking it to do too much. Crop insurance is a tool that addresses risk in an individual crop year. It does not work as a safety net by insuring against multiple-year price declines. This is simply beyond its design and capabilities. Crop

insurance is a critical part of a producer’s risk management program, but it is not a cure-all to a commodity market that can expand and contract based on the vagaries of weather, disease, and international events. That is why farm policy in the past encouraged programs such as the marketing loan and the countercyclical program to work with, not in competition, to crop insurance.

This week we have had the opportunity to debate and improve the bill. We made some important changes, but it still lacks the balance I have advocated for the past several weeks. It is still my hope to support the bill at the end of the legislative process. Perhaps after action by the House of Representatives and a conference of the two Chambers, we will see the changes necessary to gain my support.

Chairwoman STABENOW has assured me on several occasions that my concerns will be addressed and I know she will keep her commitment. I would rather have dealt with the issues during the Senate debate, but that was not possible.

We must remember that the farm bill should help farmers and ranchers manage a combination of challenges—much out of their own control. We must also remember that the farm bill is not an entitlement for any one region or any one commodity. Policymakers must remember that the bill needs to serve all producers in all parts of the country equitably and effectively. To fail in this endeavor means we as legislators have failed to produce a bill worthy of the people we represent. I am proud of the work we did on the 2008 farm bill and its ability to provide a strong safety net program for producers. I am confident that the next farm bill will adhere and honor that same commitment we made 4 years ago.

While I could not support the bill in front of us, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the weeks and months ahead.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senate today passed the Farm bill. This is bipartisan legislation that is critical to all Americans—from the farmers who grow our food, to the consumers who purchase that food, to the kids who get school lunches, and to the neediest in our Nation who deserve access to adequate nutrition. I especially want to commend Senator STABENOW and Senator ROBERTS for their yeoman bipartisan work to craft this important legislation.

As Senator STABENOW has so eloquently put it time and again, this bill is a jobs bill. One in every 12 American jobs is tied to agriculture and this legislation represents an opportunity to create more jobs.

In my home State of Oregon, agriculture is now more than a \$5 billion a year industry and it reflects a wide array of crops, mirroring the diversity in America’s agriculture.

As I like to say, Oregonians do a lot of thing well, but what we do best is

grow things and add value to those things. This bill has a lot in it to help Oregonians do that even better and in turn create more opportunities to sell those products better locally, nationally and abroad.

I was particularly pleased to have been successful in adding two amendments to the Farm bill. These are amendments to make it easier to provide healthier foods for children in schools and to help address the problem of hunger in our country.

One of my amendments would for the first time test out direct farm-to-school approaches to provide healthier foods for children in our schools. It will do this through a competitive pilot program with at least five farm-to-school demonstration projects in all regions in the country.

While there are currently some farm to school programs in place, it's a patchwork system and, according to the Agriculture Department's own Economic Research Service, "data and analysis of farm to school programs are scarce." This pilot program will fill in the information void about what works and what doesn't, and it will provide a way to improve and replace ineffective programs.

What is more, under these demonstration projects, innovative States and school districts will truly be able source fresh, high-quality local produce for our schoolchildren to enjoy. No more having to purchase far-away food from a Federal warehouse hundreds of miles away when there is healthy food just down the road.

Under my amendment, schools win. Farmers win. And most importantly, our children get to enjoy the delicious, local produce that they should be able to enjoy—every day—for breakfast, or for lunch, or for a snack. That is why the American Academy of Pediatrics the Nation's pediatricians supported my no cost farm-to-school amendment.

With the adoption of this amendment, it will be easier for delicious pears, cherries, and other healthy produce, grown just a few miles down the road, to make it into our schools.

Schools and school food authorities from all over the country with innovative ideas can now begin drawing up novel plans of action to purchase fresh, local produce for their kids.

New ideas will come forth, and the existing farm-to-school infrastructure will improve as new and better distribution models begin to emerge.

I am heartened that the farm-to-school movement has truly become national in scope, as more people recognize both the health and economic benefits that derive from these efforts. My amendment will make this movement not only bigger but better.

I thank Senator STABENOW and her staff for working with me on this amendment and helping me get this passed.

Fewer folks will be hungry thanks to the Senate's passage of my microloan for gleaners amendment.

These gleaners are mostly volunteers who collect food from grocery stores, restaurants, and farms—food that would otherwise be wasted—and distribute it to agencies or nonprofit organizations that feed it to the hungry.

These good Samaritans who save food from being tossed into landfills or burned in incinerators will finally be able to access the capital they deserve to expand and improve their operations.

At a time when food waste is the single largest category of waste in our local landfills—more than 34 million tons of food, even a portion of that wasted food could feed a lot of people. By redistributing food that would otherwise go to waste to the hungry—again, without spending extra taxpayer money—we can do more to ensure that this unwanted food is used to tackle hunger in America.

Instead of burning this food in incinerators, gleaners can help more people in need burn this food as calories.

This is just one more step in the right direction to help alleviate food insecurity in our country.

I again thank Senator STABENOW and her staff for their assistance in getting this amendment passed. It will provide real help to a group of selfless folks that are trying to bring some commonsense solutions to the hunger crisis.

As happy as I was to get the Farm Bill passed and get these amendments included, an opportunity to encourage healthier eating by recipients of SNAP benefits—what was previously known as food stamps—was unfortunately not able to come up for a vote.

This is disappointing. Not disappointing for me, but for the millions of SNAP beneficiaries, public health officials, and others who know we can do better to encourage healthier eating and increase consumption of healthy fruits and vegetables.

The existing waiver authority for SNAP is extremely restrictive and has resulted in a number of innovative State proposals being denied. It makes no sense to continue to stifle innovation and progress when it comes to incentivizing beneficiaries to eat healthier.

I will continue to push for ways to promote healthier eating through the SNAP program, given that it will improve public health, increase the consumption of healthy food, boost local farmers' incomes, and give taxpayers the confidence that their tax dollars are being spent on food that is really food.

I was also very disappointed that my amendment to legalize industrial hemp was also not granted a vote.

I firmly believe that American farmers should not be denied an opportunity to grow and sell a legitimate crop simply because it resembles an illegal one.

I fought for an amendment that would have recognized industrial hemp as a legitimate crop, but since doing so requires amending the Controlled Sub-

stances Act it was considered non-germane to the current debate and could not be brought up for a vote.

However, just my raising this issue has sparked a growing awareness of exactly how ridiculous the U.S.'s ban on industrial hemp is and I feel that important progress was made in advancing this dialogue.

I am confident that if grassroots support continues to grow and Members of Congress continue to hear from voters, then commonsense hemp legislation can move through Congress in the near future.

I plan to continue to keep fighting for this and hope to reintroduce this as a stand-alone bill.

I also want to raise concerns with language that was passed in the bill that amended the Healthy Forests Restoration Act. It is my hope that this issue will still be addressed in conference. I understand Senator BENNET made remarks expressing that same desire.

The language in the forestry title of the Farm bill amended an Act which I played a key role in helping pass originally in the Senate a decade ago.

As part of efforts to pass that legislation, which streamlined National Environmental Policy Act requirements, as well as appeals and judicial review, a carefully balanced compromise was reached. Environmental protections and clear limitations for appropriate places for the use of that authority were enacted as part of that legislation.

The language in the Farm Bill creates a sweeping new authority to use the Healthy Forest Restoration Act for areas potentially threatened with insect or disease infestations but fails to include any of the environmental protections or clear limitations in the original legislation. Additional, the way those areas that are threatened by insects and disease are defined is very broad.

I worked very hard with several of my colleagues to try to reach a compromise. It is my hope that given a little more time, we will be able to reach a compromise before a final Farm Bill becomes law.

I hope we will have a chance to perfect this language to address these concerns as the bill goes to conference.

Lastly, I want to touch the labeling of genetically modified foods.

I have always believed that consumers benefit from having more information about the food they consume, and that is why I supported an amendment offered by Senator SANDERS regarding the labeling of such foods. However, I continue to believe that the most realistic way to improve consumer information about genetically modified foods is to take a national approach and I will continue to work towards that goal. That is why I cosponsored Senator BEGICH's legislation to ensure that genetically modified fish are labeled.

In sum, I again want to reiterate my strong support for the Farm Bill passed

in the Senate and my great pleasure at having successfully gotten two amendments into this bill.

I raised several additional issues and it is my hope that there will be continued opportunities to address these issues going forward.

I yield the floor.

FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM AND MODERNIZATION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 250, S. 1940, an original bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Tim Johnson, Al Franken, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher A. Coons, Tom Harkin, Barbara A. Mikulski, Kent Conrad, Robert Menendez, Jack Reed, Barbara Boxer, Ben Nelson of Nebraska, Michael F. Bennet, Max Baucus, Mark Begich, Richard Blumenthal, Kay R. Hagan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1940, an original bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the insurance fund, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 96, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 165 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Akaka	Carper	Franken
Alexander	Casey	Gillibrand
Ayotte	Chambliss	Graham
Barrasso	Coats	Grassley
Baucus	Coburn	Hagan
Begich	Cochran	Harkin
Bennet	Collins	Hatch
Bingaman	Conrad	Heller
Blumenthal	Coons	Hoeben
Blunt	Corker	Hutchinson
Boozman	Cornyn	Inhofe
Brown (MA)	Crapo	Inouye
Brown (OH)	DeMint	Isakson
Burr	Durbin	Johanns
Cantwell	Enzi	Johnson (SD)
Cardin	Feinstein	Johnson (WI)

Kerry	Merkley	Sessions
Klobuchar	Mikulski	Shaheen
Kohl	Moran	Shelby
Kyl	Murkowski	Snowe
Landrieu	Murray	Stabenow
Lautenberg	Nelson (NE)	Tester
Leahy	Nelson (FL)	Thune
Lee	Portman	Toomey
Levin	Reed	Udall (CO)
Lieberman	Reid	Udall (NM)
Lugar	Risch	Vitter
Manchin	Roberts	Warner
McCain	Rockefeller	Webb
McCaskill	Rubio	Whitehouse
McConnell	Sanders	Wicker
Menendez	Schumer	Wyden

NAYS—2

Paul

Pryor

NOT VOTING—2

Boxer

Kirk

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 96, the nays are 2. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Louisiana.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise for a procedural request and a statement on the farm bill. On Rollcall Vote No. 153, yesterday, I voted "yes." It was my intention to vote "no." I therefore ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome of the amendment or the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I had the Rollcall Vote number wrong. It is not Rollcall Vote No. 153. It is Rollcall Vote No. 143. I voted "yes." I would like to change my vote to "no." I ask unanimous consent that be the order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Thank you Mr. President.

AGRICULTURE REFORM

Mr. President, I will be brief. I know other Members are on the floor who want to speak on other subjects.

First, I want to thank the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Kansas for an extraordinary job on a very difficult bill, a very complicated bill—and difficult because it is not just a Republican-Democratic debate or a Democratic-Republican debate, it is a regional debate that has to take place, and there is a lot of give-and-take.

I have been proud to vote for every farm bill that has been before the Senate to my knowledge, but I voted "no" today, and I want to say why.

Despite the great work of Senator STABENOW and Senator ROBERTS, there was a weak part of this bill, in my view, related to rice farming, and it is such a significant and important part

of our farming structure in Louisiana that I cast a vote against the bill to send a signal that more work needs to be done.

This bill passed the Senate with an overwhelming vote. I voted for many of the amendments that I think helped to shape it to be even better than when it came out of committee.

We beat back several attacks to uproot, destroy, or significantly modify the U.S. Sugar Program, which has been very important to the State of Louisiana—one of the Nation's great sugar growers. As I have tried to explain to people who continue to attack this program, why would you want to end a program in this bill that does not cost the taxpayers a single dime?

There are no direct subsidies for sugar, as there are for all the other crops. The U.S. Sugar Program provides American consumers with low, stable sugar prices and ensures that our sugarcane and sugar beet growers receive a fair price for their crop.

I am happy to say that American growers of sugar can provide almost 85 percent of domestic demand. So why not use domestic sugar if we can supply our domestic demand? We only import what we need to import. We do not want to flood the market with cheap imports coming into America and undermining our jobs. I was proud to stand with our sugar industry and beat back those amendments.

Louisiana farmers and ranchers make a significant contribution to our State, generating over \$10.8 billion in economic activity alone. Agriculture—including fisheries and, of course, forestry—and energy are the backbone of Louisiana's economy.

This farm bill is an important bill. As I said, I was happy to vote for literally dozens of amendments that strengthened it. But I held out my final support, hoping that, as it travels to the House and goes through the conference process, the farm provisions related to our rice growers could be perfected.

People like to say the United States grows the cheapest, safest, and most abundant food, fiber, and energy supply in the world. They are right. The people in my State who do that day in and day out are proud. They have every reason to be proud because farming is more than a business, it is more than a job; it is a way of life. It is a way of life that is important and precious and should be honored. There are many families—cousins and aunts and uncles and fathers and mothers and children who are involved in farming. In Louisiana, in our forest lands, and along our coastal lands, these families follow a preferred way of life, even though it means hard work, long hours, high risks, and sometimes heart-breakingly limited returns.

So from sugar and rice in the south to cotton and poultry in the north, and all the areas in between, Louisiana needs a farm bill that supports all of

our farmers. This one failed in one important area, which is why I cast a "no" vote.

This bill did not support adequately, in my view, the 2,000 rice farmers we have in Louisiana. Our rice industry generates \$638 million in our State alone. Along with Arkansas, we are one of the major rice producing states. Nationally, U.S. rice supports about 128,000 jobs. It is \$34 billion of economic input each year.

This bill did reduce the deficit by \$23 billion, and that is something I support. However, it took a larger chunk out of rice than was asked for any other commodity. Rice took a 65% reduction when the other crops, on average, took a 30% reduction. And I know some of the peanut growers in Georgia have some of the same concerns we do.

So let me end by saying that I hope the position of our rice farmers and the important industry that rice represents can be strengthened in the House. If so, I will proudly put my name on this bill, because there is some very good that was done to protect our nutrition programs, to help our middle-class families who find themselves in the unusual situation of having to get some food relief in these difficult times. I want to thank Senator STABENOW particularly for her help in that way.

But for my rice growers, my rice producers, the important mills we have from Crowley, LA, to other places, for companies such as Kellogg in Battle Creek, MI, that depend on strong rice production from Louisiana, I cast a "no" vote.

Finally, I will say, I hope we can find a way to open some more markets for our rice growers. We are interested—very interested—in trade with Cuba. And the politics sometimes prevents us from opening more trade relations with a nation that I know has not met our standard of democracy but most certainly would be an open market for many of my farmers.

So for my farmers who are looking for markets where we can sell and compete on the world market, if you give us an opportunity to compete and open these markets, then we may be able to adjust our program. But until then, our farmers need the support of other farmers and did not receive it in this bill.

I so appreciate my colleague from Rhode Island giving me this opportunity to speak. I thank the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PELL GRANT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, 1972 was a watershed year for expanding educational opportunities in this country.

The Education Amendments of 1972 included title IX—now known as the Patsy T. Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act—guaranteeing educational opportunities for women and girls in federally supported educational institutions.

But 1972 also saw, within the Education Amendments, the creation of

the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant. Today we know it as the Pell Grant. It was named in honor and in recognition of the extraordinary vision and service of my colleague, my predecessor from Rhode Island, Claiborne Pell. He authored this provision.

Forty years later, we can see how these two key changes to our educational laws have transformed our Nation and transformed the aspirations of millions of Americans.

It is also a good time to reflect on the challenges that remain and to renew our commitment to fulfilling the promise of opportunity represented in the Education Amendments of 1972.

Senator Pell's vision was that no student with the talent, drive, and desire should be denied the opportunity for a post-secondary education solely because of a lack of financial resources. Pell grants have opened the doors to a college education for millions of Americans.

In the 1973–1974 academic year—the first year students received grants—176,000 Pell grants were awarded. In the school year that began in the fall of 2010, that number grew to over 9.6 million.

Pell grants constitute approximately 23 percent of all Federal student aid, which includes grants, loans, and work study programs.

The Pell grant is the cornerstone of our Federal student aid programs. For needy students, it is the foundation for making college affordable. Unfortunately, reduced State support for higher education and rising college costs have eroded that foundation.

In 1976, the maximum Pell grant was \$1,400, which was enough to cover 72 percent of the cost of attendance at a public 4-year college. In 2010, the maximum Pell Grant was \$5,550, which was only enough to cover 34 percent of the cost of attendance at a public 4-year college.

We have seen an erosion of the buying power of the Pell grant. If we were matching the effort that he initiated in the 1970s, we would be providing more opportunities and more support for college students across this Nation.

Senator Pell understood that grant aid was critical for low-income students and families. The goal was to minimize the need for loans. Frankly, back in the 1970s, most young people with a Pell grant—working through the summer, and working the extra hours they had to during the academic year—could pay their way through school, leave school without huge debt.

Today, regrettably, there are students graduating from school with \$10,000, \$20,000, \$30,000 worth of debt because the Pell grants have not kept up, because college costs have accelerated, and because they have been forced to borrow. Today, low-income students and middle-income students rely heavily on student loans to pay for college.

And we are seeing another burden; and, frankly, this ripples throughout our economy. In the 1970s and 1980s, if

you left college owing a few thousand dollars, you could pay that off very quickly. So by your late twenties, you were ready to settle down, to buy the house. Today, we have a generation of students who are struggling with debt that might take them 10 or more years to pay off. Effectively, they cannot begin to buy the home, to settle down, to do the things that are so important to our overall economy.

Unless we are able to come to an agreement over the next several days, we also face the prospect of seeing the rate on subsidized student loans double by July 1.

That would deal another blow to moderate- and low-income families. Leader REID has proposed a very reasonable compromise. I hope that the Republicans will let that compromise go forward. I am hopeful my Republican colleagues can use this opportunity not only to continue to keep the lending rate low for Stafford loans but renew our own pledge on the Pell grant.

It would be ironic to see, on the 40th anniversary of the Pell grant, a further undermining of the ability of middle- to low-income Americans to go to college. In fact, this should be an opportunity to do much more. Senator Pell's words ring as true today as when he spoke them in 1995, one of the last years of his tenure in the Senate.

In his words:

As I have stated on many occasions, few things in life are more important than the education of our children. They are the living legacy that we leave behind and their education determines the future of the American Nation. . . .

He continued.

. . . Every day families are making decisions about sending their children to college. Certainly one of, if not the major obstacle they face is how to pay for college. The loan is their last resort. It provides the extra but necessary money they must have after exhausting their own resources and obtaining any grants for which their children might be eligible. Increasing the amount that children owe after graduation may well place the dream of a college education beyond their reach. That, to my mind, would be a tragedy of truly immense proportions. . . .

Senator Pell was right. Increasing student debt, especially during these difficult economic times, would be a tragedy for students, their families, and our Nation. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, on our side of the aisle, all my colleagues, to work together to prevent an increase in the student loan interest rate from doubling on July 1.

That would, indeed, be a fitting tribute to Senator Pell on the 40th anniversary of the Pell grant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am honored to join my senior Senator to commemorate such an important milestone as he has described in American education.

It was 40 years ago this week that President Nixon signed into law the

Education Amendments Act of 1972, including a provision establishing for the first time the basic educational opportunity grant, which came to be called the Pell grant for its sponsor, Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island.

Over the next four decades, Pell grants would turn the dream of college education into a reality for millions of Americans. Today, more than ever, a college diploma is important to a young person's success. The unemployment rate for those 25 and older with a bachelor's degree is less than 4 percent and over 8 percent for those with only a high school diploma. The value of that college degree could not be more apparent. Higher education provides the skills and credentials that many employers require in today's economy.

In the decades following World War II, the U.S. Government made college and occupational mobility a reality for more Americans than ever before. Claiborne Pell was a veteran of that war, and he saw how the GI bill enabled millions of his fellow veterans to better themselves through education. He recognized that many of his Coast Guard shipmates had as much talent as his Princeton classmates but not the privilege or resources to go to college.

Given the opportunity, this Greatest Generation would not only provide a better life for their families with that access to college, but they would contribute mightily to the growth of this Nation, a growth we still enjoy today.

Claiborne Pell resolved then that all Americans should have such an opportunity, and his vision would become a reality for millions through the Pell grant. In 1976, the first year the Pell grants were fully funded, a full Pell grant paid 72 percent of the cost of attendance at a typical 4-year public college. Today, a full Pell grant covers just 32 percent of those costs, but still, for many, this vital assistance can mean the difference between being able to attend college or not.

As grant aid has fallen and tuition has soared, families have had to borrow to make up the difference to send their kids to college. The total amount of student loan debt carried by Americans has recently surpassed \$1 trillion, more than Americans now owe on their credit cards.

I have talked to students around my State and I have read many heartfelt letters. It is clear Pell grants serve as a gateway to the opportunities available with a college degree, a gate that would be shut if not for Pell grants.

I received a letter from Phil in Wakefield, RI, the oldest of five children. Last year, Phil graduated from Cornell. Phil worked his way through college, including summers. His parents chipped in when they could. Phil's father is still paying off student loans, and Phil was lucky enough to earn private scholarships and receive grants from his school. He said:

But there's no way my education would have been possible without Pell Grants. We just wouldn't have been able to afford it.

I also heard from Anthony, who has been working as a waiter in Providence. Thanks to the Pell grant, he and his wife Jen have been able to go back to school at the University of Rhode Island for degrees in biotechnology. They say their education will enable them to build a better future together in Rhode Island's rapidly expanding biotech sector.

Leann is a single mother of two from Pawtucket, already carrying student loan debt, although she has not been able to finish her undergraduate program. Last year, Leann enrolled in the School of Continuing Education at Roger Williams University, and when she graduates with a bachelor's degree next year, she plans on opening her own small business. "None of this would be happening" she wrote, "if I were not receiving a Pell Grant."

The simple fact is this: Pell grants help millions of people achieve the dream of college and improve their prospects for employment. It is a wise investment in the future of our country. Congress has, in recent years, increased the buying power of Pell Grants, increasing the maximum grant from \$4,050 in academic year 2006–2007 to \$5,550 in 2012–2013.

We also increased the minimum family income that automatically qualifies a student for the maximum Pell grant, a change that better reflects today's economic realities. Sadly, however, we are seeing a truly misguided assault on Pell grants.

The editorial board of the Wall Street Journal marked the 40th anniversary of Pell grants this week by printing claims about the Pell grant that, simply to be polite, do not withstand scrutiny. The Journal says the Pell grant is rife with abuse, with students engaging in "creative accounting" to qualify by feigning financial independence.

The most common way one gets deemed independent under the Pell Grant Program is by being 24 years of age or older. It is hard to imagine doing much creative accounting with one's date of birth. The other major proofs of independence are being married and having children. Maybe when they said "creative accounting" they meant "procreative accounting."

The Wall Street Journal implies that better off students can win larger grants by attending more expensive institutions. But the cost of tuition cannot increase the maximum size of a grant. The maximum Pell grant, as I said, is \$5,550, regardless of the school one attends. As we all know, \$5,550 is far from sufficient to cover the cost of most higher education.

Perhaps the most misleading claim from the Journal is to pick out the period when Pell grant costs rose significantly, between 2008 and 2010, due largely to the enactment of a funding expansion that has since been repealed and the fact that more eligible students applied for assistance as the economy worsened in those years.

What they left out is that the Congressional Budget Office projects almost no average annual growth in program costs over the next 10 years.

The Republican budget in the House of Representatives slashes funding and eligibility for Pell grants and eliminates all mandatory funding for the program over the next 10 years. We all understand the need to find savings in the Federal budget. We all understand the need to make difficult choices. But of all the bad choices we could make, of all unintelligent choices we could make, failing to invest in Pell grants would be among the worst.

It is, frankly, shameful that Federal financial aid has not kept pace with the rising cost of college. It is truly misguided to roll back financial aid for a generation of young Americans preparing to compete in an evermore global economy. We need a highly trained workforce. Pell grants are very often the keystone in the arch that students must build to afford college, as Phil and Anthony and Jen and Leann all showed.

Rhode Island is a small State. But over the years we have had some towering and remarkable Senators. Claiborne Pell was one. Claiborne Pell believed, as he once told the Providence Journal, "that government—and the federal government in particular—can, should, and does make a positive impact on the lives of most Americans."

The Pell grant's positive impact is that people who cannot afford college have the chance to go to college, and it lifts off their backs a little bit of that burden of debt. That is something we want in this country, not just for the sake of the individual Pell grant recipient, not just for the sake of the next generation but for the sake of the good of our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

AGRICULTURE REFORM

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask to be recognized to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I wish to talk about the farm bill. As we can see from an open Senate, I think we have done our work, and we have been successful. Most of what we can say on this bill has already been said.

After final passage, I simply wish to reiterate what the chairwoman has said, what I have said all along: This is a reform bill. We cut \$23 billion in mandatory spending. These are real cuts, no gimmicks. We have eliminated four commodity programs—four commodity programs. We have streamlined conservation programs from 23 to 13. We have eliminated numerous other authorizations.

In total, approximately 100 authorizations for spending and appropriations are eliminated. This is real reform. I also wish to take a quick moment to thank all the staff who have worked so hard on this legislation, especially the committee staff on both the majority and the minority sides.

I especially wish to thank the legislative magician, if I may call him that—expert—David Schiappa and his staff. They are no longer here, but they guided us through some difficult times, as he always does—as they always do.

I would like to take a few moments to recognize the members of my staff who worked on this bill. For me, this is a very special occasion. We are only as good as our staff. I have been blessed with the very best, and I have been a bucket toter. That is what a staff member is. When someone totes buckets, they try not to spill anything.

Sometimes they are successful and other times they may trip and fall. Other times it is just the way it is. I was administrative assistant to Senator Frank Carlson, the only man in Kansas to serve us as a Member of Congress, as a Governor, and a Senator, prior to our current Governor, Sam Brownback.

I was the administrative assistant for Congressman Keith Sebelius, who was on the House Agriculture Committee, and learned an awful lot about agriculture with Keith as we went through those days. Obviously, if someone is from Kansas, they are a legislative assistant or a bucket toter or whatever description you want for Bob Dole forever.

These people, as far as I am concerned, are not only my staff, they are my family. They have persevered. Anne Hazlett, my chief counsel, in my opinion, is the best chief counsel in the Senate, one of the top legislative drafters in the Senate, former director of the Indiana State Department of Agriculture under Gov. Mitch Daniels. When she is at my door, I know I am going to be told no on something.

I actually had better listen to her.

Eric Steiner. Eric has charged me with cruel and unusual punishment for putting him in the charge of dairy policy. After the 1996 farm bill and all that—and the 2002 and 2008 farm bills—I said I don't do dairy anymore. Then, in came Eric. He also became a dad for the first time earlier this year as we worked on this bill—talk about working 24/7 and giving up your family.

Keira Franz is a former Bob Dole staffer. Bob still tells her what to do so she can tell me what he says I am supposed to be doing.

Autumn Veazey, our southern bell and specialty crop guru, has also had the pleasure of getting to know places such as Dodge City and the inside of a meat processing plant—something that should be required of every agriculture assistant. Don't ask her.

Gregg Doud. Here is a real Kansas cowboy and one of the top agriculture trade experts in Washington, and he still wears his boots.

Tara Smith, our commodities and crop insurance expert, helps me navigate the minefields of both. Thank you so much, Tara. You have been wonderful.

Janae Brady keeps our staff—and, most importantly, my staff—director organized.

Andrew Vlasity, a great young man and a tremendous writer, has helped create a research title for the future.

Max Fisher, our No. 1 crunching guru, also became a dad for the third time as we worked on this bill.

Chris Hicks, our other legal counsel, is a former Senate-confirmed general counsel at the Department of Agriculture and provides the wisdom of that position as we work on complicated matters.

Patty Lawrence is our Department of Agriculture detailee on conservation issues and the ultimate professional.

Also, in my personal office: Ryan Flickner, a young Kansas farm lad who will soon return to Kansas to get married and become my deputy State director.

Wane Stoskopf is another Kansas farm boy who is taking Ryan's position, and Emily Haug.

Also, my communications director, Sarah Little—dear Sarah is never short of work when it comes to cleaning up what I have said and should not have said.

My State agriculture representative is Mel Thompson. I used to work with Mel. He was a legislative assistant and I was administrative assistant with Keith Sebelius. We went through two farm bills. There is no better person to have eyes and ears on the ground than Mel Thompson.

Then, there are Joel and Mike, the “two musketeers,” who saw me every morning, every afternoon, and every evening. I have a tendency to wander, to reflect on past farm bill stories, and to occasionally give rants. These are not particularly helpful in regard to moving legislation forward, and so Joel and Mike would say: Sir—at least they said “sir”—Sir, keep your eye on the ball. Stay focused. Where there is a will, there is a way. If you rant, if you wander, you will be lost in the midst of the desert farm bill purgatory. Don't be lost in the desert farm bill purgatory. Stay focused.

I tried. I think we succeeded, for the most part.

The chairwoman also has a great staff. Everybody likes to brag on their staffs, and I know she will mention many of them. I especially thank her staff director, Chris Adamo, and chief counsel, Jonathan Coppess, for their outstanding work on this legislation. They have been professional throughout. I don't know what you guys are going to do now that we are not breaking into your office in the mornings, afternoons, and evenings to see your smiling faces—and then we wonder why you are not smiling. Thank you for a top job.

I also thank all those in Senate legislative counsel and the Congressional

Budget Office who helped us get to this point today. They all worked behind the scenes, but we could not be here today without them.

I view my staff as family. I thank my family over here for their tremendous work in achieving what I think is a great farm bill and for doing something to restore the Senate back to the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, we have been looking forward to this day to be able to have the opportunity to celebrate a successful conclusion in the Senate. We have more work to do, but for 1 day we can pause and celebrate what is an important and great day after a tremendous amount of hard work that has gone on by our staffs, my ranking member, myself, along with our colleagues on the committee. We are so grateful for the wonderful effort that has gotten us to this point.

I have said this before and I will say it again: 16 million people count on us. They work in agriculture or food-related industries. That is a lot of people. I am not sure we have had a jobs bill that has come before the Senate that we can say addresses 16 million people's jobs, but certainly this is one. It affects every corner of every State.

I thank everyone in the Senate for their patience with us. I thank the majority leader for his incredible patience and leadership. I thank Senator MCCONNELL for working with us and I thank all those who voted on 73 amendments and everybody who was involved in putting those together and making sure we could move through this process.

Of course, I thank Senator ROBERTS again. Kansas is lucky to have him as a champion in the Senate. I have been very lucky to have him at my side throughout this debate and work, starting in the fall with our deficit reduction proposal up until today. We have come together on a bipartisan basis. I hope we can do that more. I have heard so many comments from colleagues in the last few days, saying it feels good to work through issues, debating issues, having votes, working together, and actually accomplishing something. It feels good and we need to continue to do more of it. Frankly, the American people want us to do more of it. So I am hopeful this will be a sign, as other things have been, frankly, in the Senate moving forward.

I am proud we have been the ones doing a bipartisan transportation bill and the ones passing other bipartisan bills. This is a significant milestone in that process of working together.

I am also very proud of the reforms in the bill we have done on a bipartisan basis. This is \$23 billion in spending cuts for deficit reduction. It is true that if every committee within their jurisdiction were to focus on analyzing and reviewing the programs under their jurisdiction and making tough

decisions, ending paperwork duplication, and so on, actually it would end up to be a pretty big deficit reduction plan—if we all did it in those areas we control. That is the way we looked at the process.

We have come up with \$23 billion in deficit reduction. We have done that by ending four different subsidies that folks have talked about changing for a long time—direct payments and other subsidies that are paid out regardless of losses. We passed a bill that continues support for healthy local food systems, farmers markets, and local food hubs.

We have passed a bill that strengthens conservation and continues protections that maintain healthy soil, clean water, and fresh air.

We passed a bill that supports America's rural communities. Every State has small rural communities, towns, villages, and counties that are counting on us to continue to have their economic development tools—which is the rural development title of the farm bill—as robust as possible. American energy independence is addressed in this bill. We passed the bill in a bipartisan way. This is an incredibly important step.

Now our bill goes to the House of Representatives. I have great confidence in the chairman and ranking member of the committee. I know they will be successful in moving a bill out of committee, and I am sure they are going to do everything humanly possible to pass it in the House. I believe, ultimately, they will because every American is counting on them in order to maintain food security for our country and the ability for us to have a strong, successful, safe food supply, as well as all the jobs connected to that.

I wish to thank my extraordinary staff. They worked from sunrise to sunset and then another few hours. I think we added hours—I think we changed from 24 hours to 30 a couple of times. It has been an incredible experience, and I am very grateful, truly, to all of them.

No team does it without a great captain. I thank Chris Adamo, who was with me on the last farm bill and is now our staff director. He has provided incredible leadership. He has deep knowledge of agriculture, and he brings a tremendous leadership to this process. He put together a tremendous team. I would not be here, and we would not be here in the Senate without his leadership and hard work and the team effort involved.

I also thank Jonathan Coppess, my great chief counsel, who actually helped bring a baby into the world last August, as we were saying, “Why don't we do deficit reduction.” When the supercommittee was put into place, he was helping bring a new baby into the world. So we thank Jonathan for his leadership. I have to say this as a point of personal privilege: Even though he is from Ohio, we still welcomed him into the fold—despite the rivalry between Michigan and Ohio.

I thank all our teams as well. I thank our commodities and dairy teams. It is tough work. We changed the commodity title. I think this is the most reform, probably—I don't know ever but in a long time. Moving from subsidy systems to a risk management system is easy to say, but it is hard to put into place in a way that makes sense. It is fair with commodities and will work in a simple way across the country.

I thank our Joe Shultz, who has been amazing. So many times we said: I don't know how we are going to do this, and he pulled another rabbit out of his hat. We thank Joe for all his wonderful work as our chief economist.

Cory Claussen is on dairy. It is not an easy thing to do—focus on dairy. There are large farms and small dairies. It is an incredible job.

Marcus Graham, as well, did amazing work, as did Chelsea Render. There was great teamwork on commodities and the dairy issues. Thank you so very much.

We had a great team on title II. Thanks to the “T2 warriors”, Tina May, an amazing person, who reminded me every other day that we had 643 conservation groups from every one of the 50 States. I have it in my memory because Tina said it every time I saw her. The truth is we did have 643 different conservation and environmental groups supporting this bill. It is because of Tina May, Catie Lee and Kevin Norton and the incredible work they brought to what I believe is an extraordinary reform in conservation. We are placing conservation as a priority in a way that has not been in other farm bills. We will see our country provide better opportunities around land and water and air quality and quantity issues as a result of their hard work.

Jacqlyn Schneider and Jesseca Taylor deserve a tremendous amount of credit for their work on the nutrition and healthy food issues. A major area of debate that will be going forward, as we address nutrition and healthy foods issues, is specialty crops, which are so important to me. I know in New Hampshire and other parts of the country it is very important. They did incredible work. We had some hard issues to work through on how we could create savings in our bill in nutrition, while maintaining the strong commitment to families. So I would like to thank them for an extraordinary effort as well.

And then each of our team members—let me go through them because there are so many people who did so many wonderful things.

Jonathan Cordone, who kept me out of trouble at most moments, in his work as general counsel, counseled me well and gave me wonderful words of wisdom as we moved along, both on procedure as well as policy.

Brandon McBride on rural development—we worked through many issues on the floor with Members, many issues that Members who were not on the committee had and wanted to work

on and develop further, and Brandon's patience and creativity and hard work really created a rural development title that is extraordinary.

One of the things we worked on, which may sound easy but was not easy at all, was the differing definitions of what rural is. The Secretary of Agriculture told me one time we had 11 different definitions of what rural was. He said: You know, you ought to fix that.

We heard from part-time mayors and village presidents and county commissioners and others who said: We would like to figure this out, how we might use these programs to support our communities, but we don't know whether we fit or under which definition we fit.

Well, we have one definition now, and that may sound simple, but, no, it was very hard. And Brandon deserves a tremendous amount of credit, along with our team, for getting us to that point.

Karla Thieman, who is not here at the moment, did a tremendous job on livestock, livestock disaster assistance, and efforts on the energy title. We thank her and wish she were able to be here to actually celebrate. I don't think she is, is she? No, she is not here, but we thank her so much.

Ben Becker made sure that we were communicating effectively with those in the media, that we were communicating what we were doing. He worked extremely hard to make sure that was happening.

Russ Behnam. We thank Russ so much for all his incredible work as we moved through these amendments and moved through this process. He was absolutely invaluable in his work as well.

We thank Hanna Abou-El-Seoud, who was a terrific part of our team, and Maureen James, Alexis Stanczuk, Ryan Hocker, and Jesse Williams, our chief clerk, Nicole Hertenstein, Jacob Chaney, Seth Buchsbaum, and Alvaro Zarco. They are a terrific team, each one of them playing a very important role in getting us to this point and helping me have the information I needed, making sure things were getting done and the team was able to come together.

We had two great fellows, Lauren Reid and Matt Eldred, whom we thank as well. Also, we thank all of the great interns we have had with us since we began this process: Ryan Smoes, Jasmine Macies, Dawn Lucas, and Seth Collins.

This really is a team effort, with an extraordinary breadth of jurisdiction under this bill that created the need to really make sure we had the smartest people in the room, and I really believe we achieved that with this great team.

Also, I couldn't have gotten it done without my great chief of staff, Amanda Renteria, and the great role she played with Chris Adamo putting together our great agriculture team, and Todd Wooten, legislative director, who was on the phone counting votes every moment right up until the final vote. He did such a great job in bringing that together.

Bill Sweeney, my deputy chief of staff, made sure we were communicating in the right way, being able to tell the story of what it means to have a farm bill, what it means to people back home, to every family, every business, and every farmer. He did an extraordinary job of helping me do that.

Cullen Schwarz, who is a terrific communications director, made sure we were communicating effectively what we were doing and why we were doing it.

I also wish to thank our team in Michigan, led by Teresa Plachetka, a wonderful team that made sure we were focused, as I always am, on Michigan. Our great team consists of Mary Judnich, Kali Fox, and Brandon Fewins, who have done terrific work and outreach around the State, and Corey Hall in urban agriculture. All of our team made sure we were communicating at home with our growers.

We are proud to say we have more diversity of crops than any State but California, so I have always had to pay attention to every page. I have always kind of been jealous of folks who had to only pay attention to one title. We have had to pay attention to everything. The good news is that prepared me well for assuming the chair of the committee. But I do want to thank our Michigan staff because they are terrific as well.

This really is a bipartisan effort. It really, really is. And I have such respect and admiration for the staff of Senator ROBERTS on the committee, led by Mike Seyfert, Joel Leftwich, and Anne Hazlett. I thank them all so much for their terrific work and partnership. Everyone involved whom Senator ROBERTS spoke of is professional, smart, and dedicated. We had some tough things we had to work through, both policy-wise and procedurally, and they were terrific, just absolutely magnificent, and I am very grateful for the wonderful way in which we really have a team. It is not a Democratic team or a Republican team—we have a team.

I also wish to briefly mention our CBO farm team, whom we kept up late at night many times as we tried to get scores and work through how we fit this all together and maintain over \$23 billion in deficit reduction. So Doug Elmendorf and his terrific team—Jim Langley, Greg Hitz, Dave Hull, Kathleen FitzGerald, Emily Holcombe, Ann Futrell, Dan Hoople, and Jeff LaFave—we call them the farm team—have been magnificent and worked weekends, have gone above and beyond for us, and I thank them, with a shout-out to everybody at CBO who has helped us.

I thank Michelle Johnson-Wieder and Gary Endicott from Legislative Counsel for their invaluable assistance. And on Senator REID's staff, I thank Kasey Gillette and Nathan Engle. I claim Kasey as my former staff person, so I told Senator REID that I trained her well. But we are very grateful for the incredible team effort there.

All our floor staff, Gary Myrick, Tim Mitchell, David Krone, Bill Dauster, Reema Dodin, Stacy Rich, Meredith Melody, and everyone involved on the majority team who was so absolutely essential to us, putting in very long days and getting this done—everybody hung in there with us, and we are grateful.

Finally, let me mention the Secretary of Agriculture, Tom Vilsack, and the USDA Office of General Counsel. We had a lot of technical needs as we worked through this bill, a tremendous need for technical assistance and support, so that when we were done, as we completed the bill, it actually worked for farmers and ranchers, it worked from a Department standpoint to support farmers and ranchers and those involved in every part of this bill, and we received tremendous help and encouragement and support. So I thank them for their leadership.

To all the members of the Agriculture Committee, Democrats and Republicans, and their staffs, I wish to say how very lucky I am to have such a tremendous team who is so knowledgeable and has so much experience and a committee that has so much experience. It has been quite amazing.

So as I conclude, Madam President, I would just say this is a proud day for those who care about having the Senate work together well, for producing a product that is one that has real reforms in it and something that we can look to the American people with pride and say: We worked hard, we worked together, and we got the job done.

I thank everyone, and now we look forward to working with our House colleagues as they move this measure forward.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that I be allowed to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAXMAGEDDON

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I rise to express my growing concern as massive tax increases loom on the horizon, and yet the Senate has not taken a single vote to forestall what many are appropriately calling taxmageddon.

Washington tends to be a place where people speak in hyperbole, but it is hard to overstate the magnitude of the tax increases that will hit our economy starting next year if we do not act. If Congress does not vote to extend the current income-tax rates, the lower tax rates on investment income, relief from the alternative minimum tax, relief from the Federal estate tax, and other expiring tax relief measures, the result will be a tax increase of more than \$470 billion on Americans in 2013 alone.

Over the next 10 years this tax increase will result in nearly \$4.5 trillion in new taxes on American families and entrepreneurs. This will be the largest tax increase in our Nation's history in absolute dollars and the second largest tax increase since World War II as a percentage of our economy. This massive tax increase does not even take into account the new taxes enacted as part of ObamaCare that will also go into effect in 2013 and that will impose an additional \$23 billion in higher taxes on individuals and businesses.

What will these taxes mean to the average American family? The Heritage Foundation recently published a study that estimated the increase per tax return in every State. In my State of South Dakota, Heritage estimates that the average tax increase per tax return will be \$3,187 in 2013.

I would say this to my Democratic friends who generally believe in demand-driven Keynesian economics: The average family in South Dakota can do more to stimulate our economy and create new employment by keeping their \$3,187 and spending it as they see fit, not as Washington sees fit to spend it on their behalf.

Taxmageddon is an apt description when we consider the impact of these tax increases not just on individual families but on our entire economy. Until recently we could speculate about the impact of these tax increases on our fragile economy, but the magnitude of the damage was not in dispute. Not anymore.

Last month, the Congressional Budget Office gave us the most definitive estimate yet of the impact of the nearly \$½ trillion of tax increases in 2013 when combined with the more than \$100 billion of spending cuts from the sequester.

The Congressional Budget Office projects that the combination of massive tax increases and the sequester will result in real GDP growth in calendar year 2013 of only one-half of 1 percent. The picture is even bleaker when we consider that the Congressional Budget Office also projects that the economy will actually contract by 1.3 percent in the first half of 2013. According to the CBO, such a contraction and output in the first half of 2013 would “probably be judged to be a recession.”

So let's be clear about what “taxmageddon” means. We are not talking about a slight slowdown in growth of a few tenths of a percent. What we are facing is the difference between positive growth on one hand—which will mean more jobs and higher incomes—and a recession on the other hand.

How big is the difference in economic growth next year if we act to forestall the pending tax increases versus not doing anything about it? According to the Congressional Budget Office, if Congress acted to remove the tax increases and budget cuts, the growth of real GDP in 2013 would be in the range of 4.4 percent.

This sort of robust growth is a far cry from the lackluster economic performance that we have experienced of late. In fact, GDP growth for the first quarter of this year was recently revised downward to just 1.9 percent. This is hardly the magnitude of economic growth necessary to sustain a meaningful recovery that will finally bring the unemployment rate below 8 percent—something the current meager recovery has failed to accomplish.

We can, and must, do better. We can start by providing Americans some certainty as to what their taxes are going to be come next year. Fortunately, we learned recently that the House of Representatives intends to hold a vote on legislation to extend the existing tax rate next month. According to statements by House Speaker BOEHNER and Majority Leader CANTOR, the House is likely to consider a short-term—perhaps for 1 year—extension of existing tax rates as a bridge to fundamental tax reform next year.

Some may question why we need to vote on an extension of the tax rates now because they assume these tax issues can simply be dealt with as a part of the postelection lameduck session. The answer is that we need a vote now because the delay in extending current tax policy is having a very real impact on our economy today.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office again estimates that the mere possibility of pending tax increases and spending cuts will lower U.S. GDP by one-half of 1 percent in the second half of this year—not next year, this year. The reason for this is simple. Americans, whether they be investors, small business owners, or simply consumers, understand that they may have a larger tax bill come next year, meaning they will have less aftertax income. Faced with that possibility, we should not be surprised if Americans are choosing to consume less or put off business investments until they know what their tax situation is going to be.

Just this week there was a Bloomberg article entitled “Fiscal Cliff Concerns Hurting Economy As Companies Hold Back.” The article quoted a senior economist at Bank of America who said, “You don’t board up the windows when the hurricane is there. You board up the windows in anticipation.” This economist predicted U.S. growth decelerating to 1.3 percent in the third quarter of this year and 1 percent in the fourth quarter.

The moral of the story is clear. The sooner we act to extend the current tax rates, the better off our economy will be and the better off will be the 12.7 million Americans who are currently unemployed. The sooner we act, the better off will be the 5.4 million Americans who have been unemployed long term or the 46.2 million Americans living in poverty or the record 46 million Americans who receive food stamps.

I agree with President Obama when he said in August of 2009, “You don’t raise taxes in a recession.” End quote of President Obama in August of 2009.

If you should not raise taxes in a recession, it stands to reason you also should not raise taxes that will cause a recession. I also agree with a number of my Democratic colleagues quoted earlier this week in an article about these pending tax increases. I agree with Senator JIM WEBB, who is quoted as saying, “We shouldn’t raise taxes on ordinary income.” I agree with Senator BEN NELSON, “My druthers is to extend the tax cuts for everybody.”

I agree with former Senator Pete Domenici and former OMB Director Alice Rivlin, who appeared before the Finance Committee earlier this week, and who both agreed we need a short-term extension of current tax law in order to get us to a place where we can consider fundamental reforms to our Tax Code and our entitlement programs.

Even former President Bill Clinton, a major surrogate for the Obama campaign, admitted the obvious when he said recently that a short-term extension of the tax cuts might be necessary.

Former President Clinton and other Democratic Members whom I mentioned have not suddenly become supply-side tax cutters. But they realize it is simply common sense that with the economy slowing, the last thing the Congress should do is slam on the brakes by allowing massive tax increases.

We were reminded earlier this week just how destructive the proposed income tax rate increases would be on the sector of our economy responsible for the bulk of new job creation, and that is our small businesses. According to an analysis by the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation released on June 18, the tax increases that President Obama has proposed would hit more than half—53 percent, to be precise—of all flowthrough business income. The Joint Tax Committee estimates that 40,000 business owners would find themselves subject to higher tax rates next year.

Does anyone think, with unemployment above 8 percent for 41 straight months, that higher taxes on nearly a million business owners is the right policy? Yet that is exactly where we are headed if we do not act.

Of course, extending current tax law temporarily is only a short-term fix. What is needed is comprehensive tax reform, much like the Tax Reform Act of 1986. Real tax reform will drive economic growth higher, will lead to robust job creation, and result in more revenue to the Federal Government. But real tax reform will require Presidential leadership, something that has been unfortunately lacking over the past 3½ years. Perhaps next year we will have a President truly willing to commit to tax reform, a President who is not content with simply releasing a 23-page framework for corporate tax reform. But until we get to comprehensive tax reform, the least we can do now is ensure that Americans do not face a massive new tax hike.

In conclusion, we are facing a moment of truth. We can choose to put our heads in the sand and pretend as though Taxmageddon is not real, we can choose to accept slower economic growth for the remainder of this year and a recession in the first half of next year or we can choose to take action in a way that says, loudly and clearly to all Americans, now is not the time for a massive new tax increase.

I am hopeful we will see a bill from the House of Representatives in the coming weeks to extend the tax rates in order to avert Taxmageddon. If the Senate majority is serious in its rhetoric of getting our economy back on track, they will allow a straight up-or-down vote on this measure. Fundamental tax reform may need to wait until the next Congress, but we can and we should act immediately to forestall the looming tax increases that we know will throw this economy back into a recession. It is not a Republican or a Democratic thing to do, it is simply common sense. I am hopeful the Democratic majority will allow for debate and vote on an extension of the current tax rates sooner rather than later. Every day we wait is another day our economy suffers unnecessarily.

I do not have to tell anybody here, if you look at all the economic data that comes in month after month, we have the weakest economic recovery in 60 years. We have 23 million unemployed or underemployed Americans. We have, as I said, 41 consecutive months now of unemployment over 8 percent, and we have anemic, sluggish growth projections next year by the Congressional Budget Office if in fact we do not take the steps necessary to avert Taxmageddon.

I hope the House of Representatives will vote. I hope the U.S. Senate will follow suit. I hope the President of the United States will join us in recognizing that we cannot afford to allow taxes to go up—the largest tax increase in American history—on January 1 of next year.

We cannot wait until a lameduck session to address it, because every single day we do, Americans, investors, small businesses are putting off decisions about hiring, about putting their capital to work and growing this economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

DEBT AND TAXES

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, next week I will probably speak more about this. But looking at tax policy and debt and whatnot—I urge Senators to look at the article written by Walter Pincus in today’s Washington Post. The two wars we have been in, Iraq and Afghanistan—the two longest wars in America’s history—are noted not just for their length but for the fact that it is the only time America has gone to war where we have not had a special tax to pay for the war. In fact, it is the only time America has gone to war where we not only have not had a tax to pay

for the war but we have ended up with a tax cut, and we ended up trillions of dollars in debt as a result.

I hope we will come to the time that we will say—especially with wars of choice, these were not cases where we were attacked that there was a totally unnecessary war in Iraq—totally unnecessary. We went to war in Iraq and said we will put it on our credit card.

Of course, there were no weapons of mass destruction. Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11. A bad guy was running it, but there are a lot of countries we support with bad guys running them. There are \$1 trillion and thousands of American lives—tens of thousands of coalition and Iraqi lives—gone, and our children are going to have a \$1 trillion bill to pay for it and we got absolutely nothing out of it.

We went in Afghanistan to get Osama bin Laden. We got him. We have been stuck there for years—another \$1 trillion to beef up a corrupt government, and our children and grandchildren will be given the bill. Then we talk about what else can we do that we will not pay for? We should think about it. Let me speak now about a more positive thing.

AGRICULTURE REFORM

Earlier today, the Senate passed legislation to address one of the most significant legislative issues on our agenda this year—making needed reforms to our Nation's agriculture and food systems.

I have been both chairman and ranking member of the Agriculture Committee and I think I can say, probably as well as anybody here, how much thanks the U.S. Senate and the country owe to Chairwoman STABENOW and Ranking Member ROBERTS, who did what Senators are supposed to do. They worked together in a bipartisan way to advance the farm bill, the Agriculture Reform, Food and Jobs Act of 2012.

A lot of what people criticize about the Congress today would disappear if everyone acted the way Senator DEBBIE STABENOW of Michigan did, and Senator PAT ROBERTS of Kansas did, working across party lines, across ideologies, to try to put together a farm bill that is not a Democratic or Republican farm bill, but a farm bill for the United States of America. I am so proud of them.

I mentioned earlier today to Chairwoman STABENOW, I don't know how many times she called me weekends when I was at my home in Vermont, or sent me e-mails late in the evening, because she was trying to keep this coalition going.

The work of these leaders and the passage of this bill proves that the Senate can act in accordance with its greatest traditions and we can reach across the aisle to pass critical legislation that reflects compromise. As a former Chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and having worked closely with Senator LUGAR on many bipartisan Farm Bills, I know how difficult

the task can be of forging a comprehensive bill that addresses the many competing needs. I said earlier that Senator RICHARD LUGAR and I traded places back and forth, as either chairman or ranking member on that committee. We passed bipartisan farm bills. We worked closely together, with complete candor and honesty with each other, as one would expect from Senator LUGAR. We forged these comprehensive bills.

The Senate's action today could not have been accomplished without the hard work of many dedicated, wonderful staffers, mine and others, both here in Washington and back home in Vermont. Being such a large and far reaching bill there were many staff involved throughout its development and final passage. I would like to thank in particular Adrienne Wojciechowski, Michelle Lacko, Aaron Kaigle, Kathryn Toomajian, Kara Leene, Tom Berry, Chris Saunders, Emma Van Susteren, Ted Brady, Lauren Bracket, Nikole Manatt, Greg Cota, Will Goodman, Erica Chabot, and John Dowd from my staff.

I would also like to thank both the Chairwoman and Ranking Member's staff on the Senate Agriculture Committee who worked so closely with my office on many different issues and programs including the dairy reforms, conservation consolidation, nutrition, rural development, forestry, food aid, research, organics, energy, and the wonderful improvements we made to the Non-Insured Crop Disaster Assistance Program.

It is not easy to get what we have here, a strong bipartisan bill. So I rise to say I hope the House of Representatives will act swiftly to consider legislation that is going to allow us to move to conference. Because just as it was important to the U.S. Senate to get together and pass this bill by an overwhelming majority, the swift passage of this farm bill is essential. The current Farm Bill expires at the end of September. Before August 31, we must address the serious problem of dairy policy or our dairy farmers will be left without a vital safety net.

Dairy is a crucial industry in Vermont. I hear often from dairy farmers who are worried about the dangerous rollercoaster of price swings that impacts both producers and consumers. This is a roller coaster we have been on in dairy pricing in Vermont since January of 2000. How can any farmer stay in business if this is the way their prices go? How can they plan to buy new equipment? How can they plan to send their children to school? How can they plan to modernize their farm if they never know what day the price will be up, what day prices will be down?

I hear too often from dairy farmers who meet with me or talk to me when I am at the grocery store in Vermont, or just walking down the street. They tell me they are worried about the dangerous roller coaster of prices. These

swings impact both consumers and the producers.

For our farmers in Vermont, the dairy reforms included in the 2012 farm bill will bring some relief. We simply must free our dairy farmers from this destructive cycle of volatile price changes.

The current Federal safety net provides no protection for dairy farmers from this roller coaster of price volatility.

The 2009 dairy crisis brought plummeting milk prices and sky-high feed costs that combined to devastate dairy farmers in ways that many were unable to recover from. Many had to close down. Let's stop the roller coaster. Let's give stability to the hard-working men and women who are dairy farmers. Dairy farmers have come together to identify ways to move us away from the regional dairy fights and the constant policy conflicts between small and large farms. The results are the changes included in the 2012 Farm Bill, which will help farmers and consumers move away from these volatile price swings. Now we will have some protection.

The 2012 Farm Bill scraps outdated price supports and the Milk Income Loss Contract Program. It establishes a new risk management plan that protects farm income when margins shrink dangerously, and a stabilization program to allow farmers to take a proactive role in easing the instability in our dairy markets. And it accomplishes this at a lower cost than the current program that it replaces while contributing to the savings to this bill. It is a voluntary program, and can be tailored by the farmer to fit their individual needs.

Dairy is Vermont's largest agricultural commodity. Dairy products account for upward of 83 percent—or 90 percent depending on market prices—of Vermont's agricultural products sales. I am proud the dairy farmers of Vermont have had a voice in developing this farm bill, and enacting it is going to bring long-needed relief to the industry.

I hope that the House can now come together in a bipartisan way, just as we did in the Senate, to quickly pass a bipartisan Farm Bill. Republicans and Democrats alike came together in this body, so surely it can be done. We know the impact of this legislation goes well beyond our farms and forests to our economy, our families, and our kitchen tables.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO GOVERNOR GASTON CAPERTON

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate former West Virginia Gov. Gaston Caperton on 30 years of outstanding leadership as the president of the College Board.

It is my privilege to honor Governor Caperton, a native of Charleston, WV, for his leadership in the field of education. Governor Caperton's own childhood experience instilled in him the importance of education at a very young age. As a child who struggled with dyslexia, he was able to overcome the hurdles he faced in the classroom and truly achieve educational excellence. He earned his bachelor's degree in business from the University of North Carolina and has taught at prestigious institutions, including Harvard and Columbia University. He also holds 10 honorary doctoral degrees.

Governor Caperton returned to the great State of West Virginia and served as Governor from 1989 to 1997. During his two terms in office, Governor Caperton made education a top priority and improved the lives of thousands of West Virginia students. He supported an \$800 million school renovation program that directly benefited two-thirds of West Virginia's public school students, facilitating classroom upgrades and additional renovations in all of our schools. Governor Caperton has been recognized nationally for working to upgrade our State's classroom technology to keep West Virginia students competitive in an increasingly global economy. In addition, he helped raise teacher salaries from 49th place to 31st place in the Nation.

Governor Caperton's leadership in education left a lasting legacy in our State, and I am so proud of the work he did for West Virginia schools and all of our students.

In 1999 Gaston Caperton was appointed the eighth president of the College Board. Over the past 13 years Governor Caperton has done such important work to make higher education available to a greater number of students, especially those from underserved areas, and that is truly something of which to be proud. No matter their background, we need to do all we can to help our students achieve a higher level of education if we are going to create the jobs and train the workforce that makes America the greatest Nation in the world.

Since 1999 the College Board has reached a total of 23,000 high schools and 3,800 colleges and has served 7 million students and parents. The organization continues to provide college preparatory materials and has dramatically changed college entrance exams. In addition, the College Board has enabled students' enrollment in advanced placement courses, and Governor Caperton is responsible for more than tripling the number of students from low-income backgrounds taking AP courses.

Governor Caperton has continued to be a champion for students as he sup-

ports financial aid policies and programs, while advocating for tuition equity. From his tenure as Governor, to his work at Harvard and Columbia Universities, to his 13 years of leadership at the College Board, providing equal opportunities in the classroom has been the driving force behind Gaston Caperton's career. I am proud to honor this outstanding West Virginian and recognize his achievements in the field of education. I am also extremely proud to call him my friend, as do most all West Virginians.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG ABUSE

Mr. President, I also rise today to express my deep concern and my disappointment that the special interest groups who have a vested financial interest have derailed a strong effort to fight prescription drug abuse. It is an epidemic that is devastating communities all across this Nation. They got their victory—but not at my expense. The people who will pay the price are the young boys and girls in communities all across this Nation who are seeing their families and their schools and their neighborhoods wrecked by abuse and addiction.

What my amendment would do is simply this: It would require patients to get a new prescription to get their pills refilled. What we have right now in trying to schedule hydrocodone from a schedule III to a schedule II is the ease of availability and the prescriptions that are being refilled without any visits to their doctors. It is of an epidemic proportion. The pills would have to be stored and transported more securely, and traffickers would be subject to increased fines and penalties.

I am not trying to put anyone out of business. In fighting for this amendment, I asked anyone and everyone who was opposed to come to see me, and if we could find a way to work together, we would do that. We tried to accommodate the groups who were worried about additional administrative costs, such as new security requirements for storing hydrocodone, or additional paperwork that would come as a result of rescheduling. But at the end of the day these groups seemed more concerned with their business plans and the ability to sell more pills than the responsibility we all have to protect the future of this country and the future of the generation we are counting on to lead and defend this country.

Since the moment the Senate adopted my hydrocodone rescheduling amendment, lobbyists have been turning out in droves to fight this effort to limit people's ability to get pills too easily and abuse them. Yesterday these lobbyists got a victory when the House of Representatives passed a compromise version of the FDA bill that does not contain my amendment, and I assume the Senate will do the same.

Just a few weeks ago it was a different story. I was so proud when the Senate unanimously adopted this amendment because this is a problem

that affects every single Member in every single State. I don't know of a person in this country who doesn't have somebody in their immediate family, extended family, or a close friend who has not been affected by the abuse of prescription drugs. Where I come from, that is an epidemic. It is an epidemic we all have and we all are facing. In fact, prescription drug abuse is responsible for about 75 percent of drug-related deaths in the United States and 90 percent in my State of West Virginia. According to the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy, prescription drug abuse is the fastest growing drug problem in the United States, and it is claiming the lives of thousands of Americans every day.

I understand that limiting access to hydrocodone pills doesn't necessarily fit into the model of selling more product, but I also understand this: We have a responsibility to this Nation and, most importantly, to the next generation to win the war on drugs.

I have been a businessperson all of my life. I understand that in business one has to have a good business plan to be successful. One should also have the ability to alter that plan when necessary, while still being successful. I assure my colleagues that this is one of those necessary times. The health of our country and the public good are at stake.

I am hearing on a daily basis from people and businesses—small, medium-sized, and large—that are having a hard time finding qualified workers—qualified workers who can pass a drug test.

We have folks who cannot get the type of education they need to be part of the workforce of the 21st century because they are drug impaired.

I have been in Washington a short time compared to some of my colleagues, but I have been here long enough to know the pressures Members face around here when special interest groups get entrenched—it is no different in the Presiding Officer's beautiful State of Delaware and my State of West Virginia—and it does not look like my amendment will go into this bill. But I can assure you, it will not go away and neither will the problem of drug abuse. I am determined to see this thing through. This measure will pass. It might not be this year, it might not be next year, but I assure you it will pass.

Until we do something, there are going to be families who are separated and torn apart because of drug abuse and little kids who come to me and the Chair and plead for help because their daddy is addicted or their mother is hooked on drugs or they have had a brother or a sister or a friend who has overdosed or died.

I do not pretend this amendment will solve the entire problem of prescription drug abuse. But when every law enforcement agency—listen, every law enforcement agency in America, every

one of them to a T, which we rely on to fight the war on drugs—has supported this amendment openly and spoken out loudly and clearly that it would help them tremendously, I do not know how we can ignore this problem much longer.

The fact is we must act. I can assure you that working together, as we do, we will find a way to move forward with this vital piece of legislation.

I promise the Presiding Officer this: I will continue to fight this war on drugs with him, and I urge all my colleagues to do the same. This is a war we cannot afford to lose.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. I thank the Chair.

A SECOND OPINION

Mr. President, I come to the floor to do what I have done week after week since the health care bill was signed into law by President Obama, to offer a doctor's second opinion about the health care law, a law that I believe is bad for patients, bad for providers—the nurses and the doctors who take care of those patients—and I believe it is terrible for the American taxpayers.

I come to the floor because the Supreme Court is soon going to rule on the constitutionality of the President's health care law.

The Court's decision will revolve around, primarily, the individual mandate, the component of the law requiring all individuals to purchase not just health insurance but government-approved health insurance.

Never in the history of this country has the Federal Government required individuals to purchase a product, to come into our homes and tell us we must buy a government-approved product. Why? Simply because we happen to be a citizen of the United States.

The American people are not happy with this mandate. As a matter of fact, a recent Gallup poll found that 72 percent of Americans believe the mandate is unconstitutional. The results of the Gallup poll, however, are not surprising.

As I travel across Wyoming, I hear constantly from people who are opposed to the mandate.

It is not just the mandate they are opposed to. But, specifically, the mandate is what brings people all across the country together to be opposed to the law.

It is interesting when I go and have meetings and talk to folks. I will ask them: Under the President's health care law—remember, the one where he promised insurance rates would drop by \$2,500 per family—how many of you actually believe your own insurance rates will go up, and every hand goes up.

Then, when I ask: How many of you think the quality and availability of care for you and your family is going to go down, again, the hands go up.

It is not just the mandate; it is the entire health care law that is a prob-

lem for patients and providers and the taxpayers.

But the mandate is interesting. I bring this to the attention of the Senate because President Obama, at one point, was opposed to the mandate. When he was running for President, during his campaign for the White House, then the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Obama, quipped: "If a mandate was the solution, we can try to solve homelessness by mandating everybody to buy a house."

Now the President's tune has obviously changed.

I believe the mandate is unconstitutional. I believe if the Court strikes down the mandate, the rest of the law should also be found unconstitutional.

During the health care debate 2 years ago, supporters of the law repeatedly stated—repeatedly stated—that the mandate was an essential component of the law. So let's review what folks have said.

Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius and Attorney General Eric Holder, in an op-ed in the Washington Post, wrote: "Without an individual responsibility provision"—is what they called the individual mandate—the law "doesn't work."

The law "doesn't work."

Former Speaker NANCY PELOSI also came to this same conclusion. In two separate blog posts, she stated that without the individual mandate, the math, she said, behind the health care law does not work.

The current chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS, also came to this same conclusion during the debate on the health care law.

During a committee hearing, Chairman BAUCUS stated that allowing individuals to opt out of the individual mandate would "strike at the heart of health care reform."

Finally, Senate Democrats in their amicus curiae brief filed with the Supreme Court argued that the individual mandate is an "integral part" of the health care law.

It seems to me that supporters of the law from the very beginning of this debate recognized that without the individual mandate, the rest of the health care law would need to go away.

Now it seems Washington Democrats are changing their tune and coming to a different conclusion.

In a story published by the Associated Press on June 18 of this year, it was reported that "the Obama Administration plans to move ahead with major parts of the President's health care law if its most controversial provision"—obviously, the individual mandate—"does not survive." In fact, an anonymous, high-level Democratic official declared that the administration would move "full speed ahead" with implementation of the health care law.

It seems the administration only views the mandate as essential when it is politically convenient.

As I have stated many times before, I believe the entire health care law

needs to be completely repealed and replaced. This law does not address runaway health care spending, it increases taxes, and it hurts job creation at a time of 8.2 percent unemployment across the country, at a time when college graduates are moving back home because they cannot find work, when people are underemployed, people have given up looking for work. Yet the health care law adds to the costs and adds to the uncertainty of these uncertain times and a weak economy.

The American people want a healthy economy, and this health care law is making it worse. If the law's individual mandate is struck down, the President should not implement whatever is left standing. Instead, he should work with Congress—both sides of the aisle—to implement commonsense, step-by-step reforms that will actually lower the cost of health care for all Americans.

It seems to be lost on many that the original goal of health care reform was actually to lower the cost of care. It is what the President talked about in his initial speech to the joint session of Congress. But it is something that was ignored when the 2,700-page health care law was presented to Congress and the American people.

Americans know what they want. They know what they have been looking for in a health care law, and this is not it. Americans deserve a law that helps them get the care they need, from the doctor they choose—not that the government chooses, not that the insurance company chooses: the doctor they choose—and at lower cost.

I yield the floor.

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. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DURBIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION SAFETY AND INNOVATION ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House with respect to S. 3187.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 3187) entitled "An Act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and medical devices, to establish user-fee programs for generic drugs and biosimilars, and for other purposes," do pass with an amendment.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to concur in the House amendment to S. 3187, and ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Reid motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 3187, the FDA Safety and Innovation Act.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Kent Conrad, Jack Reed, Christopher A. Coons, Mark Begich, John F. Kerry, Charles E. Schumer, Barbara A. Mikulski, Benjamin L. Cardin, Robert Menendez, Joseph I. Lieberman, Mary L. Landrieu, Richard Blumenthal, Patty Murray, Tom Carper.

AMENDMENT NO. 2461

Mr. REID. I move to concur in the House amendment to S. 3187 with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to concur in the House amendment to S. 3187 with an amendment numbered 2461.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following new section: SEC. ____.

This Act shall become effective 5 days after enactment.

Mr. REID. I now ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2462 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2461

Mr. REID. I now have a second-degree amendment at the desk I wish to be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 2462 to amendment No. 2461.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "5 days" and insert "4 days".

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2463

Mr. REID. I have a motion to refer the House message to the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee with instructions to report back forthwith, with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to refer the House message to the Senate

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 2463.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following new section: SEC. ____.

This Act shall become effective 3 days after enactment.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2464

Mr. REID. I have an amendment to my instructions that is also at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 2464 to the instructions of the motion to refer.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "3 days" and insert "2 days".

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2465 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2464

Mr. REID. I have a second-degree amendment to my instructions that are at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 2465 to amendment No. 2464.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "2 days" and insert "1 day".

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived with respect to the cloture motion that has just been filed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business and that Senators be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, today is the culmination of several days of activities across the Nation in recognition of the oldest known observance of the ending of slavery—"Juneteenth Independence Day".

It was in June of 1865, that the Union soldiers landed in Galveston, TX, with the news that the war had ended and that slavery finally had come to an end in the United States. This was 2½ years after President Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, which was issued on January 1, 1863, and months after the conclusion of the Civil War.

This week and specifically on June 19, when slaves in the Southwest finally learned of the end of slavery, the descendants of slaves have observed this anniversary of emancipation as a remembrance of one of the most tragic periods of our Nation's history. The suffering, degradation and brutality of slavery cannot be repaired, but the memory can serve to ensure that no such inhumanity is ever perpetrated again on American soil.

I was very pleased that on June 19 of this week the Senate unanimously adopted a resolution, S. Res. 496, recognizing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day to the Nation. The resolution, which I sponsored along with Senators HUTCHISON, CARDIN, LANDRIEU, CORNYN, SHERROD BROWN, BOXER, STABENOW, HARKIN, BEGICH, DURBIN, WICKER, LEAHY, BILL NELSON, CASEY, WARNER, AKAKA, WEBB, LAUTENBERG, GILLIBRAND, and SCHUMER expresses support for the observance of Juneteenth Independence Day, and recognizes the faith and strength of character demonstrated by former slaves, that remains an example for all people of the United States, regardless of background or race.

All across America we also celebrate the many important achievements of former slaves and their descendants. We do so because in 1926, Dr. Carter G. Woodson, son of former slaves, proposed such a recognition as a way of preserving the history of African Americans and recognizing the enormous contributions of a people of great strength, dignity, faith, and conviction—a people who rendered their achievements for the betterment and advancement of a Nation once lacking in humanity towards them. Every February, nationwide, we celebrate African American History Month. And, every year on June 19, we celebrate "Juneteenth Independence Day."

Lerone Bennett, Jr., writer, scholar, lecturer, and acclaimed Executive Editor for several decades at Ebony Magazine, has reflected on the life and times of Dr. Woodson. Bennett tells us that one of the most inspiring and instructive stories in African American history is the story of Woodson's struggle and rise from the coal mines of West Virginia to the summit of academic achievement:

At 17, the young man who was called by history to reveal Black history was an untutored coal miner. At 19, after teaching himself the fundamentals of English and arithmetic, he entered high school and mastered the four-year curriculum in less than two years. At 22, after two-thirds of a year at Berea College [in Kentucky], he returned to the coal mines and studied Latin and Greek

between trips to the mine shafts. He then went on to the University of Chicago, where he received his bachelor's and master's degrees, and Harvard University, where he became the second Black to receive a doctorate in history. The rest is history—Black history.

In keeping with the spirit and the vision of Dr. Carter G. Woodson, I would like to pay tribute to two courageous women, claimed by my home State of Michigan, who played significant roles in addressing American injustice and inequality. These are two women of different times who would change the course of history.

The contributions of Sojourner Truth, who helped lead our country out of the dark days of slavery, and Rosa Parks whose dignified leadership sparked the Montgomery Bus Boycott and the start of the civil rights movement are indelibly etched in the chronicle of the history of this Nation. Moreover, they are viewed with distinction and admiration throughout the world.

Sojourner Truth, though unable to read or write, was considered one of the most eloquent and noted spokespersons of her day on the inhumanity and immorality of slavery. She was a leader in the abolitionist movement, and a ground breaking speaker on behalf of equality for women. Michigan has honored her with the dedication of the Sojourner Truth Memorial Monument, which was unveiled in Battle Creek, MI, on September 25, 1999. In April 2009, Sojourner Truth became the first African American woman to be memorialized with a bust in the U.S. Capitol. The ceremony to unveil Truth's likeness was appropriately held in Emancipation Hall at the Capitol Visitor's Center. I was pleased to cosponsor the legislation to make this fitting tribute possible. Sojourner Truth lived in Washington, DC for several years, helping slaves who had fled from the South and appearing at women's suffrage gatherings. She returned to Battle Creek in 1875, and remained there until her death in 1883. Sojourner Truth spoke from her heart about the most troubling issues of her time. A testament to Truth's convictions is that her words continue to speak to us today.

On May 4, 1999, legislation was enacted which authorized the President of the United States to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Rosa Parks. I was pleased to coauthor this tribute to Rosa Parks—the gentle warrior who decided that she would no longer tolerate the humiliation and demoralization of racial segregation on a bus. I was also pleased to be a part of the effort to direct the Architect of the Capitol to commission a statue of Rosa Parks, which will soon be placed in the U.S. Capitol, making her the second African American woman to receive such an honor.

Her personal bravery and self-sacrifice are remembered with reverence and respect by us all. Over 55 years ago, in Montgomery, AL, the modern civil rights movement began when Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat

and move to the back of the bus. The strength and spirit of this courageous woman captured the consciousness of not only the American people, but the entire world. The boycott which Rosa Parks began was the start of an American revolution that elevated the status of African Americans nationwide and introduced to the world a young leader who would one day have a national holiday declared in his honor, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. In addition, the overwhelming majority of my colleagues in the Senate joined me in sponsoring legislation authorizing the Congressional Gold Medal to be presented to Dr. King, posthumously, and Coretta Scott King in recognition of their contributions to the Nation. Companion legislation was led in the House by Representative JOHN LEWIS.

We have come a long way toward achieving justice and equality for all. We still however have work to do. In the names of Rosa Parks, Sojourner Truth, Dr. Carter G. Woodson, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and many others, let us rededicate ourselves to continuing the struggle of civil rights and human rights.

Mr. President, I was also pleased to join Senator HUTCHISON and other Members of the Senate this week, in sponsoring another measure introduced on June 19th in recognition of Juneteenth Independence Day, which will require further action in the Senate. It is a Joint Resolution, S.J. Res. 45, requesting the President to issue a proclamation each year designating Juneteenth Independence Day as a National Day of Observance, encouraging Americans of all races, creeds, and ethnic backgrounds to celebrate freedom and the end of slavery in the United States.

In closing, I would like to commend the Juneteenth directors and event coordinators throughout my State of Michigan. They have worked tirelessly in the planning of intergenerational activities in observance of Juneteenth, heading up a wide range of activities over several days in Detroit, Flint, Holland, Lansing, Saginaw, and other areas around the State.

EPA EMISSION STANDARDS RULE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, on December 21, 2011, the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, finalized the mercury and air toxics standards, MATS, rule for powerplants. These standards, which will be fully in effect in 2016, will require coal-fired powerplants to install pollution controls for mercury and toxic air pollution. When fully implemented, the MATS for powerplants will reduce mercury emissions from powerplants by 90 percent, acid gases by 88 percent, and particulate emissions, including nonmercury toxic metals, by 41 percent. Senator INHOFE'S S.J. Res. 37 would disapprove and nullify this rule and, more importantly, make it impossible for the EPA to im-

plement substantially similar rules in the future.

The State of Maine, located at the end of our Nation's "air pollution tailpipe," is on the receiving end of pollution emissions from coal-fired powerplants operating in other States. The pollution reductions required under the rule will improve public health and improve the environment in our State. That is why I will vote to uphold the clean air rule that requires coal-fired powerplants to install pollution controls.

While legitimate concerns have been raised that additional compliance time and more cost-effective options are needed, I have significant concerns with overturning this rule and permanently barring the EPA from issuing any standards in the future that are substantially similar. I will push the EPA to work with utilities to develop reasonable implementation schedules.

Reductions in air pollutants from other States will reduce air pollution in Maine, which has one of the highest asthma rates in the Nation, affecting 1 in 10 adults and over 25,000 children. The EPA estimates that the MATS will prevent 130,000 cases of childhood asthma symptoms.

Every State in the country has issued mercury advisories for human fish consumption because of high levels of mercury in our Nation's streams, lakes, and rivers, and half of U.S. manmade mercury comes from coal-fired powerplants. Mercury is one of the most persistent and dangerous pollutants, particularly harmful to children and pregnant women, and it threatens our health and environment today. Under the new rule, 90 percent of this mercury would be removed. I am a longtime supporter of efforts to reduce mercury pollution and have sponsored legislation to establish a nationwide mercury monitoring system to accurately measure mercury levels.

The rule also includes standards for 186 other hazardous pollutants, including arsenic, acid gases, and toxic metals. Additionally, the equipment installed to control these pollutants will not only reduce these hazardous air pollutants but also capture fine particles, which are linked to cardiovascular and respiratory diseases.

I am a longtime supporter of Clean Air Act protections. This landmark legislation, authored by Maine's own Senator Ed Muskie more than 40 years ago, has helped protect and improve our Nation's air quality and public health for decades.

I also support sensible regulatory reforms and have introduced legislation that calls for Federal agencies to analyze the cost and benefits of proposed regulations, including the impact on job creation and consumer prices. This will help cut the tangle of redtape that is holding businesses back from expanding and adding jobs. But when it comes to the air we breathe, I reject the false choice of pitting the environment against the economy because we

understand that for much of the State of Maine, the environment is the economy.

The people of Maine have always been faithful stewards of our environment because we understand its tremendous value to our way of life. Maine's unique forests, landscapes, waters, and wildlife are an important part of our heritage and have helped shape the economic, environmental, and recreational character of our entire State. Protecting our Nation's air quality will positively benefit the natural beauty of Maine and will improve public health, protecting our children and enriching lives.

BICENTENNIAL OF THE WAR OF 1812

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the bicentennial celebration of the War of 1812. The U.S. Congress declared war on Great Britain 200 years ago this week. The State of Maryland is proud of its contributions to this "Second War for Independence," which reinforced United States sovereignty and gave birth to our national anthem.

A generation after the United States declared its independence from Great Britain, the mercantilist ties between the two countries were not fully severed. The British impressed American merchant seamen, enforced illegal and unfair trade regulations, colluded with certain Native American tribes to attack frontier settlements, and attempted to block westward expansion. The United States declared war to assert autonomy over its own affairs once again, establish free trade, protect sailors' rights, and ensure that our Nation could prosper from sea to shining sea.

President James Madison eloquently outlined these reasons 200 years ago when he called on "all the good people of the United States, as they love their country, as they value the precious heritage derived from the virtue and valor of their fathers . . . [to] exert themselves in preserving order, in promoting concord, in maintaining the authority and efficacy of the laws, and in supporting and invigorating all the measures which may be adopted by the constituted authorities for obtaining a speedy, a just, and an honorable peace."

The contributions of the U.S. Navy were instrumental in repelling the British during the War of 1812. The U.S. Navy hardly had a dozen warships compared to the hundreds of ships comprising the British fleet. British ships were undermanned, however, while well-trained and talented officers and seamen took command of American ships. These men were largely from coastal States, like Maryland, and were accustomed to seafaring. COMO Matthew Perry took on the British Navy on Lake Erie in 1813 with a scrappy fleet of light ships. Even though his force was seemingly decimated by the

British, Commodore Perry resorted to paddling a rowboat with a banner that read "Don't Give up the Ship." He then boarded the Niagara, double-loaded the carronades, and sailed directly into the British line, ultimately claiming victory.

The following summer, in 1814, the British Navy sailed up the Chesapeake Bay to attack our Nation's capital and seize the valuable port city of Baltimore. The British dealt heavy blows to Washington, DC, setting both the U.S. Capitol and the White House ablaze. British forces then moved toward Baltimore. Citizens of Baltimore, including free Blacks, quickly mobilized to protect their city. Barricades stretching more than 1 mile long were constructed to protect the harbor, hulls were sunk to impede navigation, and a chain of masts was erected across the harbor entrance. When the British fleet approached Baltimore at North Point, Marylanders fought the British Army and helped repulse the British Navy from Fort McHenry during the Battle of Baltimore. It is important to note that American forces during the Battle of North Point were volunteer militia, heavily outnumbered by the highly trained British infantry, but managed to delay the British forces long enough for 10,000 American reinforcements to arrive, preventing a land attack against Baltimore. Following 25 hours of intense British naval bombardment at Fort McHenry, the American defenders refused to yield, and the British were forced to depart.

During the bombardment, American lawyer Francis Scott Key, who was being held on board an American flag-of-truce vessel in Baltimore Harbor, took notice of the American flag still flying atop Fort McHenry. Key realized then that the Americans had survived the battle and stopped the enemy advance. He was so moved by the sight of the American flag flying following the horrific bombardment, he composed a poem called "The Defense of Fort McHenry," which was published in the *Baltimore Patriot and Advertiser* newspaper later that year. This poem, and later the song, inspired love of country among the American people and not only helped usher in the "era of good feelings" immediately after the war, but became a timeless reminder of American resolve. "The Star Spangled Banner" officially became our National Anthem in 1931. The flag that flew over Fort McHenry and inspired this anthem is now a national treasure on display at the Smithsonian Institution, a very short distance from where we are today.

The War of 1812 confirmed the legitimacy of the Revolution and served as a critical test for the U.S. Constitution and newly established democratic government. Our young Nation battled against the largest, most powerful military on the Earth at that time and emerged with an enhanced standing among the countries of the world, both militarily and diplomatically. The U.S.

economy was freed of its dependence on British goods, which unleashed domestic manufacturing and spawned the industrial revolution. The U.S. Navy proved its worth and the U.S. Congress rewarded the Navy with funding for a permanent, more expansive fleet. A new generation of Americans too young to remember Lord Cornwallis's surrender at Yorktown, which effectively ended the Revolutionary War, and an older generation proud of defending American independence twice in their lifetimes, were inspired by Francis Scott Key's words, which embody our universal feelings of patriotism and courage.

As a Marylander, I am proud of the contributions of my State in the War of 1812 and I have been involved in legislative efforts to bring greater attention to this bicentennial celebration. My colleague, Representative DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, and I sponsored the Commemorative Coin Act, which President Obama signed into law in August 2010, directing the U.S. Mint to create coins commemorating this important anniversary. These gold and silver coin designs are emblematic of the War of 1812, particularly the Battle of Baltimore that inspired our National Anthem. The coins are on sale this year only and the surcharges from these commemorative coins will provide support to the Maryland War of 1812 Bicentennial Commission to conduct activities, assist in educational outreach, and preserve sites and structures relating to the War of 1812.

I am proud that Maryland will lead the Star-Spangled 200 celebration, a 3-year celebration that just began with Baltimore's "Sailabration" this past weekend. The Navy's Blue Angels treated spectators to dazzling air shows; the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra premiered the "Overture for 2012," composed by Philip Glass; and dozens of tall ships and naval warships from around the world anchored in the Inner Harbor, open for public tours. Through 2014, Maryland will host numerous events along the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail and at Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine to celebrate the bicentennial. This commemoration is an opportunity to showcase to the world that Maryland is an exceptional place to live, work, and visit.

I am also proud that the U.S. Senate unanimously adopted a resolution I sponsored to mark the bicentennial, to celebrate the heroism of the American people during the conflict, and to recognize the various organizations involved in the bicentennial celebration, including the U.S. Armed Forces, the National Park Service, and the Maryland War of 1812 Bicentennial Commission. As we recognize all of these ongoing efforts during this commemorative period, I encourage all Americans to remember the sacrifice of those who gave their lives to defend our nation's freedom and democracy in its infancy, and to join in the bicentennial celebration of our victory in the War of 1812.

UNIQUE SIGNIFICANCE OF SHELburne FARMS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Vermont boasts many gems that draw visitors to our Green Mountains. Among them is Shelburne Farms, known to many Vermonters—and many visitors to Vermont—for its work on historic preservation, agriculture, sustainability, and nutrition. And so it was with great interest and appreciation that I read an article about the Farm's caretakers in the Burlington Free Press.

I have been proud of the work Alec Webb and his wife, Megan Camp, have done at Shelburne Farms for the last many years. Through their leadership, Shelburne Farms has become a first-rate educational hub, promoting environmental conservation, food education and agriculture sustainability. The partnerships initiated by Alec and Megan with the National Park Service Conservation Studies Institute and with the University of Vermont Center for Sustainable Agriculture have furthered these goals.

Today, Shelburne Farms is a National Historic Landmark, a distinction I was proud to help secure in 2001 because they earned it. During this week's debate on the Farm Bill, I think it is fitting to highlight the important work being done at Shelburne Farms. Others can take a page from their successful playbook as we explore ways to bolster our green economy, put food on Americans' tables, and promote the environmental stewardship that continues to protect our farm lands and environment.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this article, "A Vision Realized," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Burlington Free Press, June 16, 2012]

A VISION REALIZED

ALEC WEBB IS LIVING—AND MANAGING—A
VISION HE RETURNED HOME TO CREATE
(By Sally Pollak)

SHELburne.—The summer Alec Webb turned 18, he ran his first camp. He pitched a tent in a field in his backyard—it was a big yard, about 1,000 acres—and camped out for six weeks with kids from Labrador, the Bronx, and a Cambridge, Mass., housing project. There were a couple of locals, too.

"It was a funky group of urban and rural kids," said Webb, who will turn 60 next month. It was the summer of 1970 and Webb, now president of Shelburne Farms, was a recent high school graduate. He had left Groton School, a prep school outside Boston, spring semester of his senior year and moved back home. Webb spent his last semester at the Shaker Mountain School, an alternative school in Burlington, where he earned credit to graduate from Groton.

"Instead of going abroad, I went to Burlington," Webb joked.

He left Groton because the school had become, to him, irrelevant.

"It was the '60s and that (Groton) environment didn't feel relevant to what was going on in the world," Webb said. "I wanted to be in an environment that was more real, more connected to what was going on in the world.

A place that was engaged with more meaningful social issues." In that context, Webb pitched a tent, built a campfire, and invited kids over. The campers even spent a solo night in the field, grown-up free (if you can call Webb, a newly minted 18-year-old, a grown-up).

"They all seemed to survive," Webb said.

The camp was the original manifestation of Webb's interest in "meaningful education" that is an intersection of agriculture, nature and environmental awareness. From these beginnings, at the boyhood home where Webb grew up the fourth of six siblings, Shelburne Farms would become a nonprofit (incorporated in 1972) whose various endeavors bring 140,000 people a year to the farm.

There are so many camps and school programs at Shelburne Farms these days, the child-centric activity prompted Webb to wonder on a recent walk—where packs of happy kids raced around the place—if summer camps had already started.

He's no longer sleeping in a field with the kids.

These days, you can find him in his corner office in a barn, surrounded by big maps and less-glamorous paperwork. He says he's part town manager, part town planner. And full-time fundraiser.

Webb lives with his wife, Megan Camp, the farm's vice president and program director, and their cats Fanta and Stella, in an 1850s shingled farmhouse that predates Shelburne Farms. Other animals sometimes wander onto their lawn. Chickens make regular appearances; goats jump the fence and hang at Webb's place. A donkey came by one morning last week.

The visitors come with the territory when you live where you work and work where you live: a teeming campus with activities including walking trails, a Brown Swiss dairy herd, environmental education programs, harvest festivals and a cheese making facility.

Shelburne Farms, a onetime private estate, was founded by Webb's great-grandparents and designed by landscape architect Frederick Law Olmstead in the 1880s. At the turn of the century, the lakeside property of Dr. William Seward and Lila Vanderbilt Webb encompassed nearly 4,000 acres. The barn they built for work animals was colossal—so big, in its reincarnated life it houses a cheese-making and packing operation, a school, a woodworking shop, a kid's farmyard, a bakery and offices.

In 1972, Shelburne Farms was incorporated as a nonprofit—a decision that was useful in setting the farm on more solid financial ground, Webb said. (His father had to borrow money to pay property taxes, he said.) In seeking a new direction for Shelburne Farms, Webb and his five siblings saw that the property could and should be a community resource and asset, he said. The six young Webbs did not want the dairy farm where they grew up to become a carved-up, high-end suburb of Burlington, Webb said.

"If we all had one-sixth of this place," he said, "we would've spent the rest of our lives dealing with that."

The common experience of growing up on the farm, a love of the land, and an interest in "responding to the context of the world we were living in at that time," helped shape the siblings' shared vision for Shelburne Farms, Webb said.

"Those threads of agriculture, youth, community, those were our intentions," he said the other day, eating lunch at a picnic table in the farmyard.

"We started Shelburne Farms because we were worried about all the things that are more pressing now," he said, noting climate change wasn't an issue people were thinking

about. "We wondered: 'How are we going to get ourselves on a path that could be more sustainable for people and the planet.' The farm would be an expression of a pathway to a better future. Not a model for that, necessarily, but an example of how things can work given a different set of intentions, around sustainability."

They wanted the land whole and accessible to the public.

Their father, Derick Webb, made that possible on his death in 1984 at the age of 70. Derick Webb—who had retired to Florida—rewrote his will before his death from a heart attack. In his revised will, he left the 1,000 acres he inherited to the nonprofit that was established by his kids 12 years earlier. An earlier version had given the property to the six children.

Though Webb and his siblings agitated for this change—including writing letters that Webb says make him cringe to read today—they didn't know their father had gifted the land to the nonprofit until after he died.

Now the integrity of the property was assured. Suddenly, the nonprofit was in a more formidable position.

"At that point, we were playing for real," Webb said. That meant fundraising, restoring and managing the property, building an organization and related programming.

Making the world a little bit better is something of a bureaucracy—with custodial work on the side.

"When I'm walking around, I'm always looking for deferred maintenance and potholes," Webb said. "It's not a downer. I kind of enjoy that."

His primary focuses are finances and farming; his brother, Marshall Webb, manages the woodland and special projects.

The farm was in disrepair when Webb was a kid, but he liked his father's Brown Swiss herd and chores related to dairying. In those days, a milk hauler rumbled up the long driveway to transport the milk to a creamery. Earlier still, the family delivered milk in cans to Shelburne.

Back then, the barn roofs leaked; plumbing didn't work in portions of Shelburne House, now called the Inn at Shelburne Farms; and Alec and his brothers, wearing plain white T-shirts, ate corn on the cob at picnic tables on a terrace, goats sniffing around the table for scraps. "It's a whole different scene down there now at 6 o'clock at night," Webb said.

At 6 o'clock these days, spiffy diners—guests, not family—eat dinner on the terrace at the inn, a dining spot that overlooks formal gardens, Lake Champlain and the Adirondacks. The food they're eating, chef-prepared, was likely produced on the farm. Not counting work-related dinners, Webb said he eats at the inn about once a year.

He still prefers dairying hours, rising by 5 a.m. and eating a bowl of oat bran before heading to work. His commute is walking across the farmyard. With the exception of two years working for the state Department of Education—fulfilling duty required for his conscientious objector status in the Vietnam War—Webb's work has been connected to Shelburne Farms.

In his office is a black and white photograph of a young girl standing at a table of vegetables. It is the summer of 1973, before the existence of the Burlington Farmers Market. The table is set up on St. Paul Street in front of the original Ben and Jerry's.

It holds cabbages, cauliflower, and bushels of beans. Hand-lettered signs describe vegetables that are organically grown and reasonably priced. The girl grew the vegetables at Shelburne Farms. She's an early example of the farm's decades-long yield: sustainable agriculture, community connections, youthful energy and vision.

"We didn't say, 40 years ago, we're going to have an inn," Webb said. "We had the intention of seeing this place being used as a place for learning—creating a living/learning environment for kids and others to increase their awareness of the environment and community."

"There was something that would seem wrong about doing anything other than treating Shelburne Farms as a community asset. Maybe it's Olmstead's design: (But) the importance of conserving this land was not as clear as it is now."

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL BARRY GASDEK

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I wish to honor LTC Barry Gasdek, Retired, for his decades of service to Wyoming and to America.

As Walter Lippmann once said, "The final test of a leader is that he leaves behind him in other men the conviction and the will to carry on." In his 49 years of service to our country, Barry's proven dedication and loyalty have touched hundreds of lives. From his extensive active duty service in the U.S. Army to his quest to aid the veterans of Wyoming, Mr. Gasdek is a true Wyoming hero.

Barry's path to Wyoming is similar to the historic trails that cross Wyoming's terrain—he started out in the east and eventually headed west. Barry showed the strong will and discipline of a natural born leader. Growing up in Pennsylvania, he excelled as an athlete and a scholar. He earned the rank of Eagle Scout in high school. At the Indiana University of Pennsylvania, where he graduated with a B.S. in education, he earned letters in three sports. All of these honors prepared him for a lifetime of service to his country.

Barry's passion and devotion to the armed forces sparked a distinguished career with the U.S. Army. Barry started his career serving in Germany, fresh from the ROTC program, where he gained firsthand experience of Cold War tensions. Later, he was called to serve in Vietnam as the conflict there worsened. Barry proved himself in Vietnam. He flew observation missions and eventually returned for a second tour of duty. One of his commanders joked that he was like a magnet for drawing fire. Despite the adversity he faced, Barry met his challenges head-on and with fortitude. He continued his military service well after Vietnam by training to become both a Ranger and a Pathfinder and by serving at a number of Army bases around the world.

He is a qualified leader, and his military achievements reflect his success. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, an award second only to the Medal of Honor. In addition, Barry received the Silver Star for his service in Vietnam, 5 Bronze Stars, 2 Purple Hearts, the Soldier's Medal, the Legion of Honor, and 17 Air Medals. These awards are but a few of his military accomplishments.

After many years of successfully serving his country, Barry accepted an

other challenge—this time in Laramie, WY. He was assigned as a professor of military science at the University of Wyoming through its Army ROTC program. Barry was a natural for the title, given his own involvement in the ROTC program in Pennsylvania. He brought the same level of talent and perseverance to this position as he did on the battlefield. For years, he encouraged his students to become our Nation's future leaders.

While many would be comfortable slipping into retirement, Barry knew his mission in Wyoming had not yet been completed. This time, he took up the banner to fight for veterans' issues. He had experienced the lack of support for Vietnam's veterans, and he vowed to keep that from happening again. Barry served in leadership positions with the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart. His goal was to support the State's current veterans while teaching the next generation about the important sacrifices our Armed Forces make each and every day. Eventually, his passionate advocacy led him to serve as a State veterans service officer for the Wyoming Veterans Commission, the UW Veterans Task Force, and as the Army Reserve ambassador.

LTC Barry Gasdek, Retired, has devoted his entire life to serving his country, his brothers in arms, and the people of Wyoming. He is a fighter, a mentor, a teacher, and a good man. He embodies the cowboy ethics and what it means to be a citizen of Wyoming. It is certain that the legacy of his leadership will inspire new generations of brave soldiers. On behalf of the State of Wyoming and the United States of America, I thank Barry for his service. His boots will be hard to fill.

RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF TITLE IX

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, this week we celebrate the 40th anniversary of the passage of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. For over 40 years, this historic law has furthered gender equality in education and sports in schools so that young women, including my three daughters, Caroline, Halina, and Anne, who all play soccer, may enjoy the benefits that come along with sports participation.

On October 29, 2002, title IX was renamed the "Patsy Takemoto Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act" to honor the tireless determination and leadership of Congresswoman Mink of Hawaii in developing and passing title IX. If Congresswoman Mink was still with us today, I know she would be proud of the remarkable gains that have been made to ensure equal opportunity for women and girls in sports, education, and professionally.

In my home State of Colorado, we are ahead of the curve with regards to opportunities for girls and women in

sports. The U.S. Olympic Training Center, located in Colorado Springs, was created by an act of Congress in 1978, just a few years after title IX was passed. It is encouraging to know that women, like Gold Medal Winner Lindsey Vonn, now make up nearly half of all U.S. Olympians competing at the games—representing more than 48 percent of the 2008 team. Jamie Derrieux, a senior at Grand Junction High School, was named to the 5A First-Team All-State team and will be playing basketball at the University of Northern Colorado this fall. The flagship all-girls charter school, GALS, Girls Athletic Leadership Schools, in Denver practices active learning that engages students in health and wellness activities in the belief that these are key contributing factors in optimizing academic achievement and self-development. The Colorado Women's Sports Fund Association works toward increasing the number of girls and women who participate in athletics and reducing and eliminating barriers that prevent participation.

Studies show that participation in sports has a positive influence on the intellectual, physical and psychological health of girls and young women. By a 3-to-1 ratio, female athletes do better in school, do not drop out, and have a better chance to graduate from college. Sports participation is linked to lower rates of pregnancy in adolescent female athletes, and according to a study from the Oppenheimer/MassMutual Financial Group, of 401 executive businesswomen surveyed, 82 percent reported playing organized sports while growing up, including school teams, intramurals, and recreational leagues.

Despite the vast improvements, inequalities and disparities still remain. According to the National Federation of State High School Associations, schools are still providing 1.3 million fewer chances for girls to play sports in high school than boys. These numbers have an even greater impact on Latinas and African-American young women. It is because of such disparities that I signed on to the Senate resolution put forth this week by Senators PATTY MURRAY of Washington and OLYMPIA SNOWE of Maine to show my commitment to working toward a more equal future.

We have work to do. Please join me in celebrating the 40th anniversary of title IX by supporting efforts to expand equality in sports participation and education for women and girls around the country.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED WAY

● Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to congratulate the United Way on its 125th anniversary. The organization began in 1887 as a community

endeavor in Denver, and it spread throughout the country.

Today, the United Way includes almost 1,800 community-based organizations in the United States and 40 other countries and territories. It applies the nearly \$5 billion it raises annually to provide for the common good in communities all over the world.

I am proud that my State of Mississippi is home to dozens of nonprofit United Way organizations. With their network of partners, these groups do remarkable work to gather private resources and generate volunteer services from all ages to address the educational, health, and income problems faced by children, families, and seniors.

Projects such as the Back 2 School Resource Fair hosted by the United Way of Northeast Mississippi, the Summer Youth Corps volunteer program run by the United Way of the Capital Area, and the Literacy Kit Workshop sponsored by the United Way of Southern Mississippi are just a very small sample of ongoing activities carried out to help improve our State.

In addition, Mississippians are grateful for the helping hand the United Way provides when disasters strike. United Way volunteers from Mississippi and around the Nation were among the thousands of people who came to the aid of my State following Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. More recently, the United Way stepped up to assist those hurt by tornadoes in northeast Mississippi and historic flooding throughout the Mississippi River delta.

The United Way has recorded an outstanding history of accomplishment in its 125 years. It has done so by joining forces with everyone from the individual giver to Fortune 500 partners.

I am pleased to be able to join in commending this organization for its good works, and I look forward to its continued success.●

SOURIS RIVER FLOOD ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, it has been nearly a year since the city of Minot and surrounding communities were devastated by a historic flood along the Souris River in North Dakota.

As we recognize this anniversary, we are reminded of the devastation it brought to thousands of families throughout the Souris River Basin, the extraordinary leadership of local officials, the valiant efforts of residents and businesses, the outpouring of support, and the perseverance and determination of the region to rebuild.

On June 22, 2011, the sirens sounded in Minot signaling the mandatory evacuation of nearly a quarter of the city's residents. A wall of water was coming at us, and we knew the existing levees would be overtopped. Work continued around the clock on temporary, secondary levees to protect as much of the city as possible, but we knew thou-

sands of homes would be impacted by floodwaters. On June 23, the river overtopped the levees in Minot, spilling into neighborhoods and businesses. When the river finally peaked, it had surpassed the record set in 1881 by more than 3.5 feet and crested more than 12.5 feet above flood stage. While the flood damaged homes, businesses, schools, parks, the zoo, and many other things, it did not dampen the spirit of those in Minot and the surrounding communities or their resolve to rebuild.

In those days leading up to and following the flood, many Federal agencies were on the ground assisting the region with response and recovery. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Federal Emergency Management Agency were there from the beginning, and both are still there today helping residents recover and repairing levees. Many other Federal agencies also provided critical support throughout the disaster. For that, we are forever grateful.

I also want to thank my colleagues for the disaster assistance provided through the Community Development Block Grant Program, the Economic Development Administration, and Emergency Relief to respond to this and other disasters in 2011. This funding is providing important resources for the region and a key part of its foundation for recovery.

The city of Minot and surrounding communities, including Burlington, Velva, and Sawyer, have come a long way since those dark days last year. While the recovery will continue for some time, I am so proud of the spirit and can-do attitude of all in the basin as they rebuild their communities.

Officials and residents will gather together this weekend to celebrate a "Weekend of Hope: Return to Oak Park." It will be a time for reflection on how far the region has come and to focus on the region's continuing recovery. Hope is guiding the region's recovery and ensuring that Minot, Burlington, and the other communities will be back better and stronger than ever.●

FULLERTON, NORTH DAKOTA

● Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I am pleased to honor an active community in North Dakota that will soon commemorate its 125th anniversary. From June 29 through July 1, the residents of Fullerton will be celebrating their community's history and founding.

The history of Fullerton is closely connected to early American history. Fullerton was founded in 1887 on land donated by Mr. Edwin F. Sweet, an investor from Michigan. Sweet, who later served as a U.S. Congressman and Assistant U.S. Secretary of Commerce for President Wilson and President Harding, named the town after his wife's family, the Fullers. The Fuller family ancestry includes Dr. Samuel Fuller, who arrived in America on the

Mayflower as a physician for the Plymouth Colony. Edwin and his wife Sophia named their first son after one of their ancestors, Charles Carroll, an original signer of the Declaration of Independence.

Fullerton's most famous landmark, the Carroll House, has a wonderful history and has been a focal point of the community from the time its doors opened in 1889. Built by Edwin Sweet and named after Edwin and Sophia's first son Carroll Fuller Sweet, the hotel's ballroom was the meeting spot for all town social gatherings, including concerts, gala balls, and church meetings. Through the years, the Carroll House has undergone extensive renovations and is now recognized as a national historic landmark. Visitors from all over the country stay at the Carroll House, and the hotel continues to host town events, like ice cream socials and silent auctions.

Fullerton is a fun and friendly community. The residents take great pride in their dining, recreation, hotel, and park facilities, in addition to their agricultural background. To celebrate the 125th anniversary, the community is holding an all-school reunion. Other planned activities for the weekend include the memorial tree planting ceremony, an all-community reunion banquet, a community choir concert, an apple pie contest, and a parade.

I ask the Senate to join me in congratulating Fullerton, ND, and its residents on their 125th anniversary and in wishing them a warm future.●

MONROE, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the community of Monroe, SD, on reaching the 125th Anniversary of its founding. This tightly knit community will have a chance to reflect on its past and contemplate its future. I congratulate the people of Monroe for reaching this milestone in their history.

The eastern South Dakota townsite that became Monroe was founded in 1887 while it was still the Dakota Territory. Its location along the Chicago and North Western Railroad fueled the town's growth, and it was incorporated as Monroe in 1901. The first building in the town was a grain house, which was soon followed by a general store, which included a post office. In the early 20th century Monroe experienced a great deal of development and growth and that energy is still evident to this day.

Monroe sought to preserve their spirit of togetherness by constructing a community center in 1990. The center houses the senior center and city office and was built using community funds and donations from the alumni of Monroe High School. Many events are held at the center, and it is a point of pride for the community.

The people of Monroe plan to commemorate their town's anniversary with many community events including a craft fair, poker run, all-school

reunion alumni banquet, and fireworks display. In addition, the community will host a tractor drive and ethanol plant tour to conclude the celebration.

Monroe and its residents embody the small town values that make South Dakota a great State to live and work in. I am proud to join with the community of Monroe in celebrating the last 125 years, and look forward to what is, no doubt, a promising future.●

PIERPONT, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to the 125th anniversary of Pierpont, SD. The residents of Pierpont exemplify the strong sense of community and welcoming spirit that are defining traits of South Dakotans.

Pierpont is a tranquil town nestled at the foot of the Coteau Hills, in Day County. The early settlers of Pierpont tenaciously petitioned the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railroad for a side track, so that farmers would have a nearby market for their grain. Charles Sheldon, a homesteader who later became the second governor of South Dakota, was the spokesman for the Pierpont farmers. Sheldon's negotiation was successful, and the farmers paid \$500 to the railroad for the construction of the side track.

In 1887, the first structures of what would become the town of Pierpont were built by the Empire Elevator Company. By 1888, the Post Office had opened and families began settling in the town. The turn of the century found a thriving, booming community with businesses that lined Main Street.

To celebrate Pierpont's historical achievement, residents will join together for a weekend full of fun activities. An all-school alumni reunion, parade, car show, and a children's carnival are just a few of the exciting events that will take place.

I am proud to recognize Pierpont on reaching this milestone and wish them nothing but the best in the future. Pierpont continues to be a prime example of the successful pioneer spirit that built South Dakota.●

SOUTH DAKOTA UNITED WAY

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize the South Dakota United Way. This is the 125th anniversary of the United Way and I would like to specifically acknowledge the South Dakota chapters on this special day. The local United Way has been active in South Dakota since 1929 and has made outstanding contributions to the communities they serve.

There are 11 United Way locations in South Dakota providing services such as educational opportunities, lower income community aid, and health awareness programs. The United Way partners with many local businesses, furthering their community impact.

I would like to offer my congratulations on this monumental day to this

program and to all the great men and women whose generosity and service make the United Way a success.●

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-6626. A communication from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Substantially Underserved Trust Areas (SUTA)" (RIN0572-AC23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6627. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sedaxane; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9345-8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6628. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a proposed change by the Air National Guard to the Fiscal Year 2012 National Guard and Reserve Equipment Appropriation (NGREA) procurement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6629. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Only One Offer" (RIN0750-AH11) (DFARS Case 2012-D013) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6630. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Applicability of Hexavalent Chromium Policy to Commercial Items" (RIN0750-AH39) (DFARS Case 2011-D047) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6631. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, the report of proposed legislation entitled "National Park System Critical Authorities Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6632. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Eligible Obligations, Charitable Contributions, Non-member Deposits, Fixed Assets, Investments, Fidelity Bonds, Incidental Powers, Member Business Loans, and Regulatory Flexibility Program" (RIN3133-AD98) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6633. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Loan Workouts and Nonaccrual Policy, and Regulatory Reporting of Troubled Debt Restructured Loans" (RIN3133-AE01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6634. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, the report of proposed legislation relative to amending the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6635. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Mississippi; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan" (FRL No. 9691-9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6636. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Central Indiana (Indianapolis) Ozone Maintenance Plan Revision to Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets" (FRL No. 9689-6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6637. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; South Carolina; Emissions Statements" (FRL No. 9689-5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6638. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; South Carolina; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan" (FRL No. 9691-7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6639. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Alabama; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan" (FRL No. 9691-8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6640. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; Regional Haze" (FRL No. 9687-9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6641. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Regional Haze" (FRL No. 9688-1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6642. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rule on Certain Chemical Substances; Withdrawal of Significant New Use Rule" (FRL No. 9353-2) received in the Office of the President of the

Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6643. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances; Withdrawal of Significant New Use Rules" (FRL No. 9352-7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6644. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Research, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Withdrawal of Regulatory Guide 7.3, 'Procedures for Picking Up and Receiving Packages of Radioactive Material'" (Regulatory Guide 7.3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6645. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of North Carolina; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan" (FRL No. 9691-5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6646. A communication from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Report to the Congress: Medicare and the Health Care Delivery System"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6647. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2012-0064—2012-0068); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6648. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)—Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program—Disability and Rehabilitation Research Project—Traumatic Brain Injury Model Systems Centers" (CFDA No. 84.133A-5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2012; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6649. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)—Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program—Disability and Rehabilitation Research Project—National Data and Statistical Center for the Burn Model Systems" (CFDA No. 84.133A-4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2012; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6650. A communication from the Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2011 through March 31, 2012; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 250. A bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mrs. BOXER for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

*Kristine L. Svinicki, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2017.

*Allison M. Macfarlane, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2013.

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Brian J. Davis, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

Patrick A. Miles, Jr., of Michigan, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Michigan for the term of four years.

John S. Leonardo, of Arizona, to be United States Attorney for the District of Arizona for the term of four years.

Jamie A. Hainsworth, of Rhode Island, to be United States Marshal for the District of Rhode Island for the term of four years.

Grande Lum, of California, to be Director, Community Relations Service, for a term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BEGICH:

S. 3325. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, in coordination with the Secretary of Education, to carry out a 5-year demonstration program to fund mental health first aid training programs at 10 institutions of higher education to improve student mental health; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. COONS, Mr. MCCONNELL,

Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 3326. A bill to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act to extend the third-country fabric program and to add South Sudan to the list of countries eligible for designation under that Act, to make technical corrections to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States relating to the textile and apparel rules of origin for the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement, to approve the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SCHUMER, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 3327. A bill to require the United States Trade Representative to take action to obtain the full compliance of the Russian Federation with its commitments under the protocol on the accession of the Russian Federation to the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. KERRY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 3328. A bill to provide grants for juvenile mentoring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 3329. A bill to designate and expand wilderness areas in Olympic National Forest in the State of Washington, and to designate certain rivers in Olympic National Forest and Olympic National Park as wild and scenic rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 3330. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Niblack mining area road corridor in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 3331. A bill to provide for universal intercountry adoption accreditation standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. INOUE, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 3332. A bill to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel in the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 3333. A bill to require certain entities that collect and maintain personal information of individuals to secure such information and to provide notice to such individuals in the case of a breach of security involving such information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 3334. A bill to protect homes, small businesses, and other private property rights by limiting the power of eminent domain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 3335. A bill to ensure the effective administration of criminal justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUE (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 3336. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a major medical facility project lease for a Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic at Ewa Plain, Oahu, Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' 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. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Con. Res. 49. A concurrent resolution to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to accept a statue depicting Frederick Douglass from the District of Columbia and display the statue in a suitable location in the Capitol; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 17

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 17, a bill to repeal the job-killing tax on medical devices to ensure continued access to life-saving medical devices for patients and maintain the standing of the United States as the world leader in medical device innovation.

S. 50

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 50, a bill to strengthen Federal consumer product safety programs and activities with respect to commercially marketed seafood by directing the Secretary of Commerce to coordinate with the Federal Trade Commission and other appropriate Federal agencies to strengthen and coordinate those programs and activities.

S. 52

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 52, a bill to establish uniform administrative and enforcement procedures and penalties for the enforcement of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act and similar statutes, and for other purposes.

S. 250

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 250, a bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of

DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

S. 504

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 504, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 555

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 555, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 697, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Services for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 866

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 866, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the per-fiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service used to reduce the minimum age at which a member of a reserve component of the uniformed services may retire for non-regular service.

S. 886

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 886, a bill to amend the Interstate Horseracing Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horseracing, and for other purposes.

S. 987

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 987, a bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration.

S. 1039

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1039, a bill to impose sanctions on persons responsible for the detention, abuse, or death of Sergei Magnitsky, for the conspiracy to defraud the Russian Federation of taxes on corporate profits through fraudulent transactions and lawsuits against Hermitage, and for other gross violations of human rights in the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

S. 1368

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Tennessee

(Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1368, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal distributions for medicine qualified only if for prescribed drug or insulin.

S. 1454

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1454, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for extended months of Medicare coverage of immunosuppressive drugs for kidney transplant patients and other renal dialysis provisions.

S. 1880

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1880, a bill to repeal the health care law's job-killing health insurance tax.

S. 1882

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1882, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure that valid generic drugs may enter the market.

S. 1906

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1906, a bill to modify the Forest Service Recreation Residence Program as the program applies to units of the National Forest System derived from the public domain by implementing a simple, equitable, and predictable procedure for determining cabin user fees, and for other purposes.

S. 1978

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1978, a bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to provide for community-based job training grants, to provide Federal assistance for community college modernization, and for other purposes.

S. 1980

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1980, a bill to prevent, deter, and eliminate illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing through port State measures.

S. 2036

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2036, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the National Baseball Hall of Fame.

S. 2103

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as

cosponsors of S. 2103, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 2143

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2143, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that paper which is commonly recycled does not constitute a qualified energy resource under the section 45 credit for renewable electricity production.

S. 2168

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2168, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to modify the definition of supervisor.

S. 2173

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2173, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 2179

At the request of Mr. WEBB, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2179, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve oversight of educational assistance provided under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes.

S. 2189

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2189, a bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal anti-discrimination and antiretaliation claims, and for other purposes.

S. 2364

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2364, a bill to extend the availability of low-interest refinancing under the local development business loan program of the Small Business Administration.

S. 3234

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3234, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the time period for contributing military death gratuities to Roth IRAs and Coverdell education savings accounts.

S. 3242

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3242, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiaries coordi-

nated care and greater choice with regard to accessing hearing health services and benefits.

S. 3270

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3270, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to consider the resources of individuals applying for pension that were recently disposed of by the individuals for less than fair market value when determining the eligibility of such individuals for such pension, and for other purposes.

S. 3289

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3289, a bill to expand the Medicaid home and community-based services waiver to include young individuals who are in need of services that would otherwise be required to be provided through a psychiatric residential treatment facility, and to change references in Federal law to mental retardation to references to an intellectual disability.

S. 3322

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3322, a bill to strengthen enforcement and clarify certain provisions of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act, and chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, and to reconcile, restore, clarify, and conform similar provisions in other related civil rights statutes, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 43

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 43, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 48

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 48, a concurrent resolution recognizing 375 years of service of the National Guard and affirming congressional support for a permanent Operational Reserve as a component of the Armed Forces.

S. RES. 493

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 493, a resolution recognizing that the occurrence of prostate cancer in African-American men has reached epidemic proportions and urging Federal agencies to address that health crisis by supporting education, awareness outreach, and research specifically focused on how prostate cancer affects African-American men.

S. RES. 494

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 494, a resolution condemning the Government of the Russian Federation for providing weapons to the regime of President Bashar al-Assad of Syria.

AMENDMENT NO. 2455

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2455 proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2455 proposed to S. 3240, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 2460

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2460 intended to be proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BEGICH:

S. 3325. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, in coordination with the Secretary of Education, to carry out a 5-year demonstration program to fund mental health first aid training programs at 10 institutions of higher education to improve student mental health; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce a very important piece of legislation—the Mental Health First Aid Higher Education Act. The bill authorizes a nationwide demonstration program that treats Mental Health First Aid like the first aid training offered by Red Cross chapters across the United States.

Mental Health First Aid teaches the warning signs and risk factors for schizophrenia, major clinical depression, panic attacks, anxiety disorders, trauma, and other common mental disorders, crisis de-escalation techniques, and equips college and university staff with a 5-step action plan to help individuals in psychiatric crisis connect to professional mental health care.

One in four adults and 10 percent of children in the United States will suffer from a mental illness this year. We know what to do if someone has a heart attack, but how do we react to someone having a panic attack? Why do we wait for a tragic event to take notice and then bring out emergency measures?

When I was Mayor of Anchorage, we worked with the local NAMI organization to train our police in Crisis Intervention Teams, great when responding to a crisis by police officers, but now we need to go further. Mental Health First Aid is for the financial aid workers, the dormitory resident advisers, coaches, and faculty members, to name a few. These are the front-line folks who will learn the warning signs and risk factors before tragedy strikes.

You have heard me say this before, an it is not something to be proud of in Alaska: we have one of the highest suicide prevalence rates in the country. Further, we are a very rural State, where access to mental health care and medical services is often very difficult.

Even today, it is not widely known that fully ⅔ of Alaska can only be accessed by airplane. By educating the general public about the warning signs of common mental disorders, we can intervene early, facilitate access to care, improve clinical outcomes, reduce costs, and maybe save lives.

My bill focuses on higher education because many mental illnesses are “adult onset conditions,” meaning onset of full symptoms generally occurs in late adolescence or young adulthood—just as young people are headed off to college. Therefore, the audiences for this vital training will encompass on-campus counseling center staff, dormitory resident advisers, university threat assessment teams, members of disciplinary committees, coaches and faculty members. The instruction will highlight available mental health resources in local communities including Community Mental Health Centers, emergency psychiatric facilities, hospital emergency rooms and other programs offering psychiatric crisis beds.

The program may also help to avert violence incidents; Mental Health First Aid gained wide public recognition in the aftermath of the tragic shootings in Tucson, AZ, involving our former colleague Rep. Gabrielle Giffords.

Mental disorders are more common than heart disease and cancer combined and a recent *Governing* magazine article reports that many states and localities are moving ahead—teaching their employees how to recognize the signs of mental health problems and how to help.

In this time of austerity, the training is not only important, because it will save lives, it is also inexpensive. Courses costs about \$180, a small price to pay to potentially save lives.

In closing, yes, we are in a presidential election year and the political season often highlights the issues that

divide us as Americans. But the Mental Health First Aid Higher Education Act is not one of them.

In the Alaska tradition, I seek to work across the aisle, and I strongly believe this legislation merits bipartisan support. Please join me in supporting this vital education program that helps to avert suffering, prevent violence and ultimately will save lives.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 3330. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Niblack mining area road corridor in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that would potentially help in solving a significant unemployment problem in my home state of Alaska. Today, joined by my colleague, Senator MARK BEGICH, I introduce the Niblack Mining Area Road Authorization Act to permit road access to proposed multi-mineral mines on southeast Prince of Wales Island in Southeast Alaska.

Prince of Wales Island, formerly the main area for timber activity in Southeast Alaska, has fallen on hard times during the past decade. In 1990, when Alaska's timber industry in total harvested more than 1.1 billion board feet of timber, Prince of Wales was the center of activity. In 1994, for example, timber jobs accounted for 32.8 percent of all wages on the island. Six years later, with total regional harvests having fallen to about 350 million board feet, timber accounted for less than 19.8 percent of wages on the island, according to the Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development. Today, with total harvests of timber being just above 100 million board feet a year in the region—just 35 million board feet being harvested from federal lands in 2011—and timber jobs statewide having fallen from about 4,000 to just over 400, Prince of Wales has been particularly hard hit. According to the State, timber jobs have fallen by more than 1,700 positions on the island.

As of April, the unemployment rate on the island was “down” to 15 percent, compared to 18.1 percent in March. The rate in the Hoonah-Angoon census area, which covers the other potentially significant timber area in Southeast, stood at 20 percent in April, compared to 25.6 percent in March, 2012. Those rates are nearly 8 percent to 12 percent higher than the national average and higher than traditional rates, even after out migration from the island over the past decade.

While the Viking Lumber Co. of Klawock remains the largest private-sector timber employer on the island, the island, the third largest in the United States, is badly in need of new employment opportunities. Fortunately today's high metal prices are encouraging a resurgence of mineral development on the 2,231 square-mile island.

Currently, Heatherdale Minerals of Canada is considering reopening the Niblack Mine, a gold, copper, zinc and silver deposit. The company is in advanced exploration and development study of the estimated 9 million-ton mine, forecast to cost \$150 million to \$200 million to reopen. The mine, likely to last at least 12 years, is forecast to produce 1,500 tons of ore per day and require 130 workers at the mine site, and another 60 at a processing mill, which could be located near the site, or in Ketchikan, AK, 40 vessel miles away.

The Niblack property is also close to another mineral deposit that is in the advanced stages of economic feasibility review, the Bokan Mountain Rare Earth Elements, REE, mine. Bokan Mountain, being considered for opening by Ucore Inc. of Canada, likely will employ 200 workers. It, too, will involve an investment of between \$150 million to \$200 million for the mine and a preliminary tailings processing plant to process the heavy rare earths, REEs, located at the site of a former uranium mine. Both mines currently estimate they could be open within three to four years, depending on final economic reviews and current permit approval timeframes. Bokan Mountain is located about 28 miles south of Niblack and can be accessed by boat by traveling down the relatively protected Moira Sound to the end of South Arm.

The two mines could produce substantial numbers of high-paying jobs for the residents of southern Southeast Alaska. Niblack, for example, predicts the average salary for mine workers at its facility will be \$80,000 a year. The problem of getting those jobs to people who need them is one of logistics.

There currently is no road access to reach either mine site, both likely to be supplied by boat from Ketchikan, Alaska. That means that potential workers on Prince of Wales will need to travel by boat or more likely by plane to Ketchikan, in order to turn around and take a mine boat back to the island to report for work—a costly, time-consuming, often unpleasant and, sometimes, dangerous process given sea conditions in Southeast Alaska. Or they will need to pilot their own small boats to the mine site, a hazardous process given that reaching Niblack from the community of Thorne Bay to the north—a site that is located on the island's road system—will require a daily 60-mile one-way boat trip down perilous Clarence Strait, a difficult water body during fall, winter, and spring storms when seas can easily top 20 feet waves.

But the problem could be solved, if a road could be extended the roughly 26.3 miles to connect the Niblack mine, by means of existing logging roads, to the State highway system on the island. Such a road will involve at least 2.5 miles of logging road reconstruction and the construction of 26.3 miles of new road. Those roads, if built to existing logging road standards, are estimated to cost \$7.075 million—the cost

certainly rising if the roads are built to Federal Aid Urban Highway standards. The issue is that 18.3 miles of that new construction is across federal lands in the Tongass National Forest and, more importantly, across areas classified as inventoried roadless under the 2001 U.S. Forest Service roadless rule, as it was reimposed on the Tongass in 2009.

Looking at the topography of the area, located inside the Eudora inventoried roadless area, the road would begin at the Haida, Hydaburg, Native village corporation's West, Cholmondeley, Arm sort yard and head Southeast through the Big Creek Valley and climb to a mountain pass at the roughly 1,400-foot elevation. From there it will drop onto land owned by the Kootznoowoo Native village corporation of Angoon and follow existing logging roads that lie on the western side of the South Arm. The route then runs south and parallels South Arm on the west side until the southern end of the bay is reached. Then the route follows the shoreline of the south end of the South Arm until the far southeast corner of the bay is reached—the location of existing cabins and a State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game fish weir. From this point, there are two potential route alternatives: the 1A route continues to run in a southerly direction through a mountain pass of slightly more than 500-foot elevation passing two unnamed lakes. Once it reaches the shoreline of Dickman Bay, the road turns in a more easterly direction and runs across the south end of Kugel Lake and Luelia Lake, and the north end of Kegan Lake. From the 900-foot elevation pass on the west side of Luelia Lake, the route continues to run in an easterly fashion and must cross 1,200- and 1,400-foot passes before the route turns north to reach the Niblack mine at tidewater. That total route is 26.3 miles of new construction and a total distance of 28.8 miles. There is an alternative, Route 1B, early in the route corridor to reduce the elevation and add switchbacks required to reach the first pass—an alternative that would add 1.9 miles to the road.

There is another alternative route, Route 2A, that leaves from the same location and runs on the same route until the south end of South Arm. The second route then turns in a northerly direction and continues to follow the eastern shoreline of South Arm, Cholmondeley, for roughly 1.5 miles. The route then turns in an eastern direction and climbs through a mountain pass of about 900-foot elevation. From this pass, the route descends into the existing road system on Kootznoowoo lands near the south shores of Miller Lake. At the eastern terminus of these existing roads, the new route picks up again and continues in a southeast direction along the south end of Clarno Cove and Cannery Cove until Cannery Point is reached. From there the route turns into a southerly direction and climbs to another mountain pass of roughly 1,000-foot elevation. The route

then follows the hillside to the west of Niblack Lake and meets another mountain pass of the same elevation and then descends in a southerly direction along the west side of Myrtle Lake to reach the Niblack Mine and tidewater. That route involves 24.6 miles of new construction, 6.1 miles of road reconstruction and involves a total length of 30.7 miles, thus costing more. It involves, however, constructing only one pass higher than 1,200 feet, compared to 3 on the first route, but may have more environmental impacts given its route along Cannery Cove and Niblack Lake.

I mention the two detailed routes only to indicate that substantial work has been done to select a potential road corridor to the Niblack mine and to make clear that I am not prejudging the route with the fewest environmental impacts. I am leaving that to the Forest Service to decide after an environmental assessment or impact statement is undertaken. The legislation I am introducing simply says that the Forest Service should permit development of a road along one of the two routes, picking the route that both minimizes the costs, while also minimizing the effects on surface resources, prevents unnecessary surface disturbances and that complies with all environmental laws and regulations.

This road, I need to point out, will not set a precedent in any way weakening the inventoried roadless rule's implementation in Alaska, regardless of how I feel about that rule. Under the original regulations governing roadless areas in Alaska issued by the Clinton Administration in January 2001, Section 294.12(b)(7) permits roads to be built across inventoried roadless areas if needed "in conjunction with the continuation, extension or renewal of a mineral lease on lands that are under lease by the Secretary of the Interior. . . . Such road construction or reconstruction must be conducted in a manner that minimizes effects on surface resources, prevents unnecessary or unreasonable surface disturbance, and complies with all applicable lease requirements."

The patents on the Niblack property certainly predate the creation of the roadless rule. The mine was discovered in the late 19th century, according to the U.S. Forest Service. Modest copper production occurred between 1902 and 1908 and modern exploration on the 2,000-acre site began in 1974, some 150 patented claims being in place at the mine.

The point is that Niblack is certainly a real prospect that offers the likelihood of real employment for many who are unemployed on Prince of Wales Island, if they simply can access the site from their homes in Craig, Klawock, Hydaburg, Thorne Bay, Kasaan, Whale Pass and even Coffman Cove, located on the northeast end of the island. The need for these jobs has prompted the City Council of Craig to formally request Congress to accelerate the approval of a road corridor to the mine

site. Such a road could be built by the mine, but more likely funded and built by the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities at state expense. Workers could then access jobs at the Bokan Mountain facility by workboat, should a route to that mine never be approved.

It makes no sense in a state that already contains 58 million acres of formal wilderness, and in the Tongass National Forest, that already contains nearly 6.4 million acres of parks and wilderness areas, to bar construction of a road that does not cross any wilderness areas, but could provide a good income to a third of all of the people, 363 people, unemployed on the island as of April 2012, according to the Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development.

I would hope that this Congress would look favorably on allowing a road to this mining area, so that residents on the island can get the jobs they so desperately need in the years ahead.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 3335. A bill to ensure the effective administration of criminal justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, I am proud to introduce the Effective Administration of Criminal Justice Act of 2012. This legislation takes important new steps to ensure the fairness of our criminal justice system for all participants.

First, this bill seeks to encourage States to adopt a comprehensive approach in using the Federal funds received through the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant, JAG, Program. This will help to ensure that their criminal justice systems operate effectively as a whole and that all parts of the system work together and receive the resources they need. Specifically, the bill reinstates a previous requirement of the Byrne JAG Program that States develop, and update annually, a strategic plan detailing how grants received under the program will be used to improve the administration of the criminal justice system. The requirement was removed from the Byrne JAG grant application several years ago, but groups representing States and victims have requested that it be reinstated in order to improve the efficient and effective use of criminal justice resources. The plan must be formulated in consultation with local governments and all segments of the criminal justice system. The Attorney General will also be required to make technical assistance available to help States formulate their strategic plans.

This legislation also takes important new steps to ensure that all criminal defendants, including those who cannot afford a lawyer, receive constitutionally adequate representation. It requires the Department of Justice to assist States that want help developing an effective and efficient system of indigent defense, and it establishes a

cause of action for the Federal government to step in when States are systematically failing to provide the representation called for in the Constitution.

This is a reasonable measure that gives the States assistance and time needed to make necessary changes and seeks to provide an incentive for States to do so. As a former prosecutor, I have great faith in the men and women of law enforcement, and I know that the vast majority of the time our criminal justice system does work fairly and effectively. I also know though that the system only works as it should when each side is well represented by competent and well-trained counsel. It was persuasive to me when Houston District Attorney Patricia Lykos testified before the Judiciary Committee several years ago when this provision was first considered that competent defense attorneys are critical to a prosecutor's job. Our system requires good lawyers on both sides, and incompetent counsel can result not only in needless and time consuming appeals, but far more importantly, it can lead to wrongful convictions and overall distrust in the criminal process. In working on this legislation, I have also learned that the most effective systems of indigent defense are not always the most expensive. In some cases, making the necessary changes may also save States money.

I remain committed to ensuring that our criminal justice system operates as effectively and fairly as possible. Unfortunately, we are not there yet. Too often the quality of justice a defendant receives in our system depends on whether he or she can pay for an attorney. That is repugnant to the American sense of justice and we must do better. Americans need and deserve a criminal justice system which keeps us safe, ensures fairness and accuracy, and fulfills the promise of our constitution for all people. This bill will take important steps to bring us closer to that goal and I urge all Senators to support this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 3335

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 "Effective Administration of Criminal Justice Act of 2012".

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE.

(a) STRATEGIC PLANNING.—Section 502 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3752) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—" before "To request a grant"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(6) A comprehensive State-wide plan detailing how grants received under this sec-

tion will be used to improve the administration of the criminal justice system, which shall—

"(A) be designed in consultation with local governments, and all segments of the criminal justice system, including judges, prosecutors, law enforcement personnel, corrections personnel, and providers of indigent defense services, victim services, juvenile justice delinquency prevention programs, community corrections, and reentry services;

"(B) include a description of how the State will allocate funding within and among each of the uses described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of section 501(a)(1);

"(C) describe the process used by the State for gathering evidence-based data and developing and using evidence-based and evidence-gathering approaches in support of funding decisions; and

"(D) be updated every 5 years, with annual progress reports that—

"(i) address changing circumstances in the State, if any;

"(ii) describe how the State plans to adjust funding within and among each of the uses described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of section 501(a)(1);

"(iii) provide an ongoing assessment of need;

"(iv) discuss the accomplishment of goals identified in any plan previously prepared under this paragraph; and

"(v) reflect how the plan influenced funding decisions in the previous year.

"(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

"(1) STRATEGIC PLANNING.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall begin to provide technical assistance to States and local governments requesting support to develop and implement the strategic plan required under subsection (a)(6).

"(2) PROTECTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall begin to provide technical assistance to States and local governments, including any agent thereof with responsibility for administration of justice, requesting support to meet the obligations established by the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall include—

"(A) public dissemination of practices, structures, or models for the administration of justice consistent with the requirements of the Sixth Amendment; and

"(B) assistance with adopting and implementing a system for the administration of justice consistent with the requirements of the Sixth Amendment.

"(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017 to carry out this subsection."

(b) PROTECTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.—

(1) UNLAWFUL CONDUCT.—It shall be unlawful for any governmental authority, or any agent thereof, or any person acting on behalf of a governmental authority, to engage in a pattern or practice of conduct by officials or employees of any governmental agency with responsibility for the administration of justice, including the administration of programs or services that provide appointed counsel to indigent defendants, that deprives persons of their rights to assistance of counsel as protected under the Sixth Amendment and Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

(2) CIVIL ACTION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Whenever the Attorney General has reasonable cause to believe that a violation of paragraph (1) has occurred, the Attorney General, for or in the name of the United States, may, in a civil action, obtain appropriate eq-

uitable and declaratory relief to eliminate the pattern or practice.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (2) shall take effect 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. INOUE (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 3336. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a major medical facility project lease for a Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic at Ewa Plain, Oahu, Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce an authorization measure for the Department of Veterans Affairs to Advance Leeward Outpatient Healthcare Access, ALOHA, lease in Ewa, HI, and to request the facility be named after my dear friend and colleague Senator DANIEL K. AKAKA.

The new facility will provide support to our proud veterans in the State of Hawaii who live in West Oahu. In addition to serving the needs of our veterans, the facility will include a collocated clinic which will serve our military servicemen and women, and their families. Both the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs, VA, will also be able to share ancillary and support services.

I believe naming this joint facility after Senator AKAKA is an appropriate and fitting way to honor his commitment to our military personnel and veterans throughout his years in Congress. As a Member of the Armed Services Committee and the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Readiness, he worked to ensure the Armed Services met their obligation to "man, train, and equip." As the Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee, Senator AKAKA also kept watch over and labored to improve the quality of care received by our brave men and women who completed their military service and entered into the VA system.

I hope my colleagues will join me in saluting Senator AKAKA who worked on behalf of the people of the State of Hawaii and this nation to improve the quality of life and care of our military personnel and our veterans.

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. 3336

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF DANIEL KAHIKINA AKAKA DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS CLINIC.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF FISCAL YEAR 2013 MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY LEASE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out a major medical facility lease for a Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic at Ewa Plain, Oahu, Hawaii, in an amount not to exceed \$16,453,300.

(b) DESIGNATION.—The outpatient clinic described in subsection (a) shall after the date

of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the "Daniel Kahikina Akaka Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic".

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 49—TO DIRECT THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY TO ACCEPT A STATUE DEPICTING FREDERICK DOUGLASS FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND DISPLAY THE STATUE IN A SUITABLE LOCATION IN THE CAPITOL

Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 49

Whereas Frederick Douglass, born Frederick Augustus Washington Bailey in Maryland in 1818, escaped from slavery and became a leading writer, orator, and publisher, and one of the Nation's most influential advocates for abolitionism, women's suffrage, and the equality of all people;

Whereas the contributions of Frederick Douglass over many decades were crucial to the abolition of slavery, the passage of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, the support for women's suffrage, and the advancement of African Americans after the Civil War;

Whereas after living in New Bedford, Massachusetts, Frederick Douglass resided for 25 years in Rochester, New York, where he published and edited "The North Star", the leading African-American newspaper in the United States, and other publications;

Whereas self-educated, Frederick Douglass wrote several influential books, including his best-selling first autobiography, "Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave", published in 1845;

Whereas Frederick Douglass worked tirelessly for the emancipation of African-American slaves, was a pivotal figure in Underground Railroad activities in Western New York, and was an inspiration to enslaved Americans who aspired to freedom;

Whereas as a well-known speaker in great demand, Frederick Douglass traveled widely, visiting countries such as England and Ireland, to spread the message of emancipation and equal rights;

Whereas Frederick Douglass was the only African American to attend the Seneca Falls Convention, a women's rights convention held in Seneca Falls, New York in 1848;

Whereas during the Civil War, Frederick Douglass recruited African Americans to volunteer as soldiers for the Union Army, including 2 of his sons who served nobly in the Fifty-fourth Massachusetts Regiment;

Whereas in 1872, Frederick Douglass moved to Washington, D.C., after a fire destroyed his home in Rochester, New York;

Whereas Frederick Douglass was appointed as a United States Marshal in 1877 and was named Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia in 1881;

Whereas Frederick Douglass became the first African American to receive a vote for nomination as President of the United States at a major party convention for the 1888 Republican National Convention;

Whereas from 1889 to 1891, Frederick Douglass served as minister-resident and consul-general to the Republic of Haiti;

Whereas Frederick Douglass was recognized around the world as one of the most important political activists in the history of the United States;

Whereas Frederick Douglass died in 1895 in Washington, D.C. and is buried in Rochester, New York;

Whereas the statues and busts in the Capitol depicting distinguished Americans number more than 180 and include only 2 African Americans;

Whereas that imbalance fails to show the historically significant contributions of African Americans to the United States;

Whereas it is time to display in the Capitol the statues and busts of outstanding African Americans whose contributions to the Nation deserve that recognition; and

Whereas Frederick Douglass's achievements and influence on the history of the United States merit recognition in the Capitol: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That—

(1) not later than 2 years after the date on which this resolution is agreed to by both Houses of Congress, the Joint Committee on the Library shall accept from the District of Columbia the donation of a statue depicting Frederick Douglass, subject to the terms and conditions that the Joint Committee considers appropriate;

(2) the Joint Committee shall place the statue in a suitable permanent location in the Capitol; and

(3) all costs associated with the donation, including transportation of the statue to, and placement in, the Capitol, shall be paid by the District of Columbia.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a bill that would bring a statue depicting Fredrick Douglass to our Nation's Capitol. The life and deeds of this great American need no introduction. He escaped the shackles of slavery to become a leading writer, orator, publisher, and a leader in the abolitionist struggle towards equality for all. I am proud that Fredrick Douglass called Rochester, NY home for 25 years. But others claim him as well. He was born into slavery in Maryland, and lived as a free adult in Massachusetts and, at the end of his life, in Washington, DC. He died here in the Nation's Capitol and is buried in upstate New York. During his time in Rochester, he published the leading African American newspaper in the country. His influential best-selling autobiography, "Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass," served as a rallying cry for the abolitionist movement and helped bring an end to that cruel institution. It is therefore fitting that this Fredrick Douglass statue should find its home in the Capitol.

The addition of this statue of Frederick Douglass to our Capitol is long overdue. It is important that the Americans depicted in portraiture and in sculpture in the Capitol reflect the true heritage of our nation and the people who have helped to make it great. Today too few of our artworks depict the richness and diversity of great Americans. In fact, of more than 180 statues and busts in the Capitol, only two are of African Americans. This resolution is a small step toward correcting that imbalance. The acceptance of this Fredrick Douglass statue into our Capitol is appropriate both because of who Fredrick Douglass was as an American and because of who we all are as Americans.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2461. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 3187, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and medical devices, to establish user-fee programs for generic drugs and biosimilars, and for other purposes.

SA 2462. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2461 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 3187, *supra*.

SA 2463. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 3187, *supra*.

SA 2464. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2463 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 3187, *supra*.

SA 2465. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2464 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 2463 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 3187, *supra*.

SA 2466. Mr. REID (for Ms. COLLINS) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 471, commending the efforts of the women of the American Red Cross Clubmobiles for exemplary service during the Second World War.

SA 2467. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1940, to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2461. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 3187, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and medical devices, to establish user-fee programs for generic drugs and biosimilars, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following new section:
SEC. ____.

This Act shall become effective 5 days after enactment.

SA 2462. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2461 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 3187, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and medical devices, to establish user-fee programs for generic drugs and biosimilars, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment, strike "5 days" and insert "4 days".

SA 2463. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 3187, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and medical devices, to establish user-fee programs for generic drugs and biosimilars, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following new section:
SEC. ____.

This Act shall become effective 3 days after enactment.

SA 2464. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2463 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 3187, to

amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and medical devices, to establish user-fee programs for generic drugs and biosimilars, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “3 days” and insert “2 days”.

SA 2465. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2464 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 2463 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 3187, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and medical devices, to establish user-fee programs for generic drugs and biosimilars, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “2 days” and insert “1 day”.

SA 2466. Mr. REID (for Ms. COLLINS) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 471, commending the efforts of the women of the American Red Cross Clubmobiles for exemplary service during the Second World War; as follows:

In the preamble, strike the third whereas clause through the sixth whereas clause and insert the following:

Whereas thousands of young women, from every State in the United States, volunteered to serve in the Clubmobiles, and were chosen after a rigorous interview process:

Whereas, between July and August 1944, less than 1 month after the invasion of Normandy, France, 80 Clubmobiles and 320 American Red Cross volunteers crossed the English Channel and began providing coffee, doughnuts, and a friendly smile to servicemen fighting on the front lines;

Whereas the Clubmobile volunteers saw service across Europe in France, Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg, and Germany, and later in the Far East, touching the lives of hundreds of thousands of United States servicemen until victory was achieved;

SA 2467. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1940, to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. ____ USE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF PORTIONS OF A FLOOD CONTROL LEVEE.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—Notwithstanding section 404(b)(2)(B) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c(b)(2)(B)), Lot 1 of the Morning Heights Subdivision, Lot 2 and PT ST of the Morning Heights Subdivision, Lot 1 and PT ST of the Bayless Addition, and Lot 24 of the Bayless Addition in Findlay, Ohio, shall be available for the construction and operation of portions of a flood control levee if the Chief of Engineers completes a feasibility study that indicates that the construction and operation is the most appropriate and cost-effective flood risk management project for the area.

(b) **USE OF PROPERTY.**—Any portion of the property described in subsection (a) that is not used for the construction and operation of a flood control levee under subsection (a)

shall remain deeded as open space in perpetuity, in accordance with section 404(b)(2)(B) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c(b)(2)(B)).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 10 a.m., to conduct a committee hearing entitled “Perspectives on Money Market Mutual Fund Reforms.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 10 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 9:45 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Russia’s WTO Accession—Administration’s Views on the Implications for the United States.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled “Implementation of the New START Treaty, and Related Matters.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled “Olmstead Enforcement Update: Using the ADA to Promote Community Integration” on June 21, 2012, at 10 a.m., in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 10 a.m., in SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION POLICY AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy, and Consumer Rights, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 1:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “The Universal Music Group/EMI Merger and the Future of Online Music.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs’ Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, “Security Clearance Reform: Sustaining Progress for the Future.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1940

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, June

25, at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, but no later than 5:30 p.m., the motion to proceed to S. 1940 be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, on Tuesday, June 26, 2012, at 11:30 a.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 652; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions to be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; and that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Foreign Service, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and that the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, considered and confirmed, are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

William B. Pollard, III, of New York, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Military Commission Review.

Scott L. Silliman, of North Carolina, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Military Commission Review.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force 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 R. Moeller

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force 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. Mark F. Ramsay

The following named officer for appointment as the Surgeon General of the Air Force and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 8036 and 601:

To be Lieutenant General

Maj. Gen. Thomas W. Travis

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force 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. Darren W. McDew

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force 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. Stanley T. Kresge

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Major General

Brigadier General Edward M. Reeder, 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

Lt. Gen. John F. Mulholland, 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. William B. Garrett, III

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. Howard B. Bromberg

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. James L. Huggins, Jr.

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. Barry D. Keeling

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. Joseph E. Rooney

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Janet R. Donovan

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Barbara W. Sweredoski

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Kirby D. Miller

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Captain Michael J. Dumont
 Captain Robert L. Greene
 Captain Lawrence B. Jackson
 Captain Scott B.J. Jerabek

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Clinton F. Faison, III

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Jonathan A. Yuen

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Katherine L. Gregory
 Rear Adm. (lh) Kevin R. Slates

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be Rear Admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Sandy L. Daniels
 Rear Adm. (lh) John E. Jolliffe
 Rear Adm. (lh) Christopher J. Paul

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be Rear Admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Bruce A. Doll

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be Rear Admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) David G. Russell

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Elizabeth L. Train

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Richard D. Berkey

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Douglas G. Morton

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Terry J. Moulton

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. David R. Pimpo

Capt. Donald L. Singleton

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Paul A. Sohl

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Bruce F. Loveless

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Brian K. Antonio

Capt. Luther B. Fuller, III

The following named United States Navy Reserve officer for appointment as the Chief of Navy Reserve and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 5143:

To be Vice Admiral

Rear Adm. Robin R. Braun

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. Paul J. Bushong

The following named officer for appointment as Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Navy and for appointment to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 5149:

To be Rear Admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) James W. Crawford, III

The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Navy and for appointment as the Judge Advocate General of the Navy under title 10, U.S.C., section 5148:

To be Vice Admiral

Rear Adm. Nanette M. DeRenzi

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. Michael J. Connor

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Brigadier General

Colonel Edward D. Banta

Colonel Matthew G. Glavy

Colonel William F. Mullen, III

Colonel Gregg P. Olson

Colonel James S. O'Meara

Colonel Eric M. Smith

The following named officer for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general in the United States Marine Corps while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be Lieutenant General

Maj. Gen. (Select) William M. Faulkner

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN1738 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning Chance J. Henderson, and ending Jeffrey P. Tan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1739 AIR FORCE nominations (3) beginning JESSICA L. WEAVER, and ending JONELLE J. KNAPP, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

IN THE ARMY

PN1721 ARMY nomination of Joseph F. Jarrard, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2012.

PN1722 ARMY nomination of Kevin J. Park, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2012.

PN1723 ARMY nomination of Charles R. Perry, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2012.

PN1724 ARMY nominations (12) beginning ANTHONY P. DIGIACOMO, II, and ending RICHARD D. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2012.

PN1740 ARMY nomination of Youngmi Cho, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1741 ARMY nomination of Richard M. Zygadlo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1742 ARMY nomination of David H. Rittgers, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1743 ARMY nominations (2) beginning Eric S. Slater, and ending Marcus P. Wong, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1744 ARMY nominations (2) beginning Gaston P. Bathalon, and ending Kevin C. Reilly, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1745 ARMY nominations (3) beginning JERRY L. BRATU, JR., and ending AMOS P. PARKER, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1746 ARMY nominations (6) beginning BRETT W. ANDERSEN, and ending MICHAEL D. WHITE, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1747 ARMY nominations (7) beginning CASEY ROGERS, and ending SHARON A. SCHELL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1748 ARMY nominations (17) beginning DWAYNE C. BECHTOL, and ending D005682, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1749 ARMY nominations (17) beginning ARMANDO AGUILERA, JR., and ending DAVE ST JOHN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1750 ARMY nominations (19) beginning BRUCE J. BEECHER, and ending D004871, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1751 ARMY nominations (107) beginning RENEE D. ALFORD, and ending PJ

ZAMORA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1752 ARMY nominations (119) beginning JUDE M. ABADIE, and ending D010155, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1753 ARMY nominations (140) beginning BRIAN E. ABELL, and ending D010333, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

FOREIGN SERVICE

PN1346 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (9) beginning William M. Zarit, and ending Michael J. Richardson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 2, 2012.

PN1526 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (3) beginning Jeffrey B. Justice, and ending Enrique G. Ortiz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 18, 2012.

PN1564 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (162) beginning Michael C. Aho, and ending Michael L. Yoder, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 26, 2012.

PN1678 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (89) beginning Alboino Lungobardo Deulus, and ending Bradley Alan Freden, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2012.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN1300 MARINE CORPS nominations (129) beginning EDUARDO A. ABISELLAN, and ending WILLIAM E. ZAMAGNI, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 31, 2012.

PN1301 MARINE CORPS nominations (677) beginning OMAR A. ADAME, and ending CHRISTINA F. ZIMMERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 31, 2012.

IN THE NAVY

PN1601 NAVY nominations (6) beginning JENNIFER D. GUNDAYAO, and ending DONALD R. WILKINSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1602 NAVY nominations (173) beginning DAVID A. ADAMS, and ending JOHN J. ZERR, II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1603 NAVY nominations (3) beginning MARK D. LARABEE, and ending RICHARD J. WATKINS, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1604 NAVY nominations (14) beginning GREGORY D. BURTON, and ending JOSEPH M. TUIITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1605 NAVY nominations (11) beginning MICHAEL N. ABREU, and ending SCOTT D. TINGLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1606 NAVY nominations (3) beginning TRENT R. DEMOSS, and ending CHARLES K. NIXON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1607 NAVY nominations (94) beginning ROGER L. ACEBO, and ending JEFFREY D. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1608 NAVY nominations (14) beginning THOMAS F. BOLICH, JR., and ending DONALD R. XIQUES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1609 NAVY nominations (8) beginning RAYMOND I. BRUTTOMESSO, and ending MARK R. SANDS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1610 NAVY nominations (3) beginning WILLIAM A. BAAS, and ending JAMES E. PUCKETT, II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1611 NAVY nominations (3) beginning THOMAS J. AMIS, and ending SUEANN K. SCHORR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1612 NAVY nominations (2) beginning JEFFERSON W. ADAMS, and ending ROBERT B. SMITH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1613 NAVY nominations (2) beginning ROBERT W. MULAC, and ending WILLIAM K. SALVIN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1614 NAVY nominations (2) beginning COLETTE E. KOKRON, and ending CURTIS L. MICHEL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1615 NAVY nominations (2) beginning TAWNYA J. RACOOSIN, and ending TODD D. WHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1616 NAVY nominations (2) beginning ELISABETH S. STEPHENS, and ending SHERYL L. TANNAHILL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1617 NAVY nominations (3) beginning DONALD W. BOSCH, and ending THERESA M. STICE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1618 NAVY nominations (20) beginning DARREN E. ANDING, and ending STEVEN K. RENLY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1619 NAVY nominations (2) beginning JEFF A. DAVIS, and ending BRENDA K. MALONE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1620 NAVY nominations (14) beginning MARK R. ASUNCION, and ending PHILIP W. YU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1621 NAVY nominations (5) beginning MARC C. ECKARDT, and ending ROBERT W. WITZLEB, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1622 NAVY nominations (5) beginning WILLIAM A. DODGE, JR., and ending ALBERT M. MUSSELWHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1623 NAVY nominations (4) beginning ALLEN L. EDMISTON, and ending JACQUELINE V. MCELHANNON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1624 NAVY nominations (10) beginning JASON L. ANSLEY, and ending LOUIS T. UNREIN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1625 NAVY nominations (8) beginning GEORGE A. ALLMON, and ending TIMOTHY G. SPARKS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1629 NAVY nominations (13) beginning JOHN P. AYRES, and ending CLAY L. WILD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1653 NAVY nomination of Glenn E. Gaborok, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1654 NAVY nomination of Roger L. Blank, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1655 NAVY nominations (2) beginning MICHAEL C. BARBER, and ending DAVID G. ORAVEC, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1656 NAVY nominations (2) beginning JOSEPH A. DAVIS, and ending SCOTT D. EBERWINE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1657 NAVY nominations (3) beginning DAVID H. DUTTLINGER, and ending DARCY I. WOLFE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1658 NAVY nominations (6) beginning FRANK J. BRAJEVIC, and ending DAVID E. WOOLSTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1659 NAVY nominations (8) beginning LAUREN D. BALES, and ending DAVID A. SERAFINI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1660 NAVY nominations (8) beginning CHRISTOPHER J. CORVO, and ending THOMAS J. WELSH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1661 NAVY nominations (10) beginning MARIA L. AGUAYO, and ending ANDREW J. SCHULMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1662 NAVY nominations (12) beginning DAVID O. BYNUM, and ending MELVIN H. UNDERWOOD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1663 NAVY nominations (13) beginning DOUGLAS J. COHEN, and ending KEVIN P. WHITMORE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1664 NAVY nominations (14) beginning RICHARD S. BARLAMENT, and ending JOHN S. SIBLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1665 NAVY nominations (14) beginning BRIAN E. BEHARRY, and ending DARREL G. VAUGHN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1666 NAVY nominations (16) beginning PATRICK J. BLAIR, and ending AARON D. WERBEL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1667 NAVY nominations (29) beginning JAMES T. ALBRITTON, and ending ROBERT L. WILLIAMS, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1668 NAVY nominations (17) beginning VERONICA G. ARMSTRONG, and ending MARIA A. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1669 NAVY nominations (49) beginning JULIANN M. ALTHOFF, and ending JOHN WYLAND, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1670 NAVY nominations (17) beginning CASEY S. ADAMS, and ending KAREN G. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1686 NAVY nomination of Robert E. Bradshaw, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2012.

PN1725 NAVY nomination of Darren W. Murphy, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2012.

PN1754 NAVY nomination of Ling Ye, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1755 NAVY nomination of Gregory E. Ringler, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1756 NAVY nominations (2) beginning CRAIG S. COLEMAN, and ending EDUARDO B. RIZO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1757 NAVY nominations (2) beginning PAUL D. GINKEL, and ending GABRIEL S. NILES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1758 NAVY nominations (2) beginning MICHELE M. DAY, and ending DET R. SMITH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1759 NAVY nominations (9) beginning STEVE M. CURRY, and ending WILLIAM R. URBAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1760 NAVY nominations (9) beginning AMY L. BLEIDORN, and ending MICAH A. WELTMER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1761 NAVY nominations (9) beginning MICHAEL J. BARRIERE, and ending MATTHEW T. WILCOX, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1762 NAVY nominations (14) beginning BRIAN M. BALLER, and ending MICHAEL J. SZCZERBINSKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1763 NAVY nominations (17) beginning HEATH D. BOHLEN, and ending MATTHEW C. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1764 NAVY nominations (17) beginning DERECK C. BROWN, and ending SHERRY W. WANGWHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1765 NAVY nominations (18) beginning MARC A. ARAGON, and ending ROBERT A. YEE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1766 NAVY nominations (28) beginning KEVIN J. BEHM, and ending EVAN P. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1767 NAVY nominations (33) beginning ERIK E. ANDERSON, and ending CHRISTOPHER G. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1768 NAVY nominations (55) beginning RENE V. ABADESCO, and ending MARK W.

YATES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1769 NAVY nominations (388) beginning DAVID J. ADAMS, and ending KEVIN P. ZAYAC, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1770 NAVY nominations (5) beginning BRIAN P. BURROW, and ending CHRISTOPHER A. WEECH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1771 NAVY nominations (13) beginning DERRICK E. BLACKSTON, and ending DEREK A. VESTAL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

CHURCH PLAN INVESTMENT CLARIFICATION ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Banking Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 33) to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to specify when certain securities issued in connection with church plans are treated as exempted securities for purposes of that Act.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the efforts of Chairman JOHNSON in making sure that our Nation's religious leaders are able to have expanded opportunities for their retirement plans, while also ensuring that we don't create any unintended consequences. To remove any potential ambiguity, we want to make clear that H.R. 33 is intended to make clear that the offer and sale of a bank collective trust's securities that are exempt from the Securities Act of 1933 if sold to employee benefit plans described in Section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code, such as 401(k) plans, would not lose such exemption solely on the basis that such securities are sold to church plans described in 403(b)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code (church plans described in Section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code already receive such exemptive relief) or to plans that include self-employed ministers. H.R. 33 is not intended to expand the exemption to any interests, participations or securities that are sold to a person other than such church plans and plans that include self-employed ministers.

Mr. JOHNSON. I agree with Senator LEVIN's statement.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 33) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

COMMENDING THE WOMEN OF THE AMERICAN RED CROSS CLUBMOBILES

Mr. REID. I now ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate proceed to S. Res. 471.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 471) commending the efforts of the women of the American Red Cross Clubmobiles for exemplary service during the Second World War.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the service of the women of the American Red Cross Clubmobiles. These brave young Americans served our country with distinction overseas during the Second World War.

During the War, the Red Cross was charged by the Armed Forces to provide for the recreational welfare of the troops. Wherever there was a sizable group of American servicemen permanently assigned, the Red Cross established canteens, which provided a bit of respite from training for war and were tremendously popular. But the canteens were fixed sites, and did not reach many of the combat troops garrisoned at small locations across the English countryside.

In order to extend a taste of home to the troops, the Red Cross Commissioner for Great Britain, Harvey Gibson, thought up the idea of the "Clubmobile," a mobile kitchen set up in an old London bus. In late 1942, several of these Clubmobiles began operating between dozens of bases around the country, serving coffee and doughnuts to those preparing for D-day.

Shortly after the beachhead at Normandy was successfully secured, 80 Clubmobiles and 320 volunteers crossed the English Channel to begin operating their mobile kitchens near the front lines. Each Clubmobile group, consisting of eight two-and-a-half ton trucks named for an American city or State, was attached to an Army Corps and moved with the unit's support elements, often going forward to provide the troops with American music, hot coffee, and doughnuts. Like every soldier, the Clubmobile women were in "for the duration." By War's end, the Clubmobiles were operating across Europe, from southern Italy to northern Germany, and in the Far East from the jungles of Burma to the shores of Tokyo Bay.

A visit from a Clubmobile was one of the most significant events for a young G.I. in combat far from home, and the women of the Clubmobiles, young women from every single State, acted as friends and sisters to the troops with whom they interacted.

These women were trailblazers, every bit as much as the Navy's Women Ac-

cepted for Volunteer Emergency Service—WAVES—the Women's Army Corps—WACS—and the Women Airforce Service Pilots—WASPs. They were young, independent, and patriotic. They joined for a variety of reasons, some for adventure, some to serve in uniform as close to combat as they were then allowed, and some to honor the sacrifices of their own fathers, brothers, or friends. Every one of them was dedicated to their country, and volunteered for the Clubmobiles rather than an easier or safer job at home.

The dangers of War were real. During the War, 52 Red Cross women lost their lives, some of them from the Clubmobiles. Their stories are those of a nation at war.

Elizabeth Richardson joined the Red Cross in 1944 after graduating from Milwaukee-Downer College and after a brief career in advertising. She helped pilot the Clubmobile named Kansas City throughout England, Holland and France, listening to soldiers' stories while cracking jokes and sharing her own. Two months after V-E Day, Liz's plane crashed en route to Paris. Liz Richardson, dead at 27, now lies interred at the Normandy American Cemetery. Before she died, she said about her service, "I wouldn't trade this for anything else."

Those sentiments are shared by Margaret "Margo" Hemingway Harrington of Rye, NH, one of the few surviving Clubmobile women. She said, "I just got itchy feet, and thought I should be doing something more."

The women of the Clubmobiles touched the lives of hundreds of thousands of U.S. servicemen. The Red Cross alone purchased enough flour to make 1.5 million doughnuts, most of which were served through the windows of a Clubmobile.

To honor their memory, 70 years after they were established, Senator SHAHEEN and I, joined by 11 of our colleagues, introduced Senate Resolution 471, which commends the exemplary and courageous service of the Clubmobiles, honors those that lost their lives, calls upon historians to not let this important piece of American history be lost, and urges the Red Cross to publically commemorate their stories.

Honoring them now is critically important, because only a very few of these women remain. Their stories are every bit as vibrant and important to our victory as those of the men who valiantly fought to defend our freedom. I urge every one of my colleagues to support this Resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; a Collins amendment to the preamble, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 471) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2466) was agreed to, as follows:

In the preamble, strike the third whereas clause through the sixth whereas clause and insert the following:

Whereas thousands of young women, from every State in the United States, volunteered to serve in the Clubmobiles, and were chosen after a rigorous interview process;

Whereas, between July and August 1944, less than 1 month after the invasion of Normandy, France, 80 Clubmobiles and 320 American Red Cross volunteers crossed the English Channel and began providing coffee, doughnuts, and a friendly smile to servicemen fighting on the front lines;

Whereas the Clubmobile volunteers saw service across Europe in France, Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg, and Germany, and later in the Far East, touching the lives of hundreds of thousands of United States servicemen until victory was achieved;

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 471

Whereas, during the Second World War, the American Red Cross was charged by the United States Armed Forces with providing recreational services to the soldiers serving in the war;

Whereas Harvey Gibson, the Red Cross Commissioner to Great Britain during the war, conceived of the Clubmobiles in 1942 as a means of providing hot coffee, fresh doughnuts, and a vital connection to home to thousands of servicemen at dozens of airfields, bases, and camps throughout Great Britain during the buildup to D-Day;

Whereas thousands of young women, from every State in the United States, volunteered to serve in the Clubmobiles, and were chosen after a rigorous interview process;

Whereas, between July and August 1944, less than 1 month after the invasion of Normandy, France, 80 Clubmobiles and 320 American Red Cross volunteers crossed the English Channel and began providing coffee, doughnuts, and a friendly smile to servicemen fighting on the front lines;

Whereas the Clubmobile volunteers saw service across Europe in France, Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg, and Germany, and later in the Far East, touching the lives of hundreds of thousands of United States servicemen until victory was achieved;

Whereas a visit from a Clubmobile, which could serve gallons of coffee and hundreds of doughnuts every minute, was often the most significant morale boost available to servicemen at war;

Whereas 52 women of the American Red Cross, some of whom served on the Clubmobiles, perished during the war as a result of their service; and

Whereas 70 years have passed since the Clubmobiles were founded, and only a few women who served in the Clubmobiles remain to share their stories: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the exemplary and courageous service and sacrifice of each of the patriotic women of the United States who served in the American Red Cross Clubmobiles during the Second World War;

(2) honors the Clubmobile women who lost their lives during the Second World War;

(3) calls upon historians of the Second World War to recognize and describe the service of the Clubmobiles, and to not let this important piece of United States history be lost; and

(4) urges the American Red Cross to publicly commemorate the stories of the

Clubmobiles and the amazing women who served in them.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 25, 2012

Mr. REID. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, June 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 the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1940, the flood insurance bill, postcloture; and that at 5:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to a cloture vote on the motion to concur in the House message to accompany S. 3187, the FDA bill, under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. At 5:30 p.m. on Monday, there will be a rollcall vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to concur in the House message to accompany S. 3187, the FDA bill.

It has been a long hard week. We have accomplished quite a bit. We have a lot more to do, but it has been one of our better weeks.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 25, 2012, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:40 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 25, 2012, at 2 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 21, 2012:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

WILLIAM B. POLLARD, III, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY COMMISSION REVIEW.

SCOTT L. SILLMAN, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY COMMISSION REVIEW.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE 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 R. MOELLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE 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. MARK F. RAMSAY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE SURGEON GENERAL OF THE AIR FORCE AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 8036 AND 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. THOMAS W. TRAVIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE 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. DARREN W. MCDEW

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE 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. STANLEY T. KRESGE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL EDWARD M. REEDER, 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

LT. GEN. JOHN F. MULHOLLAND, 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. WILLIAM B. GARRETT III

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. HOWARD B. BROMBERG

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. JAMES L. HUGGINS, JR.

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. BARRY D. KEELING

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. JOSEPH E. ROONEY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JANET R. DONOVAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. BARBARA W. SWEREDOSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KIRBY D. MILLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPTAIN MICHAEL J. DUMONT
CAPTAIN ROBERT L. GREENE
CAPTAIN LAWRENCE B. JACKSON
CAPTAIN SCOTT B. J. JERABEK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) CLINTON F. FAISON III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JONATHAN A. YUEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) KATHERINE L. GREGORY
REAR ADM. (LH) KEVIN R. SLATES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) SANDY L. DANIELS
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN E. JOLLIFFE
REAR ADM. (LH) CHRISTOPHER J. PAUL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) BRUCE A. DOLL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID G. RUSSELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ELIZABETH L. TRAIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) RICHARD D. BERKEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DOUGLAS G. MORTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. TERRY J. MOULTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DAVID R. PIMPO

CAPT. DONALD L. SINGLETON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. PAUL A. SOHL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. BRUCE F. LOVELESS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. BRIAN K. ANTONIO

CAPT. LUTHER B. FULLER III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE CHIEF OF NAVY RESERVE AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5143:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. ROBIN R. BRAUN

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. PAUL J. BUSHONG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS DEPUTY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE NAVY AND FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5149:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JAMES W. CRAWFORD III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY AND FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5148:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. NANETTE M. DERENZI

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. MICHAEL J. CONNOR

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL EDWARD D. BANTA
COLONEL MATTHEW G. GLAVY
COLONEL WILLIAM F. MULLEN III
COLONEL GREGG P. OLSON
COLONEL JAMES S. O'MEARA
COLONEL ERIC M. SMITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. (SELECT) WILLIAM M. FAULKNER

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHANCE J. HENDERSON AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY P. TAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JESSICA L. WEAVER AND ENDING WITH JONELLE J. KNAPP, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOSEPH F. JARRARD, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KEVIN J. PARK, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHARLES R. PERRY, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTHONY P. DIGIACOMO II AND ENDING WITH RICHARD D. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATION OF YOUNGMI CHO, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RICHARD M. ZYGADLO, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DAVID H. RITTGERS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIC S. SLATER AND ENDING WITH MARCUS P. WONG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GASTON P. BATHALON AND ENDING WITH KEVIN C. REILLY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JERRY L. BRATU, JR. AND ENDING WITH AMOS P. PARKER, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRETT W. ANDERSEN AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL D. WHITED, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CASEY ROGERS AND ENDING WITH SHARON A. SCHELL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DWAYNE C. BECHTOL AND ENDING WITH D00682, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ARMANDO AGUILERA, JR. AND ENDING WITH DAVE ST JOHN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRUCE J. BEECHER AND ENDING WITH D004871, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RENEE D. ALFORD AND ENDING WITH PJ ZAMORA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JUDE M. ABADIE AND ENDING WITH D010155, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN E. ABELL AND ENDING WITH D010333, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH EDUARDO A. ABISELLAN AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM E. ZAMAGNI, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 31, 2012.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH OMAR A. ADAME AND ENDING WITH CHRISTINA F. ZIMMERMAN,

WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 31, 2012.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JENNIFER D. GUNDAYAO AND ENDING WITH DONALD R. WILKINSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID A. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH JOHN J. ZERR II, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARK D. LARABEE AND ENDING WITH RICHARD J. WATKINS, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GREGORY D. BURTON AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH M. TUIITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL N. ABREU AND ENDING WITH SCOTT D. TINGLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TRENT R. DEMOSS AND ENDING WITH CHARLES K. NIXON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROGER L. ACEBO AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY D. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THOMAS F. BOLICH, JR. AND ENDING WITH DONALD R. XIKUES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RAYMOND I. BRUTTOMESSO AND ENDING WITH MARK R. SANDS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM A. BAAS AND ENDING WITH JAMES E. PUCKETT II, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THOMAS J. AMIS AND ENDING WITH SUEANN K. SCHORR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFERSON W. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH ROBERT B. SMITH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT W. MULAC AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM K. SALVIN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH COLETTE E. KOKRON AND ENDING WITH CURTIS L. MICHEL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TAWNYA J. RACOOSIN AND ENDING WITH TODD D. WHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ELISABETH S. STEPHENS AND ENDING WITH SHERYL L. TANNAHILL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DONALD W. BOSCH AND ENDING WITH THERESA M. STICE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DARREN E. ANDING AND ENDING WITH STEVEN K. RENLY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFF A. DAVIS AND ENDING WITH BRENDA K. MALONE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARK R. ASUNCION AND ENDING WITH PHILIP W. YU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARC C. ECKARDT AND ENDING WITH ROBERT W. WITZLEB, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM A. DODGE, JR. AND ENDING WITH ALBERT M. MUSSELWHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALLEN L. EDMISTON AND ENDING WITH JACQUELINE V. MCELHANNON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON L. ANSLEY AND ENDING WITH LOUIS T. UNREIN, WHICH

NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GEORGE A. ALLMON AND ENDING WITH TIMOTHY G. SPARKS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN P. AYRES AND ENDING WITH CLAY L. WILD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATION OF GLENN E. GABORKO, JR., TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ROGER L. BLANK, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL C. BARBER AND ENDING WITH DAVID G. ORAVEC, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSEPH A. DAVIS AND ENDING WITH SCOTT D. EBERWINE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID H. DUTTLINGER AND ENDING WITH DARCY I. WOLFE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FRANK J. BRAJEVIC AND ENDING WITH DAVID E. WOOLSTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LAUREN D. BALES AND ENDING WITH DAVID A. SERAFINI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER J. CORVO AND ENDING WITH THOMAS J. WELSH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARIA L. AGUAYO AND ENDING WITH ANDREW J. SCHULMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID O. BYNUM AND ENDING WITH MELVIN H. UNDERWOOD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DOUGLAS J. COHEN AND ENDING WITH KEVIN P. WHITMORE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD S. BARLAMENT AND ENDING WITH JOHN S. SIBLEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN E. BEHARRY AND ENDING WITH DARREL G. VAUGHN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PATRICK J. BLAIR AND ENDING WITH AARON D. WERBEL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES T. ALBRITTON AND ENDING WITH ROBERT L. WILLIAMS, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH VERONICA G. ARMSTRONG AND ENDING WITH MARIA A. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JULIANN M. ALTHOFF AND ENDING WITH JOHN WYLAND, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CASEY S. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH KAREN G. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ROBERT E. BRADSHAW, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DARREN W. MURPHY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF LING YE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF GREGORY E. RINGLER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CRAIG S. COLEMAN AND ENDING WITH EDUARDO B. RIZO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL D. GINKEL AND ENDING WITH GABRIEL S. NILES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHELE M. DAY AND ENDING WITH DET R. SMITH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVE M. CURRY AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM R. URBAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AMY L. BLEIDORN AND ENDING WITH MICAH A. WELTNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL J. BARRIERE AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW T. WILCOX, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN M. BALLER AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL J. SZCZERBINSKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE

AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HEATH D. BOHLEN AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW C. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DERECK C. BROWN AND ENDING WITH SHERRY W. WANGWHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARC A. ARAGON AND ENDING WITH ROBERT A. YEE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN J. BEHM AND ENDING WITH EVAN P. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIC E. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER G. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RENE V. ABADESCO AND ENDING WITH MARK W. YATES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID J. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH KEVIN P. ZAYAC, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN P. BURROW AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER A. WEECH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DERRICK E. BLACKSTON AND ENDING WITH DEREK A. VESTAL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM M. ZARIT AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL J. RICHARDSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 2, 2012.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFREY B. JUSTICE AND ENDING WITH ENRIQUE G. ORTIZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 18, 2012.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL C. AHO AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL L. YODER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 26, 2012.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALBOINO LUNGOBARDO DEULUS AND ENDING WITH BRADLEY ALAN FREDEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 15, 2012.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED WAY

HON. DAVID LOESACK

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. LOESACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 125th Anniversary of the United Way.

In 1887 in Denver, Colorado, a local woman, a priest, two ministers and a rabbi came together to work to solve the poverty facing their community. The first United Way formed a network of organizations to support local charities as well as to coordinate relief services, counsel and refer clients to cooperating agencies, and make emergency assistance grants to those most in need. The group of networks rose from humble beginnings and became the United Way, a united movement committed to improving communities around the world.

What they began 125 years ago now comprises nearly 1,800 community-based United Ways in 41 countries and territories. Today the United Way is the world's largest privately-sponsored nonprofit.

Today, United Way continues the spirit of service to move toward a world where all individuals and families achieve their human potential through education, income stability and healthy lives. Every year the United Way raises nearly \$5 billion dollars for the simple purpose to advance the common good. Working collaboratively, the United Way brings together the actions of millions of individuals to resolve pressing community issues. As a worldwide organization, it is remarkable how effective the United Way is at targeting local initiatives and bringing tangible services to our communities.

We must also attribute 125 years of United Way's success to the imaginative, passionate group of leaders, community volunteers, and partners on the local and state level. Today, United Ways in Iowa's 2nd District are working diligently to ensure the scope and depth of United Way's vision is applied to the specific needs of individuals and local charities in our community. United Way of East Central Iowa, United Way of Johnson County, Inc., United Way of Wapello County, and Burlington/W. Burlington Area United Way continue to give, advocate, and volunteer to help people in need. On United Way's 125th Anniversary, we commend our local United Ways' commitment and contributions that effectively make a difference every day in our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CALIFORNIA FLOWER MARKET

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the 100th Anniversary of a place filled with vibrant colors, tantalizing fragrances, delicate shapes and magic—the California Flower Market in San Francisco. The market is flowers galore and it's impossible to be there without feeling uplifted. I'm a proud and frequent customer at this special place that is also a great boost to our local economy.

The California Flower Market, spanning a block between 5th and 6th Streets on Brannan Street, was established by Japanese-American flower growers a century ago. The growers needed a place to sell their products and founded one of the first Japanese-American corporations in California to do so. The pioneering Issei—the first Japanese immigrants to North America, South America and Australia—honed their growing and flower arranging skills and made significant contributions to the development of the community.

Today, over 50 vendors sell their flowers to 4,000 trade buyers, which include retailers, whole sellers, party planners and interior decorators, and to the public directly. The California Flower Market is an oasis in the South of Market area of San Francisco. I personally welcome any opportunity I have to stroll through the market and pick out a perfectly grown Phalaenopsis, a blossom-covered Christmas cactus or an Ikebana arrangement.

But history wasn't always bright at the California Flower Market. During the shameful era of World War II's internment of Japanese-Americans, flower markets throughout California went from Japanese control to non-Japanese control in a matter of months.

The United States sent 120,000 people of Japanese ancestry to internment camps along the Pacific Coast. Most of them were American-born citizens and hard-working, law-abiding people. The majority of them remained silent about their experiences in the camps and later picked up the pieces of their broken lives and built new communities. The flower growers were among them. While in the camps, the flower growers association worked hard to remain organized and give growers hope for the future. In the 1950's Japanese-Americans rebuilt their prominence in the floricultural industry.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor the California Flower Market on its 100th Anniversary. It is a symbol of lasting and resilient beauty that cannot be suppressed, only enjoyed.

COUNTERFEIT DRUG PENALTY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2012

SPEECH OF

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 2012

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3668, the Counterfeit Drug Penalty Enhancement Act. I have worked with Representative MEEHAN, worked for quite a while on this issue and it's rewarding to see that bipartisan, practical ideas still have a place in this body.

H.R. 3668 will raise the penalties for counterfeit medicines, a unique consumer health and safety problem. This legislation is needed, bipartisan, and non-controversial.

Counterfeit drug enterprises jeopardize the public's safety and I believe perpetrators should be held accountable.

Unlike other consumer goods, counterfeit medicines pose a significant public health and safety threat to the innocent, sick patients who receive them.

H.R. 3668 will help protect seniors and children, who are uniquely vulnerable, as well as anyone who could be harmed by fraudulent medicines.

We must have tougher penalties for crimes that are a threat to public safety.

H.R. 3668 ensures this and I encourage my colleagues to support this straightforward, reasonable approach.

HONORING KENDRA HAYWOOD

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable valedictorian, Ms. Kendra Haywood. Kendra is the daughter of Mr. Kenneth Haywood Sr. and Mrs. Jacklon Haywood and resides in Shelby, Mississippi. Kendra is a member of Zion Grove Missionary Baptist Church where she serves as the Sunday School Secretary and volunteers with various auxiliaries in the church. She is a senior at Broad Street High School in Shelby, Mississippi and graduated on May 26, 2012.

Kendra acknowledged early on that it would take self-discipline and motivation to achieve her academic goals. So during the last three semesters of high school, she participated in Coahoma Community College Dual Enrollment Program, which allowed her to take college courses while still in high school.

Ms. Haywood is co-founder of Students Involved in Community Change (SICC), an organization that strives for both community and educational excellence. Students work with citizens in their community on beautification

● 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.

projects, hosting weekly community discussions to address littering, drug use, gang activity and the importance of community involvement.

Ms. Haywood's sense of obligation to improve her community and educational opportunities for others led her to tutor her peers after school. Her philosophy is, "knowledge is power and the more you know the more power you have." She participates in various school activities including the Alpha Kappa Alpha Bolivar County Community Humanity Involvement Club, Coahoma Community College Tr-County Workforce Job Shadowing Program, and other civic organizations.

After completing her Bachelor of Science degree, Kendra has plans to pursue a professional degree in Clinical Psychology at Colorado College in Colorado Springs, Colorado. Ms. Haywood has expressed a desire to become part of Teach for America as a way of giving back to a rural community and inspiring youth, because Teach for America has had a profound impact in her education.

Ms. Kendra Haywood has three siblings, Kenneth Jr., Darius, and Jarvis. She says they, along with her parents, had a positive impact on her desire to reach for the stars in life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Kendra Haywood as the valedictorian of Broad Street High School Class of 2012.

IN HONOR OF THE CONEJO VALLEY CHAPTER OF MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS, THE SGT. MICHAEL A. DIRAIMONDO CHAPTER OF MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART, AND THE RED, WHITE AND BLUE BALL

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of the Conejo Valley Chapter of Military Order of the World Wars, the Sgt. Michael A. DiRaimondo Chapter of Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Red, White and Blue Ball.

For 27 years, the Military Order of the World Wars has presented its Red, White and Blue Ball to perpetuate the spirit of patriotism. This year, the Conejo Valley Chapter is joined by the Sgt. Michael A. DiRaimondo Chapter of Military Order of the Purple Heart. Army Sgt. DiRaimondo was Ventura County's first casualty in Operation Iraqi Freedom. He was 22 years old.

I did not know Michael, but I have become close friends with his exceptional family.

Each year, the Ball honors an individual who has demonstrated exceptional patriotism and who has made significant contributions to the community.

The U.S. Navy will be honored at this Saturday's event. This is the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Navy SEALs and Captain Jason Ehret, USN SEAL, will be the honorary chair. The 2012 Patriotic Citizen of the Year is Colonel John Fer, who served in the U.S. Air Force for 28 years.

It is fitting that the Ball will be held at the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library. It will

start with an open reception followed by a formal opening ceremony. Dinner, dancing to music of the Harry Selvin Band, and silent and live auctions will round out the evening.

It is a festive affair, with military personnel—active, reserve and retired—wearing dress uniforms. Civilian men wear dark suits or tuxedos and civilian women wear formal or cocktail dresses.

Auction proceeds will support activities such as Ventura County and Thousand Oaks Veterans Day ceremonies, Conejo Valley Memorial Day ceremony, Thousand Oaks Youth Leadership Conference, Junior ROTC awards, and Boy Scout and Girl Scout troops.

Mr. Speaker, I attended the first Red, White and Blue Ball 27 years ago and am proud to have been presented the Gold Patrick Henry Award at the 1989 Ball.

I am leaving Congress at the end of this session, which will change my relationship with the Military Order of the World Wars and the Sgt. Michael A. DiRaimondo Chapter. I am confident, however, that the relationship will remain strong and grow in the coming years.

I am equally confident that my colleagues join me now in honoring the Conejo Valley Chapter of Military Order of the World Wars, the Sgt. Michael A. DiRaimondo Chapter of Military Order of the Purple Heart, Captain Jason Ehret, the U.S. Navy SEALs, and the Ball's 2012 Patriotic Citizen of the Year, Colonel John Fer. Thank you all for your service.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CITY OF SAN MATEO'S ADOPTION A COMPANY, 1ST BATTALION, 327TH INFANTRY REGIMENT, 1ST BRIGADE, 101ST AIRBORNE DIVISION.

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the City of San Mateo for its adoption in 1968 of A Company, 1st Battalion, 327th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade, 101st Airborne Division.

In 1967 a soldier in Vietnam named Sgt. Joe Artavia wrote a letter to his sister, Linda, asking her to convince the City of San Mateo to adopt his company. He thought an adoption would lift troop morale "as high as the sky." Linda rallied the community to support her brother and his comrades. Within three months the San Mateo City Council passed a resolution to adopt the company.

Tragically, Artavia was killed three weeks later rescuing a fellow soldier, and the people of San Mateo joined together in mourning. Artavia's death solidified San Mateo's commitment to its adopted company and, in fact, in 1972 San Mateo was the only city in the United States to hold an official homecoming parade honoring Vietnam veterans.

Since that time the city has continuously supported A Company, 1st Battalion, 327th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade, 101st Airborne Division, visiting them in peacetime, establishing pen-pals and sending care packages. The city has served as a model for other towns, cities or counties to adopt individual military units throughout the country.

San Mateo's adopted company has recently returned from a 12-month tour of duty in Af-

ghanistan and will be redeployed for a third tour. In commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the welcome-home parade for the veterans returning to San Mateo, the city is holding another welcome home parade and festival to honor past and present soldiers of the 101st Airborne Division who have put their lives on the line for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House of Representatives join me in honoring the city of San Mateo for supporting A Company, 1st Battalion, 327th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade, 101st Airborne Division and its brave men and women who filled it ranks, especially those who gave their lives for our freedom.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE MUSCOGEE RETIRED EDUCATORS ASSOCIATION

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the members and supporters of the Muscogee Retired Educators Association (MREA) as they commemorate its 50th anniversary this year. A celebration luncheon will be held on Friday, June 22, 2012 at 11:30 a.m. at the Columbus Convention and Trade Center in Columbus, Georgia.

MREA was established as the Muscogee Retired Teachers Association (MRTA) in 1962 when Mr. Boyd B. Littlejohn and a small group of other retired Muscogee teachers decided to organize themselves in order to better attend to the needs and concerns of retired teachers in the area. Mr. Littlejohn, a retired principal who served St. Elmo, Clubview, and McIlhenney schools, became the first president before going on to serve as president of GRTA from 1965–1967.

In its early existence, members of MRTA would meet in their homes or in churches. Ms. Ruth Plumb and Mrs. Rex Lavender served as presidents until MRTA became inactive for a short period. In 1972, J. Zeb Morris, retired principal of Waverly Terrace and jazz pianist, became president. After this, MRTA began to grow in membership and was able to improve its service to retired teachers.

Throughout the years, the association has been led by distinguished retired educators such as Lucile David, Lyda Hanna, Nathan Hunter, Brice Carson, Jack Shepard, Laura Haygood, L.B. Hickson, Sumter Blackmon, John Little, O'Neal Hendricks, Kathryn Hunt, Esto Smith, Anita B. Walters, Dr. Jeanette Marshal and its current president, Diane Boss, among others.

Mr. Nathan Hunter also served as GRTA President from 1979–1980 and Mrs. Lucile Hunter, his widow and an MRTA member, presented his GRTA gavel to the MREA. The gavel is a treasured keepsake and is passed on to each succeeding MREA president.

In 1998, the GRTA changed its name to the Georgia Retired Educators Association to include all those who work in the field of education and are under the Teacher Retirement System of Georgia. MRTA followed suit, changing its name to the Muscogee Retired Educators Association (MREA), as it is called today.

In addition to having served as teachers, mentors, and role models throughout their career, members of MREA continue to serve the

community in retirement by volunteering their time to help out at schools, churches, hospitals, nursing homes, museums, libraries, health screening venues and other places. A number of members also volunteered at the 1996 Summer Olympics in Columbus for fast pitch baseball.

In past years, MREA has consistently been presented with competitive Membership awards from GREA. Also, MREA strives to help active teachers by awarding scholarships to those seeking graduate degrees.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in applauding the exceptional efforts of the Muscogee Retired Educators Association for all they have done and will continue to do to address the needs of our retired educators. Not only did MREA members provide a great service during their careers teaching our young people, but they have continued that legacy of service in the community in retirement and for that, I thank each and every one of them.

IN RECOGNITION OF RAPHAEL
KAUFFMANN

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Raphael Kauffmann, an outstanding teacher who serves as a role model for students and teachers alike. It is only fitting that he has been named San Mateo County Teacher of the Year.

Mr. Kauffmann graduated Cum Laude from San Francisco State University where he earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in Broadcast and Electronic Communications in 1995. Since 2005, Mr. Kauffmann has taught at Carlmont High School in Belmont. He was promoted to Chair of the English Department in 2009. He is a member of the National Education Association, the National Council of Teachers of English and he won a PTSA Award of Excellence in 2010.

Under Mr. Kauffman's leadership Carlmont High School adopted the Expository Reading and Writing Course, a school-wide reading and writing program. The program sparked a fruitful collaboration among the teachers within his department. The program helps prepare students for college and advances students' writing skills.

Mr. Kauffmann did not always know he wanted to teach. Starting at age 12 or 13, he was most passionate about music. He played bass in his high school band and also started a band with friends. In college he learned audio production, which helped him apply his passion for music to his professional life. His dynamic career has spanned the music, recording and software industries.

These experiences taught him the skills and qualities necessary for survival in the professional world. They also taught him that he could meld together academic, professional and creative interests while navigating a career path. He brings these lessons into the classroom and offers his students a broad perspective.

Instead of creating an authoritarian atmosphere, he makes students his partners in the process of learning. He promotes an environ-

ment of mutual respect and uses his musical background to connect with at-risk youths. He uses music as a tool to communicate with young people who the educational system has left behind. For example, when Mr. Kauffmann met one student who was nearly ready to drop out of high school, Mr. Kauffmann connected with this young man about music, took him under his wing and helped him graduate on time.

Mr. Kauffmann is a devoted husband and father; he is married to Chandra Kauffmann and they have a son, Rami.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this body to rise with me to honor the outstanding service of Raphael Kauffmann to the residents of San Mateo County. For many more years to come he will serve as an inspiration for other teachers, and a beacon for his students.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION CELEBRATING 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF TITLE IX LEGISLATION

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution recognizing the 40th anniversary of the momentous Title IX legislation. Forty years ago, on June 23, 1972, it was established that educational institutions receiving federal funding were barred from discriminating against anyone on the basis of sex. That decision applied to student admissions, recruitment, scholarship awards and tuition assistance, housing, access to courses and other academic offerings, counseling, financial assistance, employment assistance to students, health and insurance benefits and services, athletics, and all aspects of education-related employment.

This landmark legislation led to gains for women in all fields, from academics to business to science and technology. The law is probably most well known for its impact on women in athletics. Since Title IX was enacted, the number of women competing in college sports has soared by more than 600 percent, and the number of high school girls competing in sports has increased by over 1,000 percent.

This is important because we know from scientific research that student athletes graduate at higher rates, perform better in school and are less likely to use drugs and alcohol, smoke, or develop mental illness or obesity later in life. Furthermore, I have heard from countless female athletes, like Olympic gymnast Dominique Dawes, that without athletic scholarships made possible by Title IX, they simply would not have been able to attend college. Imagine the vast intellectual, cultural and athletic opportunities that would have been lost to these young women had they not been able to pursue their goals of furthering their education.

In the years since the law was passed, we have had to fight for improvements to the legislation and fight against other attempts to weaken it. In 2003, I led a hearing in the basement of this very Capitol building when Title IX was being threatened by Commission for Opportunity in Athletic recommendations that ignored the continuing lack of participation

opportunities and funding that women's and girls' athletics were facing. I clearly recall watching a line of little girls in their soccer uniforms enter the room accompanied by their fathers. These dads spoke eloquently about the importance of coaching their daughters in sports, and how it meant just as much to them as coaching their sons. Although bad policy was enacted that limited the effectiveness of Title IX, I am proud to say we were able to reverse significant parts of that in 2010.

The fight for fairness continues. Today we still face disparities in opportunities for girls in sports, particularly at the high school level. Girls make up half of the high school population, yet receive only 41 percent of all athletic participation opportunities. This translates to 1.3 million fewer opportunities for young women to play high school sports than young men. Worse yet, this gap is actually increasing.

How is it that one law can have such a dramatic impact at one age level and yet be less successful for our young women who are just four years younger? The answer can be found in public transparency and accountability. As is true elsewhere in life, sunshine can be the best of disinfectants.

At the collegiate level, colleges and universities are required to publicly account for how their athletic opportunities, resources, and dollars are allocated among male and female athletes. No such transparency requirements are found at the high school level. Not surprisingly, where there is no public accountability, there is a growing gap in athletic opportunities for young student-athletes.

Currently, high schools are required to submit annual reports of their athletic participation numbers by sport and gender to their state high school athletic associations. Additionally, school bookkeepers already keep records of all school expenditures—including those made within the athletic department. Despite doing all the work of collecting this data, none of it is required to be made public.

To make a simple, but profound, change to high school reporting requirements, I have authored H.R. 458, the High School Athletics and Accountability Act. This bill would require high schools to make public vital data on the participation of girls in high school sports. Schools already collect this data. Making the information public would be a small change for school administrators—estimates are that it would take just three to six hours of time once a year to produce a report—and would have a huge impact on the opportunities available to our young girls.

As we celebrate the anniversary of the passage of this landmark legislation, we must recommit ourselves to continuing the fight for equity for women and girls. I ask my colleagues to commemorate the 40th anniversary of Title IX with me, and pledge to keep pressing forward until opportunities are equal for all.

IN RECOGNITION OF ROGER
ANDREY

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Officer Robert Andrey for his 27 years of service at the Burlingame Police Department.

Officer Andrey joined the Burlingame Police Department in 1984 and has served in a variety of capacities, such as patrol officer, field training officer, police inspector and evidence technician. In each role he demonstrated integrity, professionalism and honor. He has been recognized for his effectiveness in DUI enforcement and his compassion for donating stuffed animals to children in the Mills Peninsula Hospital Emergency Room.

Officer Andrey is an outstanding detective who is skilled in solving fraud cases. His secret to success is that he takes time to listen and pays attention to details. He says he was taught to "never leave a call unless you feel comfortable leaving." For example, he responded to a call from Child Protective Services and arrived at a Burlingame home on a hot summer day. The young girl answering the door was wearing a long-sleeved heavy sweater. Officer Andrey spent some 20 minutes talking to her and gaining her trust until she eventually told him that she had been cutting herself. Due to his keen observations, the girl received help. He humbly adds that being a police officer is not rocket science, it's about developing relationships and trust with people.

Before I ever met Officer Andrey, I heard about him in the early '90s when he recovered construction materials from local pawnshops that had been stolen from my brother. A few years later I had my own—and very memorable—encounter with him. While I was in the California State Senate, I reported a suspicious envelope under my car's windshield wiper and he responded to the call. This incident put him in the "entirely uncomfortable" situation where he had to take my fingerprints.

Robert Andrey was born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin and went to Allis Central High School. He earned his B.A. in marketing management from Milton College in Wisconsin. He moved to the Bay Area in 1982.

In his well-deserved retirement, he is looking forward to spending more time with his wife Lona, family, friends and their two dogs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this body to rise with me to honor the outstanding service of Officer Robert Andrey to the people of Burlingame. For almost three decades, he made our community a safer and better place every single day. He will be deeply missed by his colleagues and residents alike.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR.
EDWARD ROBINSON

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Dr. Edward Robinson. Born and raised in Philadelphia, Dr. Robinson dedicated his life to the welfare of people in Philadelphia and will be sorely missed.

Dr. Robinson was a true renaissance man as he excelled as an attorney, entrepreneur, educator and mentor. His accomplishments are not limited to a position as the first African American on the board of directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia. Additionally, Dr. Robinson served as the Executive Deputy Secretary of Pennsylvania and the Assistant Managing Director of Philadelphia.

Dr. Robinson's most esteemed work were his efforts on behalf of Africans and African Americans for minority rights and inclusion. He spearheaded the African Genesis Science Curriculum which was adopted in schools throughout the Philadelphia School System. Dr. Robinson's cultural influence and scholarship will not be forgotten.

I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me to honor the life of Dr. Edward Robinson. He was committed to enriching the lives of Philadelphians as a teacher, mentor and activist. Dr. Robinson's selfless dedication to others leaves a legacy that will continue to uplift and inspire others for years to come.

HONORING JALISA ALLEN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a remarkable young woman Ms. Jalisa Allen, the 2012 Salutatorian at Coahoma Agricultural High School.

Jalisa is the daughter of Janette Allen, and has two siblings. Together they proudly reside in Friars Point, Mississippi. She is a senior at Coahoma Agricultural High School. At the age of seven, Jalisa decided that she was going to get the best education possible. While pursuing this goal, she has achieved the award of being placed on both the Principal List and the Superintendent List. Jalisa is also active in many school organizations such as, Future Business Leaders of America, Math Club, Science Club, and Youth Leadership.

Jalisa plans to attend the University of Mississippi in Oxford and become an Anesthesiologist. After obtaining a degree, Jalisa intends to use her education to help her local community in Friars Point.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Jalisa Allen, Coahoma Agricultural High School Salutatorian of the Class of 2012.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LATE
LANTY MOLLOY, SR.

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the late Lanty Molloy, Sr. who passed away June 11, 2012 in South San Francisco at the age of 79. Mr. Molloy leaves behind a legacy as an extraordinary family and business man.

Mr. Molloy is survived by his beloved wife of 51 years, Blain Doyle, seven of their eight children, three of his five siblings and 19 grandchildren.

He was born in San Francisco in 1932 as the son of Frank Molloy of Ardara, County Donegal in Ireland, and Martha Loftus of San Francisco. His father Frank Molloy came to the United States in 1901 as a 18-year-old who pursued—and realized—the American dream. After spending a few years in the Pacific Northwest, Frank came to California shortly after the big earthquake in 1906. He

tended bar in San Francisco and in 1909 opened his first pub, "Molloy's" on Lafayette Street. In 1927, he relocated Molloy's to a building he bought in Colma and started the family history of three generations of tavern owners.

Lanty Molloy attended Our Lady of Perpetual Help in Daly City and graduated from Saint Ignatius High School in San Francisco in 1950. He served in the U.S. Army as an MP. While stationed in Germany he made many lifelong friends and developed a love for history.

In 1955, Frank turned the bar over to Lanty, his youngest son. He and Blain raised their family in South San Francisco and at age 21, their youngest son Owen started tending bar at Molloy's. Owen picked up the family tradition and to this day is managing the tavern.

Located in Colma, Molloy's has seen thousands of patrons toasting those who passed away. Posted on the wall is a fitting quote from the Irish Herald which reads: "Though the Molloy's dwell in the valley of death, at the very gates of the marble orchard, the lights are always twinkling in the window and a steady stream of black clad mourners duck in for a soothing pint after bearing the drunken cousin or the elder aunt. You should drop by and get your drink too and get to know Lanty, Owen and the bar."

Lanty is now the one to be toasted and remembered at this landmark in Colma. He was the second generation in a family tradition that I hope will live on for many more generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor the memory of Lanty Molloy for the love for his family and friends and his lasting contributions to our community.

IN HONOR OF KEITH RUNYON'S
ACCOMPLISHED CAREER IN KENTUCKY

HON. BEN CHANDLER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of one of Kentucky's most distinguished and long serving journalists, Keith Runyon. Mr. Runyon retired from the Louisville Courier-Journal after 43 years this last April, and it is an understatement to say that Kentucky will miss this giant in the journalism field.

A lifelong resident of Louisville, Keith Runyon joined the Courier-Journal at the age of 18 while he was a student at the University of Louisville. His relationship with the Bingham family left an indelible impression on his career, and I know Keith is proud to be the last serving member of the Bingham-era editorial board. From his early days as an obituary writer, Keith worked his way through the ranks of the paper before quickly joining the editorial board in 1977. Always seeking a greater challenge, he also started attending the University of Louisville Brandeis School of Law the same year and later became the editor of the Courier-Journal's book page in addition to his editorial page responsibilities.

Whether tackling education reform or tax referendums, Keith's judgment and talent

shaped the editorial board for more than 40 years. Throughout his esteemed career, Keith has received many awards and accolades but perhaps none as impressive as his most recent. This spring, he received the Society of Professional Journalists' gold medal, one of the most prestigious honors for editorial writing in the country, for his work on the proposed merger of the University of Louisville hospital.

A proud graduate of Leadership Louisville, he is a vibrant participant in the great issues confronting all of Kentucky. He constantly strives to promote equal rights for all and to advance the progressive principles of the New Deal, the New Frontier, and Great Society. Long after his retirement, the work he did both in and outside of the newsroom will continue to have an impact on Louisville and all of Kentucky. Keith Runyon leaves big shoes to fill at the Louisville Courier-Journal, and I wish him, his wife Meme, and his family the best in their future endeavors. I congratulate him on his stellar career and thank him for all he has done for the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

HONORING COL. GREGORY DRAGOO

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and acknowledge Colonel Gregory F. Dragoo upon his retirement after having served this great Nation for 29 years. Colonel Dragoo most recently served in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Special Access Program Central Office, responsible for the DOD coordination of programs assigned to the Air Force.

In 1983, Colonel Dragoo received his Second Lieutenant commission from the Officer Training School at Lackland AFB, TX. He completed his undergraduate navigator training and was assigned to B-52Gs at the 46th Bomb Squadron in North Dakota in 1985.

After being selected a part of the initial cadre of aircrew selected to fly the B-1, Colonel Dragoo was selected in 1989, as the first B-1 Weapon Systems Officer to attend the USAF Test Pilot School at Edwards AFB, CA.

Following his first flight test tour in the 419th Test Squadron, Colonel Dragoo returned in 1993, to the Test Pilot School as an instructor. From there, he spent the next two years in the B-1 and Tri-Service Standoff Attack Missile Program Offices at Wright-Patterson, OH followed by a year at Air Command and Staff College (ACSC) at Maxwell AFB, AL.

In 1996, Colonel Dragoo returned to Edwards AFB as Operations Officer of the 419th Flight Test Squadron. There, he was dual-qualified in the B-52 and B-1 and responsible for all B-52, B-1, and B-2 Flight Test operations.

Colonel Dragoo was next assigned in 2000 to the Pentagon as the Headquarters Air Force Plans and Programs bomber programmer responsible for programming the budget and force structure of the B-52, B-1, B-2, and Unmanned Combat Air Vehicles. In 2003, Colonel Dragoo attended the Air War College at Maxwell AFB, AL, and upon graduation was assigned as the Deputy Director and then Director of the Weapons Division of the Secretariat of the Air Force Capability Di-

rectorate responsible for coordinating the programmatic issues of all Air Force weapons acquisition programs.

In 2006, Colonel Dragoo was selected to command the Air Combat Command's Electronic Warfare Group at Eglin AFB, FL. This 450-person group was responsible for delivering and evaluating electronic warfare software for the entire Combat Air Force.

Following his command assignment, Colonel Dragoo was assigned to the Pentagon as Deputy Director of the Secretariat of the Air Force Special Programs Directorate where he served until assuming his current position in the Office of the Secretary of Defense Special Programs office. In conjunction with his permanent assignments, Colonel Dragoo deployed in 2001 as Chief of Staff, Combined Air Operations Center, J-3, Prince Sultan Air Base Saudi Arabia; in 2004 as Air Liaison Officer, C3 Plans, Multi-National Force-Iraq, Baghdad; and in 2007 as Deputy Director and Chief of Staff, Combined Air Power Transition Force, Kabul, Afghanistan.

Colonel Dragoo is married to the former Teresa K. Wisner. They have two happily married children, three incredibly adorable grandchildren, and will celebrate 31 years of marriage this year.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 29 years, Colonel Dragoo has faithfully served our nation as a member of the U.S. Armed Forces. As he enters the next phase of his life with his beloved wife Teresa, their two children Melissa and husband Shawn, and Matthew and wife Lauren, and their three wonderful grandchildren, Mackenzie, Carson, and Daisy, he leaves behind a legacy of dedication, integrity, excellence.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Colonel Gregory F. Dragoo upon his retirement and recognizing his years of loyal service to our community and country.

RECOGNIZING THE HUMAN COST OF OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the human cost of the war in Afghanistan. Last Thursday, June 14th, Marine Corporal Taylor Baune, of Andover, Minnesota, was killed in Helmand Province, Afghanistan. He was 21 years old, and had married his high school sweetheart just three months ago. Corporal Baune was the 2000th American killed in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

We often speak of the financial cost of the war in Afghanistan, which has grown to \$289 million per day. Although this is a staggering figure, the human cost of the war is beyond measure.

Just last month, a young man from my district, Travis Morgado, was killed in Kandahar Province. Travis was an athlete who enjoyed basketball and football. He joined the Army after graduating from the University of Washington with a degree in civil engineering, expressing a desire to give back to his country. Second Lieutenant Morgado leaves behind his mother, Andrea, and stepfather, Dean Kessler,

his father, Joe, and stepmother, Nancy, as well as two younger brothers, a stepsister, and a stepbrother. He is remembered as a loving big brother, and a positive role model for his younger cousins.

I would also like to recognize Marine Corporal Kevin Cueto of San Jose, who was killed in action nearly two years ago, on June 24, 2010, in the Helmand Province of Afghanistan. He was 23 years old. Corporal Cueto grew up in San Jose, and later moved to Campbell to live with his father. At Westmont High School, Kevin served in the Reserve Officers Training Corps and was a member of the football, baseball, and wrestling teams. He was also involved with the debate team. After graduating from high school, determined to serve his country, Kevin enlisted in the Marines. Corporal Cueto served a tour in Iraq in 2009, before being deployed to Afghanistan. Corporal Cueto has left behind his father, Phillip Cueto, his mother, Kelley Greenhaw, and a younger brother.

Finally, many mourned the loss of Pat Tillman. Pat grew up in my district. He was a star football player at Leland High School in San Jose, and earned a scholarship to Arizona State University. He helped lead ASU to the Rose Bowl in 1997, and was selected as the team's most valuable player as well as the Pac-10 Defensive Player of the Year. As a student, Pat also excelled, earning the Clyde B. Smith Academic Award, the Sporting News Honda Scholar-Athlete of the Year, and the Sun Angel Student Athlete of Year awards during his time at ASU. Pat was drafted by the Arizona Cardinals in 1998, and began a promising career as a professional football player. However, when the United States invaded Afghanistan in 2001, Pat and his brother, Kevin, decided to enlist. Pat married his high school sweetheart, Marie, and became an Army Ranger, serving tours in both Iraq and Afghanistan. Corporal Tillman was killed in Afghanistan. He left behind his wife, Marie, his father, Patrick, his mother, Mary, and two younger brothers.

I extend my sincerest gratitude to these brave young men and their families as we mark this solemn milestone. Two thousand American soldiers have paid the ultimate price in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. Countless others have suffered wounds, both physical and mental. The human cost of the war in Afghanistan has been immense, and I urge my colleagues to support a safe, immediate, and orderly withdrawal of our troops, and to ensure that our veterans, who have sacrificed so much, are given the care and benefits that they deserve.

IN HONOR OF THE OLD MISSION CHURCH OF SAN JUAN BATISTA

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 200th Anniversary of the dedication of the "Mission of Music," the Old Mission Church of San Juan Bautista. On June 23, 2012 the Mission celebrates the anniversary of its dedication and an unbroken succession of pastors since its founding by the Franciscan order in 1812.

The Mission, the fifteenth and largest of California's twenty-one missions, was established by the Franciscan friars and dedicated in 1797 by Father Fermín Francisco de Lasuén to its patron, St. John the Baptist. For the last two centuries, the Mission has served mass daily to parishioners and visitors, including the Amah Mutsun and other native California Indians who first inhabited the surrounding area.

Today the Mission continues to function as an active parish within the Catholic Diocese of Monterey. The Mission has been included in the National Register of Historic Places and the California Historic Register. With three naves it is the largest and one of the tallest missions in California. It also features the only Spanish Plaza in its original configuration remaining in California.

The bi-centennial dedication of the Mission honors the influence of Native American, Spanish, Mexican, and American settler influence on the California Central Coast. The 200th Anniversary will be marked with a spectacular fiesta and procession from the Mission to downtown San Juan Bautista. Funds earned from the celebrations will go toward unearthing a newly discovered chapel site in the area as well as for maintenance and restoration of the Mission basilica and its associated buildings.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I am not alone in recognizing the continuous work of the mission church in supporting the community of San Juan Bautista, including its role as a significant visitor destination in the region. For all the Mission has managed to contribute to the community and for all that it will undoubtedly continue to do I extend my most sincere thanks to it and wish it the best as it moves into a third century of service to the community of San Juan Bautista.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES
ON H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION
EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

SPEECH OF

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 2012

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, more than three and a half years ago an impoundment holding disposed ash waste broke open, creating a massive spill in Kingston, Tennessee. The spill covered entire neighborhoods and the Clinch River with over one billion gallons of coal fly ash—displacing residents and resulting in \$1.2 billion in clean up costs.

The accident underscored the need for strong rules to ensure structural stability and the safety of coal ash impoundments. Yet, as of today, no national rules have been put into place to prevent another Kingston spill.

Two years ago the Environmental Protection Agency proposed the first-ever regulations to ensure the safe disposal and management of coal ash from power plants under the nation's primary law for regulating solid waste, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).

EPA presented two regulatory options: regulating coal ash as hazardous waste under Subtitle C or regulating coal ash as a non-haz-

ardous waste under Subtitle D. But the EPA's proposal has stalled creating uncertainty for businesses and families.

As I said when the House of Representatives considered this issue last October, I have concerns that designating fly ash as a hazardous material will have major impacts on the recycling and reuse of fly ash to manufacture wallboard, roofing materials and bricks, and especially concrete.

In 2008 alone, the concrete industry used 15.8 million tons of fly ash in the manufacturing of ready mixed concrete making it the most widely used supplemental cementing material. When combined with cement, fly ash improves the durability, strength, constructability, and economy of concrete.

It also has huge environmental benefits. Using coal ash—an industrial byproduct—in concrete results in longer lasting structures and reduction in the amount of waste materials sent to landfills, raw materials extracted, energy required for production, and air emissions, including carbon dioxide.

A “hazardous” designation of fly ash could put these benefits in jeopardy. It could make fly ash storage and transportation more expensive, and create a legal environment that would deter cement manufacturers from recycling fly ash in cement production.

The result would not only be devastating for the cement manufacturing industry and American jobs, it could also divert millions of tons of coal fly ash from beneficial uses to surface impoundments like the one that broke open in Kingston, Tennessee—an outcome nobody wants.

I don't think H.R. 2273 is a perfect bill. And, to be clear, I support strong regulations for the disposal and storage of coal ash. But, these regulations can and should be completed without jeopardizing the recycling and reuse of fly ash.

I am supporting Rep. MCKINLEY's motion to instruct because it would move the conversation forward on how to find a reasonable and responsible balance between protecting communities and our environment, while also incentivizing the recycling and reuse of coal ash—goals we can all support.

It is my understanding that my colleagues on the conference are making progress in finding that balance. Meaningful conversations that began more than six months ago between key stakeholders are beginning to bear some fruit on this issue.

We shouldn't ignore this issue—it's too important. We shouldn't wait for an undefined period of time before strong rules are put in place. We shouldn't discourage recycling and reuse of coal ash by unnecessarily labeling it as “hazardous waste.”

Let's pass this motion and get back to work on a long-term bill.

U.S. SHOULD REMAIN OPTIMISTIC
FOR POLITICAL RECONCILIATION
IN THAILAND

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the events over the past six years in Thailand have left the country deeply divided. A military coup

overthrew an elected government in 2006. Violent protests demanding new elections in 2010 led to the deaths of at least 90 people. Rich and poor, military and civilian, politician and voter—all have had differences over the years.

But, the newly elected party of Prime Minister Yingluck Shinawatra promised to bridge those divides and lead Thailand towards a more stable and democratic future. For this country to move forward towards a more free and fair society, its leaders must push for political reconciliation between differing parties despite any opposition it may face today. The Thailand legislature is currently working its way through a political reconciliation bill. As it continues this process, the United States should be encouraged and hopeful in our ally's path to democracy and reconciliation. And that's just the way it is.

INTRODUCING THE “SYRIA NON-
INTERVENTION ACT OF 2012”

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the Administration is marching toward another war in the Middle East, this time against Syria. As with the president's war against Libya, Congress has been frozen out of the process. The Constitution, which grants Congress and only Congress the authority to declare war, is once again being completely ignored.

The push for a U.S. attack on Syria makes no sense, is not in our interest, and will likely make matters worse. Yet the Administration, after transferring equipment to the Syrian rebels and facilitating the shipment of weapons from Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States, has indicated that its plans for an actual invasion are complete.

This week there are even press reports that the Central Intelligence Agency is distributing assault rifles, anti-tank rocket launchers, and other ammunition to the Syrian opposition. These are acts of war by the United States government. But where is the authority for the president to commit acts of war against Syria? There is no authority. The president is acting on his own.

Today we are introducing legislation to prevent the administration from accelerating its plan to overthrow the Syrian government by assisting rebel forces that even the administration admits include violent Islamic extremists.

The bill is simple. It states that absent a Congressional declaration of war on Syria:

“No funds available to the Department of Defense or an element of the intelligence community may be obligated or expended for the purpose or which would have the effect of supporting, directly or indirectly, military or paramilitary operations in Syria by any nation, group, organization, movement, or individual.”

This legislation is modeled after the famous Boland Amendments of the early 1980s that were designed to limit the president's assistance to the Contras in their attempt to overthrow the government of Nicaragua. Congress has an obligation to exercise oversight of the president's foreign policy actions and to protect its constitutional prerogatives. This legislation will achieve both important functions.

Mr. Speaker, the last thing this country needs is yet another war particularly in the Middle East. Even worse is the president once again ignoring the Legislative Branch and going to war on his own. I hope my colleagues will join me in standing up for our Constitutional authority and resisting what will be another disastrous war in the Middle East.

IN HONOR OF ANTHONY COSTA

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Anthony Costa on the occasion of his recognition by the Grower Shipper Association with its prestigious E.E. "Gene" Harden Award for Lifetime Achievement in Central Coast Agriculture. The Ag Leadership Award is presented to the individual, company, group, association, or agency that has made a significant contribution to the agricultural community in the Salinas Valley.

Anthony Costa, or Tony, as he is known by most, was born in Wakefield Massachusetts and is the oldest of seven children. He came to California on a train with his aunt and uncle when he was eleven years old, settling in the San Joaquin Valley town of Los Banos. He graduated high school in 1946, and later served our nation in the U.S. Army during the Korean War. After leaving the service, he found his way to Salinas, California, where he met and married Salinas Valley native Elsie Bassi. Elsie was born and raised in the Soledad Mission District, graduated from San Jose State University, and was a school teacher.

In 1956, the young Costa couple began farming on a ranch outside of Soledad. As their family grew, so did their farming operation. For over fifty-six years, the Costa Family has dedicated itself to being quality growers of more than twenty different vegetable row crops in the Salinas Valley. Their original small operation has grown to encompass strategically owned and leased ground up and down the Salinas Valley. The family also runs year-round harvest operations, field-to-cooler trucking, joint ventures in Huron, Yuma and Imperial Valley crops, and partnership interests in cooling and processing operations. Their farming operation has been a key supplier to several shippers and processors in the area for many years.

The Costa Family Farms is a family farm in every sense of the word. And while the award singles out Tony for recognition, it is really a recognition of the whole Costa family. The family continues to farm the original ranch which they leased for many years. Their business now involves three generations of family members including their children David, Michael, Diane, and JoAnn, who are joined by their grandchildren Colby Rubbo and Peter Dossche. Several other grandchildren are pursuing agricultural degrees. They have built a remarkable operation that bridges the old produce world of trust and handshakes and the new modern world of food safety and product traceability.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for the whole House in offering Tony and Elsie Costa and their whole family our heartfelt congratula-

tions on their recognition by the well deserved honor of E.E. "Gene" Harden Award for Lifetime Achievement in Central Coast Agriculture.

IN HONOR OF NATIONAL MARINE
WEEK

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of National Marine Week so that we may join in a celebration of the individuals who dedicate themselves to the service and defense of this great country.

Each year a city is chosen to host National Marine Week and to serve as a venue to showcase the achievements of our most elite service members. This year Cleveland, Ohio was chosen to bring together technology, history, Marines and the public they serve. Cleveland is a fitting location as currently more than 9,000 active duty or reserve Marines hail from the state of Ohio. By highlighting the community, country and Corps, National Marine Week is both an educational and civic event which fosters awareness and connection between the military and civilian communities.

A week including Marine sporting events, speakers, and bands demonstrates the wide array of talents which fuel the Corps forces both at home and abroad. Various demonstrations will showcase the Expeditionary Forces in Readiness. The week is a unique exchange of thanks and respect for soldier and citizen alike. By remembering the sacrifices of the past, as well as the missions which continue to require our forces in the future, National Marine Week is a sign of the gratitude and honor which these heroes deserve.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues please join me in honoring National Marine Week 2012 to show our appreciation to those who give so much in service to their country.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 125TH AN-
NIVERSARY OF THE UNITED
WAY

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize a special organization that is near and dear to me, The United Way.

The United Way Worldwide is the leadership and support organization for the network of nearly 1,800 community-based United Ways in 45 countries and territories. In East Alabama, we are home to three different United Way locations—The United Way of Lee County, The River Region United Way and The United Way of East Central Alabama.

United Way focuses on helping people reach their full potential in education, income and health while also encouraging volunteerism and service. June 21st is United Way's Day of Action and June 28th is the official United Way Founders Day.

The United Way of East Central Alabama, in particular, is a special organization to me be-

cause I had the honor of working there from 1982 to 1986 as the Director of their Dislocated Worker Program. I saw and participated first-hand in the organization's efforts to help laid-off workers go back to school for retraining.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my congratulations to this organization that has touched so many lives and offer a very happy 125th anniversary.

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN BURROUGHS
HIGH SCHOOL JUNIOR STATE OF
AMERICA CHAPTER

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the John Burroughs High School Junior State of America Chapter (JBHS JSA), from Burbank, California, upon being announced as the winner of the fifth annual National Civic Impact Award.

The concept for the Junior State was envisioned in the 1930s by Professor E.A. Rogers, who strongly believed that teaching youth the fundamentals of good government is one of the central needs of a democracy. When he introduced this idea to his students, a recommendation for a junior government was proposed by a student, where students would not only learn about democracy, but practice it as well. Formerly known as the Junior Statesmen of America, this project has spread to many high schools in California and across the nation. Since its inception, over 500,000 students have gained the skills and knowledge essential to be informed and active citizens and leaders.

Today, the Junior State of America (JSA) and the Junior Statesmen Foundation, strive to prepare and educate high school students for continuing involvement and participation in a democratic society. It encourages students to advocate their personal opinions, develop respect for opinions that oppose their own, think critically, and exchange ideas through problem solving, talks and debates. This experience also allows students to understand the responsibilities and challenges of leadership.

Every year, the top JSA chapters from across the U.S. compete for the National Civic Impact Award. This award is presented to the JSA chapter that makes the most prevalent impact at their school, by raising the degree of civic engagement and awareness. Ten finalists, who had all been announced winners of the "Chapter of the Year" award in their respective regions, advanced to be considered for the National Civic Impact Award. A panel of judges reviewed the materials the finalists had submitted, and announced John Burroughs High School as this year's winner. In addition to this prestigious title, the JBHS JSA will receive a grant towards maintaining the school's civic engagement programs, a stipend reward for the Teacher/Advisor as well as a plaque highlighting their achievement. The JBHS JSA is also incredibly active in their school and community. They have raised money for the Ronald McDonald House Charity, attended City Council and School Board meetings and hosted guest speakers.

I applaud the student participants and all the supporters of JSA for your unwavering commitment to civic engagement, and I ask all

Members to join me in congratulating the JBHS JSA Chapter for their noteworthy achievement.

CANDLES HOLOCAUST MUSEUM

HON. LARRY BUCSHON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the CANDLES Holocaust Museum and Education Center located in Terre Haute, Indiana.

CANDLES is the only Holocaust Museum located in the State of Indiana, the only Holocaust Museum in the world focusing on forgiveness, and the only one focusing on the stories of twin children who were used as subjects in medical experimentation at Auschwitz. CANDLES is an acronym for Children of Auschwitz Nazi Deadly Lab Experiments Survivors.

The mission of CANDLES centers on the elimination of hatred and prejudice from our world. The Museum was founded in 1995 by Eva Mozes Kor who, as a twin, survived the genetic experiments of Dr. Josef Mengele in the Auschwitz Concentration Camp.

I was honored to be invited to tour CANDLES earlier this year and to meet Eva Mozes Kor and her husband, Mickey Kor. Their moving account of their experiences during the Holocaust and their willingness to forgive make their stories truly remarkable. I encourage all Hoosier and anyone who has the opportunity to visit CANDLES and to learn from Eva's powerful message of forgiveness.

TRIBUTE TO SHIRLEY MACLAINE

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 7th, 2012, the American Film Institute bestowed its prestigious 40th Lifetime Achievement Award upon actress Shirley MacLaine. I was privileged to speak at the event in tribute to my dear friend. I submit my remarks for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"I met Shirley MacLaine 33 years ago, with Congresswoman Bella Abzug at Elaine's Restaurant in New York City, the beginning of a magical friendship. She is my daughter Jackie's godmother. Seven years ago Shirley officiated at Elizabeth's and my wedding.

The Shirley MacLaine I know has an uncommon intellectual curiosity, borne of a courageous approach to life. She has the capacity, in an instant, to go very deep into human experience, into the cosmos, into herself. Her gift to her friends is her ceaseless call for authenticity, the challenge to take off the mask, and compassion for those who journey towards the inner truth.

"The poet, Walt Whitman, may have anticipated Shirley when he wrote "I contain multitudes." Shirley brings an extraordinary emotional coloration to the Art of Life and to the performing arts that is so vivid that she has the ability to light up a character, light up stage and screen and light up our lives.

"In a world where most people play it safe, Shirley pushes the envelope, to pierce the veil which covers reality itself, to explore and to guide us to other dimensions. She has lived a life out on the limb, picking apples that most would fear to reach, and tonight, Shirley, you are harvesting an orchard."

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my colleagues join me in celebrating Shirley MacLaine's extraordinary career and her attainment of the AFI's 40th Lifetime Achievement Award.

HONORING THE UNITED STATES
ARMY MISSION AT TOBYHANNA

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the U.S. Army Mission at Tobyhanna Army Depot in Tobyhanna, Pennsylvania, on the occasion of their 100th year of service to our nation.

Originally used as an artillery training field, Tobyhanna Army Depot has housed the United States Army since 1912. The current supply depot was built in 1953 and has served the U.S. Army ever since.

In its 100-year history, the U.S. Army has found numerous uses for the Army Depot as a Civilian Conservation Corps camp, tank and ambulance center for World War I, prisoner-of-war camp during World War II, and storage point for gliders used in the D-Day landings at Normandy in 1944.

Tobyhanna Army Depot itself has been a leader in the design, manufacture, and repair of many integral and state of the art U.S. Army systems and tools for nearly 60 years. Currently, it is the largest, full-service electronics maintenance facility within the Department of Defense.

Tobyhanna serves not only the U.S. Army but also the people of northeastern Pennsylvania by providing the single largest number of jobs and employment in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the U.S. Army Mission at Tobyhanna Army Depot, and ask my colleagues to join me in praising their commitment to country and community.

HONORING EMILY E. RANDLE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Emily E. Randle. Emily is Raymond High School's Valedictorian at Raymond High School for the Class of 2012. She is the daughter of David and Ruth Randle of Utica, Mississippi.

Ms. Emily Randle has a 4.2 GPA and is enrolled in both advanced performance and accelerated classes. She has appeared numerous times on the Principal's List while in high school. Emily is also involved in extra-curricular activities. She is the President of the Senior Class, a member of the Beta Club, and a member of the Student Council.

Emily is very serious about continuing her education and has received several academic

scholarships from colleges and universities in the United States. She has also been selected as a National Achievement Scholarship Finalist, Clinton Alumni Chapter Scholarship Recipient, Rho Lambda Omega Alpha Kappa Alpha Scholarship Recipient, 2012 MS Scholars Award, and Outstanding Young Citizen for the Loyal Order of the Elks 2011.

Emily is also actively involved in extra-curricular activities such as, playing the trumpet in the Raymond High School Band, serving as the drum major for the 2011-2012 school year, and participating in both the Mid-South Honor Band for 2011 and the Capital District Honor Band. Emily is also a member of the Young People's Department at her church, Pearl Street AME Church.

After high school, Emily plans to attend Duke University in Durham, North Carolina. She intends to pursue a career in Intelligence Securities with hopes of becoming a research analyst for the Central Intelligence Agency, Federal Bureau of Investigations or the National Security Agency.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join me in honoring Ms. Emily E. Randle, Valedictorian of Raymond High School Class of 2012.

DOMESTIC ENERGY AND JOBS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 2012

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4480) to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas exploration, development, and production under oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in response to a drawdown of petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve:

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, the bill that the House is considering contains a very troubling provision. It would place a \$5,000 fee on anyone who wants to protest a lease of federal lands.

The language in this legislation is very clear: it refers to this as a "protest fee" and it costs \$5,000. Clearly, a \$5,000 fee places a higher burden on citizens who might seek to delay or prevent oil and gas development.

Mr. Chair, my colleagues are well aware that the first amendment says that Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

This fee violates that most basic freedom and it violates the spirit of the first amendment. My amendment, Number 13, offered by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia as my designee, would fix that.

I am not a lawyer Mr. Chair, but I have experience in non-violent protest. I have experience in petitioning the government over a grievance. And I believe this provision is unconstitutional.

I have seen firsthand the power of the first amendment—the power of protest. My experience has taught me that this is our sacred right as Americans. It is a protection from oppression. It is a protection from tyranny and injustice. On more than one occasion, my

friends and I put our lives in its care for what we believe. We must protect that right.

In the past three years there have been members of this body who have protested the policies of the administration. While I disagree with them on many issues, I deeply respect their right to peacefully and non-violently protest. Some of them may be new to protest but I know that every member of the Tea-Party Caucus will support my amendment.

Mr. Chair, the ability to protest was the foundation of our country. Protest has shaped and reshaped our society. Again and again. If the courts review this policy, we should make clear that this provision should not stand. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this amendment.

IN HONOR OF AIRMAN 1ST CLASS
OWENS

HON. MIKE ROSS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. ROSS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true patriot who died in service to this great country. On February 17, 2011, Airman 1st Class Corey C. Owens, USAF, died of a non-combat related incident at Al Asad Air Base in Iraq in support of Operation New Dawn.

Airman 1st Class Owens, 26, of San Antonio, Texas, was assigned to the 47th Security Forces Squadron, Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, and was on his second deployment to southwest Asia. His father resides in Story, Arkansas.

Although I never had the honor of meeting Airman 1st Class Owens, it is clear by the outpouring of praise from his colleagues, friends, and family that he was well liked and well respected by all who knew him. In fact, local news reported that when Laughlin Air Base held a memorial service on Feb. 28, they had trouble finding a space large enough.

Airman 1st Class Owens is survived by his current wife, Misty Owens; his two daughters, Xiya and Xoe Owens from his first marriage; his father, Steve Owens of Story, Ark.; his mother, Chris Owens of Springfield, Ill.; two sisters, Ann Kusterbeck of Princeton, Tex., and Sandra Owens of Springfield, Ill.; two uncles, two aunts, two nieces, one nephew and several cousins.

When we think of true heroes, we think of brave Americans like Airman 1st Class Owens who risk everything to defend freedom and serve this great country. We will always be grateful for his selfless sacrifice and he will be deeply missed by all who knew him. My thoughts and prayers go out to his parents and the rest of his family and friends during this very difficult time. We are who we are as a nation because of patriots like Airman 1st Class Owens.

Today, I ask all Members of Congress to join me as we honor the life of Airman 1st Class Corey Owens and his legacy, as well as each man and woman in our Armed Forces, and all of those in harm's way supporting their efforts, who give the ultimate sacrifice in service to this great country. We owe them our eternal gratitude.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM A.
KRUPMAN

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to William A. Krupman of Purchase, NY, who is being honored for his dedication to at-risk youth and their families upon his retirement as Chair of the Children's Village, a New York-based multi-service, not-for-profit agency.

Mr. Krupman was elected to the Board of the Children's Village in 1974. In 2004, he was elected as Chair of the Board. Through his tireless efforts as Trustee and eventually Board Chair, Mr. Krupman helped the Children's Village to become a leader in the child welfare and juvenile justice fields. He also successfully created nationally recognized, evidence-based models of care that lead to real social impact.

During his almost four decades on the Children's Village Board, Mr. Krupman has provided guidance to approximately 10,000 children and their families. He has not only motivated guardians to lead by example and teach their children the importance of social, educational, and economic skills, but has also provided guidance to orphans, an especially vulnerable group. The Children's Village's Dobbs Ferry campus includes long-term residential treatment programs, a short-term crisis intervention center, temporary placement for youth awaiting a court disposition, and a public school that educates all of these children as well as day students from around the region. The Children's Village also has offices in Harlem and the Bronx and program sites around Westchester County.

Mr. Krupman's work has also had a profound impact abroad. Through his commitment and strong will, Mr. Krupman has succeeded in expanding literacy programs around the globe. In 2009, at the invitation of the Government of Iraq, Mr. Krupman traveled to the country as part of the Children's Village delegation to help train NGO's working with orphans. In Iraq, Mr. Krupman, along with a team of professionals, assessed the needs of the locals and offered suggestions on how to apply local feedback into the curriculum to ensure that the needs of Iraqi families and children were being met. The information they gathered helped Iraq's non-government service organizations develop programs for family foster care homes, social workers, and short-term crisis stabilization facilities similar to the one run by the Children's Village. Additionally, they established a team of Iraqi social service leaders to continue and develop the outstanding work started by Mr. Krupman and the team.

Mr. Krupman currently serves as Chief Advisor to Litworld, an organization that strives to make the dream of world-wide literacy for children a reality. LitWorld teams work with teachers, community members, parents, and children to establish communities that will grow and expand to harbor literacy leaders. Recently, Mr. Krupman traveled to several African countries, including Kenya and Rwanda, bringing with him his enthusiasm and energy to share the gift of literacy with children by reading to them.

Mr. Krupman's many outstanding achievements in providing assistance to children and youth, both here and around the world, are inspirational. I urge you to join me in honoring William A. Krupman.

HONORING DEBORAH J. MAGGS

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my constituent, Deborah J. Maggs, on the occasion of her retirement.

Deborah was hired in May of 1975 as a Caseworker 2 for the Lycoming County Children and Youth Services. She has served for 37 consecutive years, 34 of which were full time. She worked part time for three years from 1979 to 1982 in order to raise her two children.

In 1985, she was promoted to Casework Supervisor 1 in the General Protective Services Unit, a unit she led until 2005. Deborah's extensive training, experience and skills helped her develop expertise in the area of Child Protective Service investigation.

In 2005, Deborah was instrumental in the development, implementation, and supervision of the County's Integrated Assessment Units, composed of caseworkers cross-trained to perform Child Protective Services, General Protective Services and Mental Health Assessments.

Throughout her career, Deborah has supervised and mentored over 30 staff, many of whom have gone on to become supervisors themselves.

Deborah has dedicated a significant part of her life to service casework, having either supervised or conducted over 21,000 investigations and assessments protecting the health, safety and wellbeing of well over 38,000 children. In 2010 she was recognized with the "Excellence in Human Services" award as nominated and selected by her staff and peers.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Deborah J. Maggs, and ask my colleagues to join me in praising her commitment to Pennsylvania's 10th Congressional District.

H.R. 1756, THE NATIONAL OILHEAT
RESEARCH ALLIANCE REAU-
THORIZATION ACT OF 2011

HON. CHARLES F. BASS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress debates measures to address our nation's energy independence, economic growth, and job creation, I rise in strong support of the National Oilheat Research Alliance Reauthorization Act of 2011 (H.R. 1756).

Oilheat safely and efficiently heats 9.5 million American households, keeping an estimated 24.5 million individuals comfortable when the temperature drops. As the American cost of living continues to rise, vital advances in this industry can save consumers money. With the goal of improving heating efficiency

and technology, we have introduced H.R. 1756, legislation to reauthorize this vital program and have the support of 70 bipartisan and geographically diverse cosponsors.

Since its inception in 2001, the National Oilheat Research Alliance (NORA) has made significant progress in improving the efficiency and reliability of oilheating equipment, thus lowering costs to consumers and reducing the use of oil. NORA is a collaborative program established by the oilheat industry aiming to strengthen the industry by improving education and training for employees, providing information to customers, and developing new products for consumers. From an ecological standpoint, NORA is working on the development of sustainable biofuels as part of heating oil, and improving emissions controlling technology.

NORA is funded by a fee of 2/10th of 0.01 cent per gallon paid for by oilheat distributors only if 85% of the industry agrees that it is wanted. This fee does not affect consumers, but rather is an initiative by members of the industry to improve their product and save customers money.

Since the authorization of NORA the industry has:

Improved residential oilheat efficiency by 30 percent or 120 gallons per home. Based on the U.S. average heating oil price in the 2009/2010 winter season, the volume reduction over this period has reduced oilheat consumer's energy costs by about \$335 per household at a cost of \$7.50 per household heated with oil.

Reduced foreign oil imports by 185,000 barrels per day.

Reduced CO₂ emissions by 30 million tons. The adoption of NORA's best practices resulted in reduced claims and less severity for industry participants. This yielded a significant reduction in the cost of insurance for companies. For a typical company utilizing NORA's best practices, insurance costs per customer will be reduced by 1.0 cent per gallon.

The authorization of NORA merely provides the mechanism for the oilheat industry, should they choose to work cooperatively, develop programs, and ensure that solutions are found systematically and resourcefully. By reauthorizing NORA, we will help ensure the continuation of research that has helped lower consumer costs and improved heating efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues and the staff on the Energy and Commerce Committee for the work they have done on this legislation and urge its consideration and passage.

IN RECOGNITION OF A SAFE
PLACE

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize A Safe Place, its Board of Trustees, its counselors, and its volunteers as the organization celebrates its milestone of twenty-five years of service to the community.

A Safe Place is an organization on Nantucket that helps survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault as they start over and rebuild their lives. They were founded in 1987 by five members of the Nantucket Wom-

en's Bar Association and, since then, have continued to provide free and confidential services to these survivors. Over the years, the organization's outreach has expanded to also include specialized assistance to children whose lives have been affected by violence in the home.

Today, A Safe Place provides a 24-hour hotline that people can call when they are in immediate need of assistance, and its counselors often will meet with survivors in the local hospital or police station as soon as the need arises. It has even organized a network of "safe houses" on the island through its Safe Home initiative, a program through which volunteers offer emergency accommodation in their own homes to those leaving an abusive situation. The organization provides assistance with relocation as survivors work to rebuild their lives. When a survivor must confront her abuser in court, a counselor from A Safe Place is often right by her side. A Safe Place offers comfort and assistance to hundreds of people each year, and it is considered to be an invaluable service to the Nantucket community by local law enforcement and healthcare providers.

Mr. Speaker, it brings me great pride to honor A Safe Place, its Board of Trustees, its counselors and its volunteers as the organization celebrates twenty-five years of service. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the importance of this organization to the Nantucket community and its significance to those whose lives have been changed by its support.

RECOGNIZING THE STATE OF OHIO
IN CARING FOR OLDER AMERICANS

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, as we work to re-evaluate our country's health care delivery and payment system, I rise in recognition of the great success my home state of Ohio has had in caring for our senior citizens. Ohio Governor John Kasich realized not only the cost savings but also the quality of care that could be achieved through caring for seniors in their own homes. He dramatically increased the availability of home health services for Ohio's senior populations, and according to the Ohio Department on Aging, the state will save an additional \$300 million per year by 2020 because of that decision.

When seniors are paying their own room and board, sleeping in their own beds, and doing their own laundry and cooking, they end up having more personal investment in their own health care decisions—covering costs that taxpayers would otherwise pay in increased Medicare and Medicaid spending. Giving seniors, and all Americans, more control over their medical choices and health care dollars will help promote high-quality, cost-effective health care.

Last month was Older Americans Month, and this year's theme was Never Too Old To Play. Older Americans were encouraged "to stay engaged, active and involved in their own lives and in their communities." What better way for seniors to do this than to receive

needed care in the comfort of their own homes? I applaud the state of Ohio for the quality and cost-effective care we are offering our senior citizens and encourage the federal government to do the same.

CONGRATULATING USCG CAPTAIN
STEVE POULIN ON PROMOTION
TO REAR ADMIRAL

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer congratulations to USCG Captain Steve Poulin for his much-deserved promotion on June 25, 2012, to the rank of Rear Admiral. His unwavering dedication to duty, combined with his impeccable service record, is a credit to the United States Coast Guard.

For the people of the Gulf Coast, Captain Poulin has been a good friend and protector of our shores as Commander of Coast Guard Sector Mobile, Alabama, from 2009 to 2010.

During his command of Sector Mobile, Captain Poulin demonstrated a level of professionalism in keeping with the finest traditions of the Coast Guard. He was not only the leader of one of the largest operations in the Coast Guard but also a visible and respected member of our community.

Prior to assuming the command of Sector Mobile, he served in Mobile during earlier assignments as Deputy Commander, from 2007 to 2009, and as Law Enforcement Officer and Assistant Operations Officer from 1986 to 1989.

On July 9, 2010, Captain Poulin left the command of the USCG station in Mobile to assume sole duties as local incident commander for the Unified Command. In this capacity, Captain Poulin marshaled Coast Guard resources in the federal response to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill which threatened our coastline for much of 2010.

Captain Poulin's extensive service record also includes assignments as Deputy Commander of the Coast Guard Group Galveston, Texas, from 1996 to 1999, and Special Adviser for Border and Transportation Security for Vice President Richard Cheney from 2005 to 2007. From 2003 to 2005, he was Coast Guard liaison to the State Department's Office of Oceans Affairs. He also served as Legal Counsel for the Coast Guard's Port Security Director from 2002 to 2003, and Legislative Counsel in the Coast Guard's Office of Congressional Affairs from 1999 to 2001.

A 1984 graduate of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, Captain Poulin was awarded his Juris Doctor, magna cum laude, from the Miami School of Law in 1992.

After leaving the Gulf Coast, Captain Poulin assumed the position as the Coast Guard's director of Congressional Affairs in Washington, DC. He currently serves as the Coast Guard's Maritime and International Law Office Chief.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of South Alabama, I wish to congratulate Rear Admiral Poulin on his promotion. I also would like to extend my very best wishes to his lovely wife, Sherry, and their two children, Steven and Erin.

TRIBUTE TO MS. SUZANNE GOSS

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Ms. Suzanne Goss, Government Relations Specialist for JEA (Electric, Water & Sewer) on her recent election as the new President of the National Association of Clean Water Agencies, NACWA.

Ms. Goss is an accomplished leader and committed environmental steward who plays a prominent role in seeking a sound direction for the implementation of the Clean Water Act. Throughout her career in the water industry, Ms. Goss has exemplified what it means to be a public servant. Ms. Goss will continue to ensure that Florida's, and the Nation's, clean water agencies are sustainable, that the environment continues to improve, and that public health is protected.

At JEA, Ms. Goss works for an advanced publicly owned water, electric, and sewer utility, providing invaluable services to approximately 420,000 people in Northeast Florida. Ms. Goss effectively engages in complex state and federal legislative and regulatory issues involving wastewater and drinking water with an in-depth knowledge of the affordability concerns of her community and the need for a partnership between all levels of government. She also manages JEA's Grant Program.

A member of NACWA's Board of Directors since 2007, Ms. Goss has served as the organization's Secretary, Treasurer, and Vice President, and has been a member of many NACWA committees and workgroups. She has played a leading role in NACWA's pretreatment program and is also one of the drivers behind the organization's funding efforts. In 2005 she received the President's Award for her work as Vice Chair of the Clean Water Funding Task Force.

In addition to her work with NACWA, Ms. Goss is an active member of local, regional, state and national professional organizations. These include the American Water Works Association, the New Water Supply Coalition, the Florida Municipal Energy Association, the Florida Water Environment Association, the Florida Energy Coordinating Group, the Pinellas County Sewer System and the Advisory Council on Environmental Policy and Technology Sustainable Infrastructure.

Ms. Goss has selflessly shared her time, passion, energy and ideas to carry out the objectives of the Clean Water Act.

It is my sincere pleasure to congratulate Suzanne Goss on becoming President of NACWA. I am certain her actions will ensure continued water quality progress for the Jacksonville area, the State of Florida and the Nation.

IN HONOR OF CORPORAL BERNARD
P. CORPUZ

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Corporal Bernard P. Corpuz,

and to join the U.S. Army in recognizing his service to our nation by dedicating the military's newest language training facility in his honor. Corporal Corpuz was a native to California's Central Coast, and represented his community with pride during his service in the Army. He was killed in action in Ghazni, Afghanistan, on June 11, 2006 in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

Bernard Corpuz was born on August 16, 1977, and grew up near Watsonville, California. He graduated from Palma High School and attended Hartnell College, both in Salinas, California. In July 2004, Corpuz joined the U.S. Army. After completing basic training, he was sent back to California's Central Coast to study at the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLI) in Monterey, California. DLI is the nation's largest and most rigorous language education center. Corpuz completed a rigorous six-month French basic course and graduated on April 28, 2005. His instructors at DLI described him as an extremely dedicated student of French, who studied the language with passion and read French literary and religious books with zeal.

Following DLI, Corpuz trained as an Army interrogator. In December 2005, he deployed with the 303rd Military Intelligence Battalion, part of the 504th Military Intelligence Brigade, to Afghanistan. On June 11, 2006, Corporal Corpuz was fatally wounded when an improvised explosive device detonated while he traveled in a convoy of vehicles conducting a village assessment. He died in the arms of a Catholic chaplain at the age of 28.

Our nation's need for military linguists has grown dramatically in the wake of the September 11, 2001 attacks. DLI has grown in an equally dramatic way to meet this demand. Congress and the Department of Defense have helped by funding the expansion and modernization of DLI's teaching facilities. The newest facility, a 47,000 square foot state of the art building will be formally dedicated and named in honor of Corporal Corpuz on Friday, June 22, 2012. The new Corpuz Hall will house DLI's Multi-Language School, which educates students in the critical languages of Dari, Pashto, Urdu, Uzbek, Punjabi, Turkish, and Hindi. Every time these future military linguists enter the building they will be reminded of the passion and determination Corporal Corpuz brought to the classroom and to his service to our nation.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak on behalf of the entire House, in expressing our nation's gratitude to Corporal Bernard P. Corpuz. Also, may his mother, Peggy Corpuz, seek comfort in knowing her son's name is a beacon for higher learning and national service.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY
OF BALLY BOROUGH

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Bally Borough, Berks County, Pennsylvania on its 100th anniversary.

While the Borough of Bally was incorporated in 1912, it has a rich history that stretches back to before the American Revolution when present-day Bally was known as

Goshenhoppen in Philadelphia County. The original settlers enjoyed generally peaceable relations with the Indians and worked hard to ensure the survival of their frontier settlement.

After 1855, the town was re-named Churchville, Washington Township, due to the prominence of the Catholic and Mennonite churches that had been in the area since the 18th century. After the death of Father Bally, the Catholic priest in the village, a post office was established in Churchville in 1883 and named for the revered priest. The name of the village was eventually changed to correspond with that of the post office and, in 1912, was incorporated as the Borough of Bally.

Over the years, Bally has grown from a few families in a small frontier town to a vibrant borough of over 1,090 people and 430 households. In times of war, the citizens of Bally have always heeded their country's call, and are commemorated by the war memorial dedicated to their service. The Borough of Bally has been home to many industrial concerns including the Great American Knitting Mill, Bally Case and Cooler, Bally Pants Factory, Bally Ribbon Mills, and Bally Block Company. Throughout its rich history, Bally Borough and its citizens have made great contributions to the quality of the economic and social life of Berks County and the region.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me today in congratulating Bally Borough and its storied history on the occasion of its 100th anniversary and to extend best wishes for the Borough's continued longevity.

MYPIE INC.

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Katherine Anne Crouse and Peter Crouse, owners of myPie Inc., for receiving the Golden Rotary Ethics in Business Award.

myPie opened in 2010 with Katherine delivering pizzas subway style via her bicycle, which she rides to and from work every day. myPie is the first delivery service in the U.S. to sell pizzas in a subway sandwich style. This entrepreneurial eye carries forth in their community outreach as well.

myPie initiated the 31.4% day where it awards 31.4% of all sales to local charitable organizations and schools. So far myPie has donated more than \$3,000 to Wheat Ridge High School and Middle School, the Action Center of Jefferson County, 40 West Arts in Lakewood, and Wheat Ridge 20/20.

myPie is a model for outstanding ethics in business. It is an example for all businesses in America to emulate.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Katherine Anne Crouse and Peter Crouse for their well deserved recognition by the Rotary of Golden. I have no doubt Katherine and Peter will exhibit the same dedication and character in all their future accomplishments.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION THAT WILL ENSURE THAT FEDERAL MONEY GRANTED TO STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT IS USED FOR ITS INTENDED PURPOSE

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce legislation that will ensure that federal money granted to state and local law enforcement is used for its intended purpose, and not in violation of our constitutional right to equal protection. As a member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, I am proud of the service we provide to the American people. Through the Department of Homeland Security, over \$35 billion in federal funds have been granted to local and state governments for counterterrorism programs that have kept our homeland safe since 9/11.

Unfortunately, not every dime of federally granted money has been used wisely. Troubling reports demonstrate that DHS grants have been used to fund biased training activities that are inaccurate, surveillance programs that target members of neighborhoods simply because of their religion, and other activities that are overbroad and compromise our security. Aside from being unconstitutional, these programs fail to narrowly target individuals that are actual security threats.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation that secures our homeland, while maintaining the integrity of federal grants. This legislation will require that DHS counterterrorism grants are used to fund training programs developed by the Department of Homeland Security, or training programs that are pre-approved by the Department's Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties and its Privacy Office. Additionally, the bill will require that the Department's Inspector General regularly review DHS funded programs to ensure that they are not used to support civil rights violations, including racial, ethnic, and religious profiling.

Mr. Speaker, we all know the often quoted statement from Ben Franklin, one of the authors of the Constitution, that "anyone who trades liberty for security deserves neither liberty nor security." Today, we need both security and liberty, and can ill-afford to sacrifice either. These two concepts—security and liberty—are national interests that work hand-in-hand; when one is dismissed, the other is inherently discarded. This legislation is as much about the liberty of a few, as it is about the security of this whole nation.

I hope my colleagues join my effort to restore the integrity of taxpayers' dollars; let us provide the appropriate tools to law enforcement so that they may secure our homeland well; nevertheless, let us also protect the American people from unreasonable government treatment by enacting this legislation.

COMMEMORATING THE 350TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. FRANCIS XAVIER CATHOLIC CHURCH IN MARYLAND

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to both salute a former staffer who now works for a boss more powerful than any Member of Congress and to celebrate a feat of incredible longevity at his new workplace.

I was honored to employ Brian Sanderfoot, from Appleton, Wisconsin, for many years. He represented the highest values we in Congress want to provide: courtesy, commitment, and a dedication to public service.

A devout Catholic, Brian left Congress to pursue his true calling in the priesthood. After studying both at D.C.'s Catholic University and in Rome, Brian became Father Sanderfoot and entered a new phase of service.

Father Sanderfoot settled in the Archdiocese of Washington which is home to over 600,000 Catholics living in Washington, DC, and five Maryland counties. He now ministers at Maryland's St. Francis Xavier parish and is making a real difference in the lives of his congregation.

In a nation that commemorates the 25th or 50th anniversary of an event, Father Sanderfoot's parish has a special distinction. It recently celebrated its 350th anniversary, making it the oldest Catholic parish in America.

In anticipation of this milestone, Father Sanderfoot initiated two historical discovery projects. The first was a thorough survey of the cemetery at the parish's Newtowne Neck Church to map and index the graves. The second project was an archeological dig to discover the location of the original chapel.

St. Francis Xavier's parish has been a silent witness to a new country coming into being, its expansion across a continent, a civil war that pitted brother against brother, the strength of a people tested by the Great Depression and world wars, and the rise of a superpower. It has been the site of countless baptisms, weddings, funerals, masses, and homilies. For three and a half centuries, this parish has been the place where faith was nurtured, renewed, and embraced.

It is a privilege to consider Father Brian Sanderfoot a part of the extended Lewis family. I celebrate his new life and his lasting faith. Let us honor the durability of St. Francis Xavier's parish, which has been a steadfast source of identity and a pillar of stability for all Catholics in the area.

JEAN KIRSHNER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jean Kirshner, co-founder of the Belize Education Project, for receiving the Golden Rotary Ethics in Business Award.

The Belize Education Project is responsible for bringing thousands of books and supplies

to students and teachers in Belize, as well as delivering teacher training to Belize educators in Belize and here in Colorado.

Utilizing five focuses of the "lifting lives through literacy project", reading with students, teacher education, family literacy, school supplies and scholarships for both primary and high school students, the Belize Education Project has been able to reach several of their goals.

Since 2007, an education team has traveled annually to Belize to work with teachers, students and families. In addition, a group of educators from Belize are hosted in Colorado to learn from instruction in Colorado classrooms.

I congratulate Jean Kishner for her leadership, and all the individuals of the Belize Education Project for making our world a better place to live.

THE LITTLE ROCK DIFFERENCE

HON. TIM GRIFFIN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Little Rock Air Force Base (LRAFB) and the LRAFB Community Council, both of which are located in central Arkansas, which I represent.

This week, the Community Council was presented with the Abilene Trophy, which recognizes the community that provides the "finest support" to an Air Mobility Command unit.

This is the second time the LRAFB Community Council has received this award, and it's truly a testament to their dedication to military families, to their community, and to their nation.

LRAFB has always enjoyed the support of the surrounding community. In fact, LRAFB was founded in 1952 when community leaders raised \$1 million to buy property from more than 150 private landowners and donated the property to the U.S. Air Force to create LRAFB.

In 2011, when LRAFB was hit by a tornado, the community responded by adopting affected families. Two weeks later, LRAFB was similarly responsive, assisting local families affected by flooding.

This supportive and cooperative relationship goes beyond just "neighbors helping neighbors." Last year, LRAFB's Joint Education Center became a first-of-its-kind partnership between the City of Jacksonville and LRAFB, and, to fund this project, the residents of Jacksonville voted to tax themselves to raise \$5 million to put toward the overall project.

The relationship between LRAFB and the community is unique, and, together, they are one team and responsive to the needs of each other. They serve as examples of excellence. This is how LRAFB and the Community Council differentiate themselves from other communities with air bases and what led to the creation of "The Little Rock Difference."

"The Little Rock Difference" initiative was unveiled this week by the Community Council. It establishes the characteristics of the relationship between LRAFB and the local community, and it is based on the LRAFB mantra "Rock & Role."

"Rock" is for "The Rock," which is the nickname of LRAFB and how the community affectionately refers to LRAFB. "Role" is for the

guiding principles of “ROLE”—“Responsive,” “One Team,” “Leading,” and “Excellence”—which the LRAFB community and the local community embody.

I congratulate the LRAFB leadership and the members of the Community Council for their dedication in creating and implementing “The Little Rock Difference” and for their ongoing efforts fostering strong and positive relations between the people of Arkansas and the men and women who protect our country.

I am proud to be a part of such a fine group of men and women dedicated to their nation and to their community, and I congratulate them on their success.

HONORING PROSPECT HILL

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a historic landmark in Jefferson County, Prospect Hill. Prospect Hill served as the catalyst for freed-slaves to immigrate to a colony known as “Mississippi in Africa”. Prospect Hill represents a small, but important part of American history. This landmark, rich in history, contributed extensively to the dispersal of African Americans to Africa.

Prospect Hill was originally founded by Revolutionary War veteran, Issac Rose; in his will he provided funds that would allow freed-slaves to immigrate to the region of Liberia known as “Mississippi in Africa”. Although this sparked turmoil in Jefferson County, this action eventually led to the successful immigration of free-slaves to Liberia in the 1830’s.

Prospect Hill has long served as a portion of the past that reflects on the abundant history of the South. Its memory recalls the presence of hope and determination that was incessant during the 19th century. As a prominent landmark, Prospect Hill conserves a crucial piece of American history.

In 2011, Prospect Hill was included on Mississippi’s list of the Ten Most Endangered Historic Places. As a result, The Archaeological Conservancy acquired Prospect Hill to conduct research for educational purposes and preservation efforts. Today Prospect Hill continues to undergo renovation by The Archaeological Conservancy, in an attempt to restore an important element of American history.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join me in recognizing Prospect Hill as an important Historical Site in Jefferson County, Mississippi.

COMMENDING MONTFORD POINT MARINES AND SON OF CIVIL WAR VETERAN

HON. G.K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two American trailblazers from North Carolina’s First Congressional District: Montford Marine veterans Johnny Thompskins and the recently deceased Joe Cobbs. I would also like to recognize the son of a Civil War veteran, Luke Martin, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, Thompskins, Cobbs, and Martin will be honored by the Christian Community Charity Workers (CCCW) Inc., on June 24 at the Flame Banquet Center in New Bern, North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, recruiting for the “Montford Marines” began on June 1, 1942, following public pressure on President Franklin D. Roosevelt by Black leaders to issue Executive Order 8802, which barred government agencies and federal contractors from employment discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color or national origin. The order also required all of the U.S. Armed Services, including the United States Marine Corps, to recruit and enlist African Americans. Despite an era thick with racial discrimination, Black recruits lined up by the thousands to defend the freedoms of people abroad, while still being denied basic unalienable rights at home.

Among the inaugural class of Black Montford Marines were Johnny Thompskins and the late Joe Cobbs. Thompskins, a man of small stature but enormous courage; and Cobbs, who developed a strong work ethic while working his family’s farmland, received basic training at the segregated Camp Montford Point in North Carolina because no Black recruit was allowed to enter the main base of nearby Camp Lejeune unless accompanied by a white Marine.

Nevertheless, these two men were unafraid by the onslaught of World War II. They understood that victory in war was only achievable with the talent of its Black citizens. As a result, these men served their country with distinction, charted uncharted territory, and set the bar for exemplary African American servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, on a similar note, at 94 years old, Luke Martin, Jr. is widely known around the state of North Carolina as one of a few living children of Civil War veterans. His father, Luke Martin, Sr. was a slave in Hertford County when he bravely joined the Union Army to fight for the freedoms of his loved ones.

Due to his father’s efforts to help gain civil rights for Blacks, Martin Jr. was able to become a distinguished mason who has earned enormous respect for building several structures across Craven County.

Today, Thompskins and Martin both reside in New Bern. Cobbs also lived there until his passing in May.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire U.S. House of Representatives to join me in recognizing these men, who will forever remain a cornerstone in American history.

HONORING MATTHEW LEVIN

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of my friend Matthew Levin, the Southeastern States Director of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC). Matt has shown outstanding leadership in the development and coordination of AIPAC’s political and grassroots objectives. It is an honor to commemorate his years of dedicated service in strengthening the United States’ relationship with our great ally Israel.

A native of South Florida, Matt graduated with a Bachelor of Arts in political science

from the University of South Florida in Tampa. He first joined the Washington, DC, office of AIPAC in 1987, where he served as a Field Organizer for pro-Israel communities throughout the United States. Matt traveled extensively throughout the Northeast, Midwest and Southwest to speak about the importance of the United States-Israel relationship and encourage citizen involvement in the American political process. From this wealth of experience, Matt has gained an extensive background in politics and foreign policy.

Matt’s impact in the Jewish community of South Florida and the United States extends beyond his work with AIPAC. For six years, Matt served in BBYO, one of the world’s leading Jewish organizations, where he demonstrated his passion for convening and connecting Jewish teenagers of all backgrounds, while motivating them to make a difference in the world. In 1981, Matt rose to become the Gold Coast Council President of BBYO.

It is an honor to congratulate Matt, his wife Danielle and their sons Jakob, Cooper and Noah, as they celebrate Matt’s outstanding work and leadership. Matt Levin has dedicated 25 years to strengthening the U.S.-Israel relationship, a commitment he and I both share. I applaud his efforts and look forward to working with him to strengthen our community at home and throughout the world in the years to come.

INTRODUCING THE WILD OLYMPICS WILDERNESS AND SCENIC RIVER ACT OF 2012

HON. NORMAN D. DICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker. Today I am proud to be introducing the Wild Olympics Wilderness & Wild and Scenic River Act of 2012, which will provide critical protection of key forested areas and rivers in the State of Washington. This bill, a result of more than two years of work by my staff and the staff of Washington Senator PATTY MURRAY, is a consensus effort that adds critical protection for sources of clean drinking water and preserves critical salmon and steelhead habitat. It creates more than 126,000 acres of new wilderness on the Olympic National Forest and designates 19 new Wild and Scenic Rivers and their tributaries in the National Forest, in Olympic National Park and on Washington Department of Natural Resources land.

I am particularly proud that the final version of this bill that is being introduced today has evolved through a long consultative process that included extensive local community input from Tribes, conservation groups, timber communities, business leaders, shellfish growers, farmers, local elected officials, hunters, anglers, mountain bikers, hikers, federal and state land managers and the general public. The result, in my judgment, is a common sense solution that offers permanent protection to some of the most spectacular of the Olympic Peninsula’s public lands—without having a significant impact on timber jobs or recreational access.

In our great state of Washington, Mr. Speaker, we cherish the ability of our citizens to have access to the natural beauty of our region, especially areas that remain pristine and

undisturbed. Our challenge as leaders of a growing population has been to assure that the most sensitive of these areas are protected from development so that future generations—our kids and their kids—have the same ability that we have had to see the magnificent vistas and enjoy the benefits of a clean environment. The Wild Olympics Wilderness & Wild and Scenic River Act of 2012 represents an important incremental step in assuring the protection of additional roadless areas in Washington, and I will be working with my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee to urge timely consideration of this legislation.

JUDY DENISON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and applaud my friend and talented singer Judy Denison for receiving the Living Landmark Award.

The Living Landmark Award is presented by the Golden Landmarks Association, a non-profit organization whose focus is to preserve historic places and educate people about the wonderful history the City of Golden has to offer.

Judy Denison relocated to Golden in 1988 because she loves the peaceful nature of Golden and the small town feel. She was the co-founder of Save the Mesas and an organizer for the Mesa Music Festival. Judy's involvement in Citizens Involved in Northwest Quadrant (CINQ) lead to the establishment of the Golden Newsletter, which reaches out to nearly 1,000 Golden citizens each week. The newsletter discusses environmental and cultural news and its mission is to preserve the clean mountain air and the ambiance of Golden.

Judy's accomplishments are many. After a medical mission to Belize, Judy set up the Belize Education Project to send teachers to Belize and provide books and scholarships to underprivileged students. She is a member of the Golden Rotary Club and meets with teenage girls in the community to discuss life and ethics. Furthering her youth outreach, Judy organized the Golden Community Choirs, which is now in its twelfth season.

Judy Denison is a true "Golden" citizen in every sense of the word. She has been a champion in the community and I am honored to congratulate her on this well deserved recognition by the Golden Landmarks Association. Thank you for making our community a proud place for all Coloradans.

DOMESTIC ENERGY AND JOBS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 2012

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4480) to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil

and gas exploration, development, and production under oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in response to a drawdown of petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 4480, the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act. This important legislation brings together multiple domestic energy bills that seek to help jumpstart our economy, spur job creation, and reduce energy costs on families and small businesses.

Given our slow economic recovery and high unemployment, we ought to do everything within our powers to ease the burdens facing Americans. Instead, this Administration continues to push policies that stifle job creation and increase uncertainty. The failed policies of the last three and a half years have only made a bad situation worse. Why would we continue to go down a path that makes it harder and harder for American companies to compete in a competitive global market? Energy costs are a major factor for companies when they are considering building a new facility or moving operations overseas. Let's make that decision easy for them and work to keep energy costs low so a U.S. presence is more attractive.

Today, we have an opportunity to pass legislation that will help stimulate the economy, lower the costs on small businesses and put a few extra dollars in the pockets of hard working Americans. For too long, we have ignored the abundant resources here at home, leaving us at the mercy of OPEC and other unstable countries throughout the world. I found it amusing that earlier this year when gas prices rose to record levels, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, these are the same individuals who are vehemently opposed to opening up production of oil and gas here in the U.S., were encouraging OPEC to increase oil production output. Why would we encourage OPEC to increase production, while doing everything in our power to severely limit production here at home?

Additionally, I am pleased that this legislation makes an attempt to reduce the abuse of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to score short term political points by tying the release of oil to opening up federal lands for oil and gas production. Also, this legislation takes important steps to streamline the permitting process for all energy sources, increase transparency and accountability on EPA regulations, and provide for greater lease certainty.

It is important for everyone to understand that currently only three percent of federal land is leased for oil and gas development. Given the instability in the Middle East, we must make it a priority to explore and develop our own natural resources. This doesn't mean that this has to come at the expense of our environment. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has identified 351 energy projects that have been stalled by "not in my backyard" suits, regulatory red tape, and endless challenges from environmentalists. What many may not realize is that almost half of these projects were for renewable energy projects. So this is not just an obstacle the oil and gas industry is facing. I am confident that we can find a way to ensure the protection of our environment while developing energy resources here at home, and this legislation is a step forward to make that possible.

It is time we put Americans back to work, and this legislation will go a long way to encourage economic growth, decrease our nation's dependence on foreign sources of oil, and reduce the costs on hard working Americans. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

RECOGNIZING ILIR ZHERKA

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Ilir Zherka, Executive Director of DC Vote, who has been the outstanding leader of District of Columbia residents in the fight for equal citizenship rights in our country. Ilir will celebrate his tenth anniversary as Executive Director of DC Vote on June 24, 2012. Ilir has built DC Vote in membership and in the use of a wide assortment of sophisticated tactics and approaches. Under Ilir's leadership, DC Vote has sustained itself for 10 years without interruption, thus ensuring the sustainability of a citizen's movement here for the first time in decades. Ilir has been the major tactician of the movement, skillfully using approaches as varied as polling, lobbying, and civil disobedience.

Most recently, Ilir was the architect of unprecedented civil disobedience on the streets in front of the Senate and the White House last year, after Congress reimposed anti-home-rule riders on the D.C. appropriations bill, and after the District government barely avoided being shut down because of a federal budget fight in which the city was not involved. Ilir's own arrest was emblematic of the courageous leadership that he has given the movement.

Ilir's earlier leadership in the fight of D.C. residents for a full vote in the House brought the city the closest to success in its history. Ilir brought a wide variety of approaches to the voting rights struggle with mounting success. His valuable work behind the scenes in establishing contacts to help remove an amendment that tied passage of the D.C. House Voting Rights Act (DCVRA) to the elimination of the city's gun safety laws is not well known. Years of diligent and systematic work brought passage of the DCVRA in the House and Senate, only to be undercut by the dangerous gun amendment. This disappointment after many years of hard work would have caused many to move on. However, on the heels of the setback for voting rights, Ilir immediately turned to leading a new fight for D.C. budget autonomy and building an expanded national coalition to protect the District's home rule from an unprecedented series of attacks.

Ilir's aggressive creativity in building DC Vote has been matched by personal modesty, rare in a leader of a movement. Most who have worked with Ilir have been unaware that he was brought to this country as a child in an immigrant family from Montenegro, fleeing ethnic tension with Albanians. He rose from an underprivileged childhood in the South Bronx to attend college at Cornell University and law school at the University of Virginia. Ilir's work for justice before and during his leadership of DC Vote was chronicled in an April 2012 article in Washingtonian magazine, entitled "Taking It to the Street." I ask for unanimous consent to place the article in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, for 10 years, Ilir Zherka has been leading the fight for equal rights for the residents of the District of Columbia, within view of the U.S. Capitol. Ilir has visited the offices of many Members. His leadership has been in the great tradition of citizens who have petitioned for their rights and engaged in citizen action, including time-honored civil disobedience. I ask the House to join me in commending Ilir Zherka for his outstanding leadership of the movement for equal citizenship rights for the more than 600,000 Americans who live in the Nation's capital.

TAKING IT TO THE STREET

(By Ariel Sabar)

The Headquarters of DC Vote have a lived-in feel, with scuffed blue carpets and hallways lined with stacks of cardboard boxes. The walls are a bricolage of candid photos from protests and posters from the group's well-known ad campaigns (I AM DC, I DEMAND THE VOTE). When I first visited last summer, a couple of crumpled dress shirts hung over the backs of chairs in the office bullpen. A staffer apologized, saying they'd been tossed there by interns who had changed into T-shirts before going out to leaflet.

The corner office of DC Vote's executive director, Ilir Zherka, was so tidy by comparison that I asked whether he'd cleaned up for my visit. There was a stand for his leadership awards, a single mounted news article, an impeccably trimmed ficus. Zherka said the slim pile of papers on his desk was a bit thicker than usual: "I don't like clutter. It prevents me from freeing up my mind to work."

A diagram tacked to the inside of his door added to the picture of Zherka as the cool tactician bringing discipline to the District's long and messy struggle for full democratic rights. The nation's capital has more residents than Wyoming—but no vote in Congress, which has the power to overrule the District's leaders on local matters.

The hand-drawn diagram, of X's and O's yoked by arcing lines, looked like a page from a coach's playbook. Inside the biggest loop was a list of what Zherka said were "opponents or problems." These included Power of Elites, Ignorance, NRA, Republicans, Blue Dog Dems, Pseudo Strict Constructionists. The list had the gravity of a voting-rights Ten Plagues.

The diagram, Zherka explained, was a postmortem inked after one of the movement's most spectacular defeats. Legislation that DC Vote had spent seven years fighting for—and that had won historic votes in both the House and the Senate—came to an ugly end in the spring of 2010, the victim of a fractured city leadership and of deft politicking by the national gun-rights lobby. The DC Voting Rights Act would have expanded the US House of Representatives by two seats. One would have gone to DC, whose residents are overwhelmingly Democratic, the other to Utah, a Republican-leaning state that had failed by a whisker to win a fourth House seat through the 2000 census.

In trying to regroup, Zherka—a tall 46-year-old man with narrow features, a loping gait, and a salt-and-pepper goatee—had organized a series of meetings to pick through the wreckage. The movement needed to pivot, to find a new way forward. At the front of everyone's mind was the one-word question scrawled in big red letters at the top of the diagram: How?

As Zherka came to see it, the "inside game"—of lobbying Congress, of quiet meetings with elites—had to give way to something more aggressive. The District had to make Congress and the White House pay a

higher price for denying greater self-rule to the 600,000 residents of the nation's capital.

"Part of our strategy is to push this fight to the point where Americans weigh in in large numbers," Zherka told me. "That's the way the civil-rights movement worked, when people from the North called their congressmen and said, 'Stop those dogs, turn off those water hoses.'"

We left Zherka's office and walked to the small break room. Among the photos on the wall was one of Zherka wrapped in a TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION flag and pointing skyward with his right hand. The gesture managed to evoke both the Statue of Liberty and Moses.

Zherka said that the day after Barack Obama won the presidency, he taped the Washington Post's front page to the same wall. It was a totem to the man who was supposed to be the movement's redeemer; the man who had backed the voting-rights bill as a US senator, who ate at Ben's Chili Bowl, who played basketball with then-DC mayor Adrian Fenty and won Fenty's endorsement in the Democratic primary; the man, an African-American, who said he saw this historically black city on the Potomac as something more than a seat of federal power.

That now felt like a long time ago. Last spring, Zherka removed the Election Day front page and replaced it with one more attuned to the times. Its centerpiece was a photograph of current DC mayor Vincent Gray being handcuffed by the Capitol Police on April 11 of last year, a day when 41 people, including Zherka, the mayor, and six DC Council members, were arrested in the movement's largest act of civil disobedience in decades. The arrests made headlines around the world.

The television cameras, the turnout among local leaders, and the location—a tightly policed street near the Capitol—gave the appearance of significant advance planning. But Zherka had put the entire demonstration together in about 48 hours. The catalyst was news that President Obama had agreed to a Republican-sought ban on locally funded abortions in DC in a last-minute deal to avert a federal-government shutdown. "John, I will give you DC abortion," Obama had told GOP House speaker John Boehner, according to a Washington Post article reconstructing the negotiations.

From his iPhone that weekend, Zherka sent an e-mail summoning his staff to a 10 AM conference call. This latest attack on self-governance demanded a response, he said. They would need to e-mail supporters, contact the media, work Facebook and Twitter, and get permits from the Capitol Police. Zherka and his deputies would need to track down Mayor Gray and the council over the weekend and urge them to attend. In less than three hours, an e-mail to supporters announced a 5 PM demonstration that Monday, at Constitution Avenue and Second Street, Northeast.

Zherka's plan was to have speeches and then lead perhaps a half dozen protesters into the street, blocking traffic and refusing police orders to move. Zherka suspected that Obama's concession would inflame DC leaders, particularly those who had worked to elect him. But how many were willing to be thrown into the back of a police van? Zherka had run into Mayor Gray at a social function the night before, but Gray had been noncommittal.

The next day, after the speeches, Zherka was the first to defy Capitol Police and set foot in the busy street. To his relief, Gray was right behind him.

When I caught up with him not long afterward, Zherka told me that the 41 arrests were a "huge turning point." But a year later, the movement's prospects seem anything but clear.

If Eleanor Holmes Norton—DC's nonvoting member of Congress—and a string of the city's mayors have been the public face of the fight for greater self-rule in the District, Zherka is its chief strategist and organizer. He is in many ways the movement's Zelig, a shape-shifter as comfortable testifying before Congress as he is leading chants through a bullhorn.

His own obscurity belies the influence of the nonpartisan advocacy group he turned from a once-flailing nonprofit into a many-tentacled powerhouse. Before its advent, Norton says, she often felt like "a talking head with nobody, meaning a body of citizens to back her up."

When he isn't emceeding rallies, Zherka is either on the Hill or at DC Vote, in Dupont Circle, where he morphs into a methodical puzzle-solver. At their Monday meetings, his half dozen staffers turn in reports of their activities over the past week, with a breakdown of successes and failures. Zherka uses the reports as real-time intelligence—a "dashboard," as one of his deputies puts it—to identify trends and new lines of attack.

In the halls of Congress, Zherka has a reputation for relentlessness. When a hard-fought 2007 voting-rights bill fell three votes short in the Senate, Zherka "was absolutely the first person who said, 'We have to get back on the horse. We have to get moving again. What are we doing? Who are we targeting?'" says Deborah Parkinson, then a senior staffer on the Senate committee with District oversight. "Just when you're tired and ready to take a break for 24 hours, he was right there saying, 'What are we going to do to make sure we get three votes for next time?'"

I accompanied Zherka one morning to a seminar he was leading for staffers from other nonprofits. The course was based on a how-to advocacy book Zherka is writing. Its chapter titles have the ring of both a battlefield manual and a self-help guide—Recruit the Right Champions; Communicate at All Times in All Directions; You Lose Until You Win.

The seminar was in a guesthouse at the villa-style DC home of Daniel Solomon, a philanthropist who helped found DC Vote. Zherka started with a lesson on issue-framing: why "marriage equality" is a better phrase than "gay marriage," why "climate change" is more likely to get a politician's ear than "global warming."

He gave an example from his own movement: "When someone says 'statehood,' people will ask, 'Well, where's the building going to be? Who's going to be the governor?' When you frame it as 'DC voting rights,' which is essentially the same thing, people will say, 'Oh, it's what everyone else has.'"

During a break, Zherka and I stepped onto the patio. "When I was in college," he said, "I took one of those tests that's supposed to tell you what career to go into." It was some 150 questions but offered less clarity than he'd hoped. "I remember the results were actor, politician, professor, and military officer."

When DC Vote hired Zherka as its executive director a decade ago, it needed—and got—all four.

A group of civic leaders and philanthropists established DC Vote in 1998 to rouse public support for the plaintiffs in *Alexander v. Daley*. The civil suit grew out of a legal theory that Jamin Raskin—a star professor at American University and now also a Maryland state senator—had laid out in a Harvard law journal. A group of 57 residents, joined by the DC government, argued that their lack of full congressional representation violated what Raskin said were equal-protection and due-process rights to "one person/one vote without regard to geographic residence."

DC Vote's founders saw in the suit new hope for a struggle winding back 200 years. The District was founded in 1790 on land ceded by Maryland and Virginia. A year after Congress moved to the new capital in 1800, lawmakers stripped residents of their ability to vote for Congress and President. When Philadelphia had been the capital, the Pennsylvania governor had refused to protect Congress from a mob of angry soldiers. Never again, Congress felt, should the seat of federal power be subject to the whims of local politicians.

Washingtonians raised an outcry They paid federal taxes and fought wars but were denied the very democracy the United States had just fought Great Britain to win. Yet for the next 160 years, little changed.

Over the decades, resistance to self-rule took on more cynical dimensions. For many in Congress, DC was simply too liberal and too black. A history of local corruption didn't help, though whether the District's scandals were any worse than those in Congress or in the states remains a fair question.

It wasn't until 1961, with the 23rd Amendment, that Washingtonians won the right to vote in presidential elections. In 1970, the District was granted a nonvoting delegate in the House. Three years later, Congress let DC residents elect a mayor and 13-member council. Though the so-called Home Rule Act was a giant leap, Congress retained the power to review the city's budget and all acts of the council.

The momentum the District had drawn from the broader civil-rights movement in the 1960s and '70s fizzled amid the violence and corruption of the 1980s and '90s. After then-mayor Marion Barry's arrest in a crack-cocaine sting, public animus toward the city crested. "The whole idea of making this little pissant city into a state is ludicrous, something like a fly landing on an elephant's rump and contemplating rape," the Philadelphia Inquirer's David Boldt wrote in a 1993 editorial.

By October 2000, Anthony Williams—first as DC's chief financial officer, then as mayor—had shored up the District's finances and made friends in Congress. But the civil suit hit a wall. The Supreme Court upheld a lower-court ruling that under the Constitution only "the People of the several States" could choose members of Congress, and DC was not a state. The lower court had recognized the "inequity" but said only Congress could fix it.

By 2002, DC Vote was adrift and nearly bankrupt. Yet Daniel Solomon and another founder, Joe Sternlieb, came to see the legal defeat as an argument for the group's revival. As they looked back at the history of the struggle, they noticed a lack of continuity. Leaders came and went; passions burned and cooled.

"There were these episodic moments of great interest but nothing continuing, nothing being built," Solomon—whose grandfather cofounded the Giant Food supermarket chain—told me. "As a philanthropist, I saw—we all saw—the importance of building a structure that could keep pushing the issue forward, even and especially in the lean times."

Board members recognized that DC Vote's survival—and perhaps the movement's—depended on its next choice of leader.

Illir Zherka was born in 1965 in Montenegro, then part of socialist Yugoslavia. His grandparents were farmers who had fought against the Italian and German occupation of Albania during World War II. Disease and the ravages of war claimed the lives of all but one of their seven children—Zherka's father, Ahmet.

After the war, Zherka's grandfather clashed with Albania's new Communist lead-

ers and fled with the family to Montenegro. (Zherka's parents are Muslim, though Zherka now goes with his family to a Unitarian congregation.) In their small town, Ahmet, charismatic and handsome, earned a reputation as an agitator against police harassment of Albanians. "My dad was very brash, very nationalistic, very unafraid," Zherka says.

But after taking part in an ethnic brawl one day, Ahmet feared for his family. They borrowed money from neighbors and landed in New York in May 1968, when Zherka was 2½.

Eleven people—Zherka and his six siblings, their parents and grandparents—squeezed into a three-bedroom apartment in the South Bronx. His father worked as a janitor and elevator operator by day; his mother cleaned offices at night. Zherka remembers feeling humiliated when his mother paid for groceries with food stamps.

When Marshal Tito or some other Yugoslav official visited the United Nations, Ahmet hauled his children there in his Pinto station wagon and helped lead hundreds of fellow Albanian-Americans in protest. "We, the kids, would march in circles and would be holding signs and shouting out chants," Zherka says.

By the time Zherka was a teenager, in the late 1970s, the South Bronx was a wasteland of poverty, racial tension, and violence. His older brothers ran in a tough circle, and several dropped out of high school.

For awhile, Zherka stayed out of trouble. He got a black belt in karate by sixth grade and started rap and breakdancing groups. In the schoolyards on Friday and Saturday nights, Zherka—as MC Rockwell or *Il Rock*—would join the crews who set up turntables and performed for the neighborhood.

When the family moved to a slightly better-off neighborhood in the North Bronx, Zherka fell in with a gang of Albanian teenagers who robbed houses, sold drugs, and rumbled. Zherka had to repeat ninth grade. When he transferred to Christopher Columbus High School, the principal noticed the disparity between his high test scores and his low grades and warned him to get his act together. The message struck at the right time. One of Zherka's friends was imprisoned for burglary; another was found dead in a river, in what neighbors suspected was a homicide.

It was during an 11th-grade government class that he felt a calling for public service. By his senior year, he was a good enough public speaker that teachers picked him to give "scared straight" talks to freshmen and to testify against budget cuts before the board of education.

With the help of a state program for underprivileged students, Zherka won a full scholarship to Fordham University. He drew straight A's his freshman year and transferred to Cornell.

The leap from the Bronx's mean streets to the Ivy league necessitated a costume change: "I went out and bought three sweaters and a bunch of button-down shirts." He joined the debate team and was elected president of the Cornell Democrats. He interned in the office of New York senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan and graduated from Cornell with distinction and the school's John F. Kennedy Memorial Award for public service.

Back in the Bronx, Zherka's success became a source of pride. Among former classmates, *Il Rock* had become Political II.

During his second year at the University of Virginia School of Law, he met Linda Kinney, a third-year student from Southern California, who would become his wife. They bought a condo in DC's Cleveland Park in 1994, and Zherka landed a job as a legislative aide to longtime California congressman George Miller, a liberal from San Francisco.

The night before a major hearing, Zherka helped labor activist Charles Kernaghan prepare testimony accusing the manufacturer of a Kathie Lee Gifford clothing line sold at Walmart of forcing underage workers into long shifts at Honduran sweatshops. "I had no idea it would be one of the sparks that would set off dramatic changes within the garment industry worldwide," Zherka says.

Despite a precocious start on the Hill, Zherka's past tugged at him. The 1995 Dayton Accords settling the conflicts between former Yugoslav Republics left unresolved the status of Kosovo, a predominantly Albanian province of Serbia chafing under the brutal rule of Slobodan Milosevic.

Albanians in the United States turned to Washington for help. Joe DioGuardi, a Bronx-born Republican former congressman from New York with a big personality, had founded the Albanian American Civic League in 1989. But DioGuardi was seen as part of the old guard. Zherka felt he could do better. In 1996, while still working for Miller, he raised money from Albanian-American business owners to form a rival organization, the National Albanian American Council.

"It was a huge rift," says Avni Mustafaj, who grew up with Zherka in the Bronx and became NAAC's executive director. "They're looking at Ilir Zherka and me and saying, 'We know your grandfather and father—what are you doing?'"

For a few years, Zherka tried to keep an oar in establishment Washington. He was tapped as national director of ethnic outreach for President Clinton's 1996 reelection campaign and left Miller's office for a job as a senior legislative aide to Labor Secretary Alexis Herman.

But by 1998, Zherka's thoughts had again turned homeward. Milosevic had launched a violent campaign that forced hundreds of thousands of Kosovar Albanians from their homes. "I picked up the Washington Post and read a story about an entire family that had been wiped out, including a toddler whose throat had been slit," Zherka says. "I remember thinking to myself, 'The person who killed this girl had to be holding her.' I remember going home to my wife and saying, 'I can't work, I can't do my job.' So she said, 'You have to go to NAAC.'"

As the Kosovo crisis deepened, Zherka became the go-to American spokesman not just for Albanian-Americans but also, it seemed, for Albanians in Kosovo. In 1999 and 2000, he testified before the House International Relations Committee, was quoted in the New York Times, and wrote op-eds in the Washington Post, pressing for Western military intervention. As a NATO bombing campaign got under way that March, Zherka sparred with Oliver North and Sean Hannity on TV and warned, on CNN, that "acts of genocide are being committed in the heart of Europe."

Zherka led an NAAC delegation to a White House meeting with President Clinton to press, unsuccessfully, for a ground invasion. NATO's bombing campaign ended in June 1999 with Milosevic's capitulation. When Zherka visited the Albanian capital of Tirana, people stopped him in the streets for photos and autographs.

But the long hours and days on the road were taking toll. His son, Alek, had been born in 1997 and a daughter, Hana, three years later. By 2002, the wars were over and NAAC was shifting into a new phase. Zherka was ready for a job closer to home.

As DC Vote's board sifted through résumés in 2002, it came up with only one strike against Zherka: He lived in Bethesda. (He and Linda had left their Cleveland Park condo for a larger home just over the Maryland line in 1999.) In the end, qualifications trumped residence.

Zherka turned down an offer from a law firm for what he suspected would be a grueling fight. A member of Congress he knew

from his work on Kosovo questioned his sanity “Man, Ilir, DC Vote?” Zherka recalls the congressman saying, “Either you’re really smart because you’ll have this job for life or you’re really stupid because you actually think you can win this.”

I asked Zherka how he responded.

“I said, ‘I’m stupid enough to think I can win.’”

A few months into the job, Zherka went to see Congressman David Bonior, a Democrat from Michigan, which has a large Albanian population. “Ilir, you’ve got to give your opponents something they want,” Bonior said, according to Zherka. “Your argument can’t be ‘Do this because it’s the right thing.’ You actually need to give them something that they want.”

But what, Zherka wondered, did backers of DC voting rights have to trade?

In 2003, Congressman Tom Davis, a Virginia Republican, offered an answer: a GOP seat for Utah. Davis chaired the House committee with District oversight and was popular in his party. In making his case in an interview with radio host Kojo Nnamdi, Davis had used all the right words: “It’s hard to make a straight-faced argument that the capital of the free world shouldn’t have a vote in Congress.”

But DC’s Eleanor Holmes Norton and other Democrats in Congress were skeptical. Davis had just finished a four-year stint as chair of the National Republican Congressional Committee, charged with electing GOP candidates to Congress. What good-faith reason could he have for offering a heavily Democratic enclave a voting seat in the House? Statehood advocates also lined up in opposition, because the proposal did nothing about DC’s lack of representation in the Senate.

Zherka, however, saw in Davis the sort of champion who could rewire the GOP’s opposition to DC voting rights. In 2004, Zherka and a group of leaders from DC Vote’s coalition told Davis that if he put in actual legislation, they would back him.

I asked Zherka if it was awkward to get behind a proposal then opposed by Norton.

“Absolutely, it was a little awkward,” Zherka said. “All of us recognized that Congresswoman Norton’s leadership on the issue was significant and it would be hard for us to move too far forward without her support. At the same time, we all concluded within our organization that this compromise was the best opportunity to actually achieve representation.”

A few minutes later, Zherka added, “I’ve always been a big fan of the adage that you can’t just keep doing the same thing over and over again.”

After arriving at DC Vote, Zherka pleaded the organization’s case to Washington foundations and soon quadrupled DC Vote’s budget, to \$1.7 million. Republicans in Congress had barred the District from using public money to lobby for voting rights. Zherka obtained a pro bono legal opinion arguing that the ban placed no such restrictions on funding for voting-rights education. He gave the opinion to Mayor Anthony Williams, who in 2006 authorized the first of several half-million-dollar grants to DC Vote.

For DC Vote to be effective, Zherka felt, Americans outside DC—Americans who had a vote in Congress—needed to get involved. He and his staff visited national organizations to argue that they, too, had a stake in DC’s plight. Common Cause, the National Bar Association, and the United Auto Workers, among a diverse group of others, joined its coalition, lending their moral weight, lobbying muscle, and hundreds of thousands of grassroots members who could be called on to write or phone their representatives on Capitol Hill.

Zherka went after hostile or wavering Congress members in their own districts. When

GOP senator John Ensign of Nevada sought to undermine the DC voting-rights act in 2009, DC Vote launched Internet ads on websites in his home state. “Senator Ensign is focused on DC’s affairs . . . and his own—where does Nevada fit in?” one read, alluding to Ensign’s admission of an extramarital liaison with a former staffer.

The group got hundreds of residents to burn copies of their federal income-tax returns in Farragut Square in a “Bonfire of the 1040s.” It handed out tea bags labeled End Taxation Without Representation at Glenn Beck’s 2010 rally on the Mall and festooned lawns across Capitol Hill with signs reading Congress: Don’t Tread on DC! One of its most eye-catching ads depicted two firemen, one in Maryland and one in DC. “Both will save your life,” it said. “Only ONE has a vote in Congress.”

Davis remembers Zherka during negotiations as an understated pragmatist. With DC Vote, he says, “we finally had a group that wasn’t going to be partisan about it. They just wanted to get the job done.”

Davis introduced the DC Fairness in Representation Act in 2004, and DC Vote went to work, writing editorials and mounting public spectacles. As the bill gained traction, Norton and leading Democrats expressed more support.

In April 2007, DC Vote organized the biggest voting-rights demonstrations in a generation. Mayor Adrian Fenty and thousands of residents marched from the Wilson Building to the Capitol. Less than a week later, the bill cleared the House 241 to 177, with 22 Republicans in favor. But in the Senate it came up three votes short.

Heartbroken supporters turned to the 2008 elections. Obama’s ascension to the White House and the Democratic takeover of Congress infused the movement with a new optimism. “I really can’t think of a scenario by which we could fail,” Norton told the Washington Post just after the election.

Privately, though, Zherka warned advocates to take nothing for granted. Davis had retired from the House, which would make it harder to recruit Republicans. And Utah was just a few years from winning a new seat anyway through the 2010 census.

Very early on, Obama’s willingness to expend political capital on the issue appeared brittle. A few days before his inauguration, Obama told the Post’s editorial board that he backed a House seat for the District. “But this takes on a partisan flavor,” he said, “and, you know, right now I think our legislative agenda’s chock-full.” Unlike President Clinton—and like George W. Bush—Obama declined to adorn the presidential limousine with Taxation Without Representation license plates.

In February 2009, the former Davis bill—now called the DC House Voting Rights Act—made it to the Senate floor, a first for DC voting rights in more than three decades, and passed on a largely party-line vote of 61 to 37.

The euphoria was again short-lived. Senator Ensign had slipped in an amendment eviscerating the city’s gun-control laws. Zherka says that in the run-up to the Senate vote, advocates had mistakenly assumed that Majority Leader Harry Reid, a Nevada Democrat, would oppose the gun amendment. But Reid was facing his toughest reelection fight ever. As a centrist from a gun-friendly state, he couldn’t afford an unfavorable rating from the National Rifle Association. “Not only did he vote for it,” Zherka says, “but he gave Democrats”—particularly moderates from conservative Midwestern states—“a green light to vote for it, so everyone piled on.”

As the bill moved to the House, the NRA made clear that it was putting everything on

the line. To fend off a parliamentary move to bar all amendments to the House bill, the pro-gun lobby took the unusual step of threatening to “score” the vote on any such tactic; avote to disallow amendments would count as anti-gun on lawmakers’ political scorecards.

Despite months of lobbying, Zherka and Norton couldn’t come up with enough votes from conservative Democrats, many facing reelection battles, to tilt the scales.

Congress effectively gave Washingtonians an ultimatum: You can have your vote, but only if you give up your gun laws.

Among voting-rights advocates, the choice touched off a bruising debate. In one camp were purists outraged at the hypocrisy of having to surrender power in order to get it. In the other camp were pragmatists who glimpsed a now-or-never chance. Everyone knew the clock was ticking toward the midterm congressional elections, which were likely to cost Democrats a crippling number of seats.

A gloom fell over the offices of DC Vote. “Morale was very, very low,” Zherka says. “The economy was tanking. A number of our big donors either walked away or reduced their donations. We had to let people go.” Zherka was also grappling with a string of personal losses. From 2002 to 2009, three of his siblings—all in their forties—died in a cruel streak of sudden illnesses.

For a short while, it looked as if the bill giving DC and Utah House seats might pass. In April 2010, Norton, who had assailed the gun amendment the previous year, said she would grudgingly accept it. House majority leader Steny Hoyer, a Maryland Democrat, vowed to move the measure to the House floor. Zherka threw his organization’s weight behind Norton.

But on April 16, the New York Times editorialized against any deal that scuttled the District’s gun laws, calling it “extortion.” The Washington Post’s editorial page followed suit two days later. Support on the DC Council was cratering. Mayor Fenty had backed Norton’s change of heart, saying the city could undo the gun measure later. But it was an election year, and his chief rival, then-council chairman Vincent Gray, tacked in the other direction; Gray said he wouldn’t sacrifice public safety, and the council lined up behind him.

Meanwhile, liberal Democrats in the Senate were threatening a filibuster of any bill with the gun amendment. DC Vote couldn’t hold its own coalition together. Two of its partners—the Coalition to Stop Gun Violence and the League of Women Voters—broke with the group over its support for the Norton strategy.

Then Norton reversed herself again. In a press release, she said that after seeing “egregious changes” in the House gun language—allowing the open carrying of firearms—she could no longer go forward.

The 180s left DC Vote battered. And yet when the legislation finally died, it was less disappointment than relief that Zherka says washed over him. Whether or not the bill with the gun amendment had passed—which was far from certain—it risked so dividing city officials, advocates, and lawmakers that further progress on voting rights and home rule might well have stalled for years.

In a series of sometimes emotional meetings in the summer and fall of 2010, DC Vote’s staff, board, and coalition members sifted through the rubble. Out of that soul-searching came the shift from an “inside game” to an “outside game”: civil disobedience aimed at embarrassing congressional leaders and the President and winning national sympathy.

“One of the lessons we learned from the fight was that we need to increase the intensity of support from our allies,” Zherka says.

“Whether it’s Reid or Obama, when given a choice between the District and their own political fortunes, they’ll choose their own political fortunes.”

In February 2011, Zherka and a group of activists stood up at a House subcommittee hearing in protest with red gags in their mouths. A week later, Zherka led a few dozen protesters in a demonstration outside House speaker John Boehner’s Capitol Hill apartment. Zherka accused Boehner of hypocrisy for intruding in DC’s affairs while simultaneously backing Tea Party calls for small government.

Since the start of DC Vote’s Demand Democracy campaign, some 76 people have been arrested—two of them twice.

Zherka believes that for the campaign to succeed, Mayor Gray and other local officials need to take more of a lead. But Gray, council chairman Kwame Brown, and other District officials have been embroiled in scandals that could complicate their case for greater independence.

On The Kojo Nnamdi Show last May, Gray said he saw his arrest as “reigniting” the movement but downplayed the likelihood of a reprise. “What we’ve got to see,” Gray said, “is really a much broader commitment on the part of the 600,000 people who live in this city.”

Critics say Zherka has pursued too narrow a strategy and that his success has sidelined other voting-rights groups. Stand Up! for Democracy in DC, a volunteer group pressing for full statehood, was founded in 1997, a year before DC Vote. Anise Jenkins, its president and cofounder, labeled the Utah compromise a “single vote” strategy because it did nothing about Senate representation or statehood.

Mark Plotkin, the Fox 5 political analyst and former WTOOP commentator, is a fan of neither Zherka nor Norton. “Cairo, Syria—people are willing to lay down lives,” he says. “And here our response is DC Vote? A tepid, timid, timorous, establishment organization that doesn’t want to offend anybody and, worse, is an appendage to Eleanor Holmes Norton.”

When four Occupy DC protesters went on a hunger strike for District voting rights in December, Zherka issued a statement praising their “courage and conviction” but didn’t explicitly endorse the action.

At recent rallies, I heard young Washingtonians express a willingness to “shut the city down,” perhaps by blocking major roadways from Maryland and Virginia.

I asked Zherka whether DC Vote would endorse such tactics. “Virginia and Maryland people are family, friends, neighbors,” he told me. “There’s no reason to inconvenience and punish them.”

Protests, Zherka said, “have to be tightly tied to injustice and the people perpetuating it.” Hence the demonstrations outside the Capitol and White House, which offer not just the iconography of those buildings but the sight of federal police—not city ones—carting away District residents.

The street protests seem to have chastened some in Congress. GOP threats last year to ban the District’s needle-exchange program, undo its gay-marriage law, and permit concealed firearms were all thwarted, sometimes by other Republicans.

In November, Congressman Darrell Issa, the powerful GOP chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, drafted a bill to let the District spend its money without congressional approval, a right local officials have long sought. (DC Vote is opposing the Issa measure for now because a provision would bar locally funded abortions. But Issa has signaled he is open to finding a resolution.)

In February, Obama released a 2013 budget request that promised to “work with Con-

gress and the Mayor to pass legislation to amend the D.C. Home Rule Act to provide the District with local budget autonomy.”

But first he has to be reelected. “Right now we have a President who isn’t willing to expend a lot of political capital but will sign anything that we get to him,” Zherka says. If a Republican wins in November, “all of our calculus will change,” with public protests playing an even greater role than they do now.

DC has grown whiter in recent years, with census figures last year showing blacks losing their historic majority. If race had been a subtext of congressional opposition to voting rights, I asked Zherka, shouldn’t those demographic shifts, however cynically, alter the political math?

Zherka told me that they had not. The District remains a place that lets gay people marry, permits medical marijuana, and funds abortion for poor women. The city’s liberal politics is in some ways the movement’s most intractable handicap.

“If DC for some reason became more Republican,” Zherka says, “absolutely there would be a different perspective” in Congress.

Last May 11, a month after Mayor Gray was arrested, DC Vote hosted another rally. It was at Upper Senate Park, a leafy trapezoid across from the Capitol.

As supporters gathered by a table piled with T-shirts and bumper stickers, Zherka, in a gray suit and yellow tie, shook hands with the assurance of a seasoned politician. A woman had brought two young boys, and Zherka patted them on the head. “Ah, look at these protesters,” he said approvingly. When an aide identified an older man in a blazer and penny loafers as “our most loyal online donor,” Zherka unfastened a DC Vote pin from his lapel and pinned it on the donor’s.

After the speeches, the Capitol Police arrested eight activists who had blocked a few lanes of traffic and refused to move.

But soon the crowds and police vans were gone. Zherka was eager to get home to Bethesda. His son had a series of exit interviews at Westland Middle School, from which he was graduating. His daughter, a fifth-grader at Westbrook Elementary, was recovering from a stomach bug. He also wanted to catch up with his wife—a lawyer with the Motion Picture Association of America—about a house they were remodeling in Chevy Chase. (They moved in November.)

Just when it seemed everyone had left, a young man in shorts and a soccer shirt pulled up on a ten-speed. “Are you with this group?” he asked.

“I’m the director,” Zherka said.

The man told him he wanted to get involved but had questions: Why did the city’s website give the impression that the movement was divided, listing not just DC Vote but two other organizations? If the District’s population was half black, why were protesters today mostly white?

After Zherka’s long day, I wasn’t sure how much patience he’d have with a halfhearted supporter who had missed much of the rally for a soccer game on the Mall. But Zherka gave no air of hurry. The movement was less divided than the website suggested, he said, and many African-Americans have turned out at other rallies.

“Come help us organize and help us get out the word—do we have your info?” Zherka said, handing him a card as the sun set behind them. “Shoot me an e-mail. We need a lot of foot soldiers out here.”

MEG VAN NESS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and applaud Meg Van Ness for receiving the Living Landmarks Award.

The Living Landmark Award is presented by the Golden Landmarks Association, a non-profit organization which works to preserve historic places and educated people about the wonderful history the Golden area has to offer. Meg has been a champion in preserving and promoting the historical integrity of Golden.

Meg Van Ness has had a passion for archaeology since high school. She attended the University of Missouri and later the University of Northern Arizona where she received her Master’s in Archaeology. In 1990, six years after she moved to Golden, Meg was appointed to the Golden Historic Preservation Board and remained on the board for ten years.

In 2000, Meg joined the Golden Planning Commission and worked with the community to keep Golden special. Meg worked for 16 years as an archaeological consultant, another 16 years with the Colorado Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, and is currently the Regional Historic Preservation Officer for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. She continues to serve on various outreach programs and committees in Golden.

I am honored to congratulate Meg Van Ness on this well deserved recognition by the Golden Landmarks Association. We all thank her for her advocacy for the Golden community.

HONORING JESSICA THOMPSON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a very astute young woman from the Second Congressional District, Ms. Jessica Thompson. She has been bestowed the distinction of Salutatorian for the Class of 2012 of Charleston High School in Charleston, Mississippi.

Jessica is an extremely hard worker, and is devoted to academics. She has maintained a position on the Superintendent and Principal Lists throughout high school. In addition to honoring her academic responsibilities, Jessica has also remained dedicated to her extracurricular activities. She has served as the captain of the cheerleading squad, a member of the science club, the Student Council Treasurer, a member of the Future Christian Athletes organization, a National Honor Society member, and as an usher at St. Paul C.M.E. Church.

Jessica will be attending the University of Southern Mississippi as a Lucky-Day Scholar this fall, and plans to major in Kinesiotherapy. After obtaining a bachelor degree in Kinesiotherapy, she plans to become a physical therapist. Jessica does not take her education for granted, because she knows that an education is essential to her hopes of fulfilling

her dreams. Jessica gives the credit of her achievements to her parents, Ms. Lisa Thompson and the late Thomas Thompson, and her twin sister, Eboni, because their support has shaped her into the young woman that she is today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Jessica Thompson for her unwavering dedication to education, and striving to improve not only her life but the lives of others.

TRINITY EPISCOPAL CHURCH 250TH
ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION
AND WAR OF 1812 COMMEMORATION

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a storied institution of faith in Virginia's Third Congressional District. This year, Trinity Episcopal Church in Portsmouth, Virginia is celebrating its 250th anniversary, and I would like to take a moment to reflect on the history of this esteemed church and its contributions to the greater Hampton Roads community.

The story of Trinity Episcopal Church begins in 1752 with William Crawford, the founder of Portsmouth, when he designated space at the intersection of High and Court Streets for a parish church. Between 1761 and 1762, the Vestry of Trinity Church was formed. Reverend Charles Smith served as the first parish priest.

During the American Revolution, the church was used by the British garrison, and Trinity's old church bell was cracked celebrating General Cornwallis' surrender. During the War of 1812, Captain Arthur Emmerson III, a lay leader in the congregation, was instrumental in the American victory at the Battle of Craney Island. During the Civil War, the crew of the ironclad C.S.S. Virginia—commonly called the Merrimac—worshipped at Trinity before boarding the ship to fight in the first battle of the ironclads against the Union ship, U.S.S. Monitor.

Over the years, Trinity continued to grow and expand, and its congregation felt a great sense of community responsibility, contributing to the well-being of the City of Portsmouth, surrounding neighborhoods and area churches. In the 1890s, Trinity founded the King's Daughters Hospital, which later became Portsmouth General Hospital. In the 1960s, under its noted Rector, the Rev. C. Charles Vaché, the congregation was active in the civil rights movement and endorsed the equality of all persons. Its members support organizations such as Portsmouth Volunteers for the Homeless, Oasis Social Ministry Center, and other social agencies, providing breakfasts, dinners, overnight accommodations, and financial support to those in need. Trinity is best known for its Annual Children's Christmas Shoppe, where hundreds of children, guided by members of the parish and community disguised as "elves," can do their own shopping for loved ones. The Episcopal Church Women and the Brotherhood of Trinity take on additional local, national and even international community service projects of their own.

Yet another longstanding Trinity tradition worthy of note is its music. Mentions of organists and accompanying choirs date back to 1823. Instruments housed at Trinity are revered as representative early-American works by their crafters. The choir has received acclaim dating back to the 1860s, when the Rt. Rev. John Johns, Bishop of Virginia, called the Trinity Choir "the best in the diocese." Today, the Trinity Music Series features local musical ensembles and world-renowned artists, working with the Virginia Arts Festival and other community organizations to provide quality music services, recitals and concerts to the public free of charge.

As Trinity Episcopal Church gathers to celebrate this historic milestone, the church can truly remember its past, celebrate its present, and focus on its future. I would like to congratulate Rev. John R. Throop, D. Min., and all of the members of the Trinity Episcopal Church on the occasion of their 250th Anniversary. I wish them many more years of dedicated service to the community.

IN TRIBUTE TO RON PLOTKIN

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to a constituent and friend, Ron Plotkin, who will be rightfully honored this weekend by the Republican Jewish Coalition at its 2012 RJC Summer Bash.

An ardent Zionist and member of the Republican Jewish Coalition's Board of Directors, Ron has committed himself to educating the voting public and supporting Republican candidates who understand the unique relationship between Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East, and the United States.

In addition, Ron is a highly successful Los Angeles-based international business executive and philanthropist who has made his mark in corporate marketing and advertising. As a partner and Chief Operating Officer of TMP Worldwide, he was instrumental in building the company into the world's largest "yellow pages" advertising agency.

The next global move was to cofound and develop the largest jobs website on the Internet, Monster.com. He is now Chief Executive Officer of Directional Marketing at Monster Worldwide.

Ron is an active investor in small technology start-up companies based on unique concepts that have the potential to be cutting-edge ground-breakers in very competitive fields.

His career in Yellow Pages began in 1975 with the L.M. Berry Co. where he held a number of positions that progressed to sales management at its headquarters in Dayton, Ohio. In 1986, he became an equity partner in CPC (Communications Planning Corporation) and shortly afterward, he entered into a partnership arrangement with TMP Worldwide, and officially joined the company on July 1, 1988.

He is also an Executive Advisory Board Member of the Cabrillo Music Theatre, Inc. and a Board Member of the Association of Directory Marketing, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure my colleagues join the Republican Jewish Coalition and me in

honoring Ron for his tireless efforts on behalf of democracy both here at home and with our strong ally Israel.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CITY OF
HILLSBOROUGH'S ADOPTION OF
H&H COMPANY, 1ST BATTALION,
327TH INFANTRY REGIMENT, 1ST
BRIGADE, 101ST AIRBORNE DIVISION

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the City of Hillsborough for its adoption in 2007 of H&H Company, 1st Battalion, 327th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade, 101st Airborne Division.

In 1967 a soldier in Vietnam named Sgt. Joe Artavia wrote a letter to his sister, Linda Patterson, asking her to convince the City of San Mateo to adopt his company. He thought an adoption would lift troop morale "as high as the sky." Patterson rallied the community to support her brother and his comrades. Within three months the San Mateo City Council passed a resolution to adopt the company.

Tragically, Artavia was killed three weeks later rescuing a fellow soldier, and the people of San Mateo joined together in mourning. Artavia's death solidified San Mateo's commitment to its adopted company and, in fact, in 1972 San Mateo was the only city in the United States to hold an official homecoming parade honoring Vietnam veterans.

Working with Patterson and the city of Burlingame, Hillsborough adopted its own company of the 101st Airborne Division in 2007. Since that time the city has continuously supported the H&H Company, 1st Battalion, 327th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade, 101st Airborne Division, sending care packages, writing letters and supporting the families of soldiers who are deployed.

In a few months Hillsborough's adopted company will be re-deployed for another tour in Afghanistan. In commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the original welcoming-home parade, a new parade and festival are being held to honor past and present soldiers of the 1st Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault).

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House of Representatives join me in honoring the city of Hillsborough for supporting HHC 1st Brigade Combat Team 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) and its brave men and women who fill its ranks, especially those who gave their lives for our freedom.

YIMI SERRANO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Yimi Serrano for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Yimi Serrano is an 11th grader at Jefferson Senior High and received this award because his determination

and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Yimi Serrano is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Yimi Serrano for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all his future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK HALL

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to a good friend of mine, Frank Hall. Frank passed away June 15, 2012 in Norco, CA. A resident of Norco, CA, for 35 years, he was a pillar of the community and he will be deeply missed.

Frank was born March 2, 1938 in Los Angeles. He grew up in Newport Beach, graduating from Newport Harbor High School and Orange Coast College, with additional studies at Pacific State University and Riverside Community College. As a youth, he worked for his uncle renting boats. Frank served the County of Orange from 1959 to 1995 in the General Services and Environmental Management agencies in the field of Right-of-Way Engineering, Property Management and Facilities Planning, and served honorably in the United States Naval Air Reserve as flight crew on anti-submarine aircraft from 1961 to 1969.

After retiring from the County of Orange, he became involved with Norco city government, serving as a City Councilman for 12 years and Mayor for 8 years. Frank was a visionary in Norco; he maintained the community's rural spirit while encouraging commercial and business development in the Inland region. As a Councilman, he held several appointed positions, including Riverside Transit Agency, RTA, where he was Chairman in 2007; Riverside County Transportation Commission, RCTC, Commissioner; Western Riverside Council of Governments where he was Chairman in 2001–2; Member of the Military Affairs Committee for the Norco-Corona Area, which was successful in retaining the Naval Surface Warfare Center in Norco; and Member of the City of Norco Economic Development Advisory Council, among many others. At the time of his death, he had been appointed by Supervisor John Tavaglione as an additional alternate to Riverside Transit Agency and the RTA Transportation-NOW coalition.

It is hard to imagine that Frank would have any free time on his hands yet he always found time for his community. He was a member of many local and regional organizations, including the Citizens Advisory Group at the Norco College, the Death Valley 49er's Association, the Pacific Crest Trail Association, the Norco High School Agricultural Advisory Committee, and the California State Parks Foundation. He was active in the Corona-Norco YMCA and was President at the time of his

death. Local clubs he belonged to were Norco Lions Club, Residents of Norco Urging Protection of Rural and Animal Keeping Lifestyle, RURAL, American Legion Post 328, Norco Historical Society, Norco Regional Conservancy, Saddle Sore Riders, Riverside Recreational Trails, and Norco Senior Citizens and Pet Relief Fund. A longtime horse lover, Frank belonged to a number of equestrian sports organizations. He was a life member of Equestrian Trails, Inc., the California Horseman's Association, and the Norco Horseman's Association, which he founded and served in for 18 years as President in 1991 and Treasurer from 1992 to 2012.

Frank is survived by his wife of 37 years Sharon; son Steve (Brenda) Hall, son William (Kate) Hall, and son Robert (Robin) Hall; six granddaughters, Kristin Hicks, Ashley Hall, Heather Hall, Holly Hall, Vanessa Hall and Lauren Hall, as well as two great-granddaughters Joie Lynn and Abbylynn. Frank is also survived by brother Howard (Kathleen) Hall.

On Friday, June 22, 2012, a memorial service celebrating Frank's extraordinary life will be held. Frank will always be remembered for his incredible work ethic, generosity, contributions to the community and love of family. His dedication to his family, work, and community are a testament to a life lived well and a legacy that will continue. I extend my condolences to Frank's family and friends; although Frank may be gone, the light and goodness he brought to the world remain and will never be forgotten.

IN MEMORIAM AND REMEMBRANCE OF FIRST SERGEANT
ACKEEM PAUL GREEN 369TH
HARLEM HELLFIGHTERS—HARLEM
YOUTH MARINES, INC.

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to share the news of a devastating loss to Harlem and the greater New York City community. We joined with many family members and friends at Memorial Baptist Church to celebrate the life of Harlem Youth Marine Cadet First Sergeant, Aceem Paul Green, who passed away Sunday, June 3, 2012, from a fatal gunshot wound.

On behalf of our beloved Village of Harlem, my wife Alma and I want to extend our most sincere and heartfelt sympathy, support, and love to my beloved friend, Col. Gregory E. Collins, and the entire family of the First Sergeant Aceem Paul Green. At the age of 25 he was indeed a promising young man continuing the honorable legacy of his father to better not only himself, but his fellow peers as well.

Extraordinary young men like Aceem are a rare commodity in this world and serve a higher purpose in making it a better place. First Sergeant Aceem Paul Green lost his life on the urban battlefield, from gun violence right here at home, while enjoying a game of basketball with friends on a Sunday afternoon. First Sergeant Green was shot in the back by an illegal gun in the hands of a misguided youth. Gun violence has taken the lives of so

many of our promising youth and it has taken over every urban neighborhood in the United States of America.

Every time I hear the news that one of our young sons, daughters, fathers, mothers, husbands and wives are struck down by illegal guns in the wrong hands of our misguided people—it pains my heart with anger. What makes this very difficult for me is that it has taken the life of a young man whose very focus in life was to mentor his peers and others to provide them with a positive direction through the principles and leadership of the Harlem Youth Marines and with the values and courage of the United States Marine Corp.

Since the age of 15 Aceem has committed a tremendous amount of time and effort to the Harlem Youth Marine Cadets (HYMC). Once Aceem reached the age limit to serve as a cadet, he remained dedicated and continued to serve the organization through volunteer work. He took mentored young cadets, served as a positive influence in the community, and was a much needed role model to many of our youth both in and outside of HYCM.

The Harlem Youth Marines, Inc. (HYCM) provides instruction in military grooming and development to students willing and eager to learn. This program has supported the youth in my district for over 30 years with an emphasis on youth development through education and discipline. They also provide cadets with the opportunity to engage in basic military skill training activities such as rappelling, marksmanship, and weapons safety. The children of Harlem have thoroughly benefited from this program through the development of body, mind, and spirit. Aceem was a remarkable testament of their success.

Mr. Speaker, I know that we, the Village of Harlem, will honor Aceem's life by ensuring that its young infant son, Aceem Paul Green, Jr., honorable legacy remains alive. We must bring a realistic end to gun violence because it is destroying the lives of our children, families and communities. I ask that you and my colleagues join me in honoring this ambitious young man and an impassioned mentor whose legacy shall be far remembered and everlasting.

HONORING PRESIDENT TED
MARTINEZ

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Ted Martinez, Jr. as the eighth Superintendent/President of Rio Hondo College. A Texas native, Dr. Martinez has dedicated himself to education and been a strong role model for Latinos in academia.

Dr. Martinez has worked throughout his career to insure that all students have access to quality higher education. In his capacity as Superintendent/President of Rio Hondo College he has been committed to maintaining fiscal stability while enabling student success, high-level learning outcomes, and the completion of the \$245 million building program. His leadership provided a new platform for Rio Hondo College to utilize its resources in partnering with community and business leaders.

While at Rio Hondo College, he established a community advisory committee that includes local school and government officials, service agencies, religious groups, small businesses and veteran's groups. Our community is especially grateful for the strong and vibrant Mathematics, Engineering, Science, Achievement (MESA) program and outstanding Veterans Service Center that were established under his watch at Rio Hondo College. In 2010, Under Dr. Martinez' leadership, in 2010 Rio Hondo College launched the award-winning South Whittier Educational Center (SWEC) partnership that provides students from underserved areas with a historically low college attendance a real pipeline to college.

Dr. Martinez's commitment to education has not gone unnoticed. Among many other honors and awards, Ted has been distinctly honored with the Outstanding President Award from the California Community College Council for Staff Development, the District 6 Pacesetter of the Year Award from the National Council for Marketing and Public Relations, and the Phi Theta Kappa Alumni Key Award from the International Honorary Society for students in two-year colleges.

AARON TATE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Aaron Tate for receiving the 2012 Amgen Foundation's Teacher of the Year Award.

This award is designed to recognize and honor extraordinary science teachers at the K–12 level who significantly impact their students through exemplary science teaching and who achieve demonstrated results in student learning in communities where Amgen operates.

Mr. Tate has been a middle-school science educator for nearly ten years at Bromley East Charter School in Brighton, CO. His classroom experiences include developing and implementing 7th grade science and S.T.E.M. elective courses, sponsoring chess, middle school science, and LEGO clubs, and overseeing the 7th grade science fair. Aaron Tate's commitment to teaching science is commendable.

In addition to his time in the classroom, Aaron is a member of the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) and Kappa Delta Pi, the International Honor Society in Education, where he stays abreast of the newest researched-based best practices in science education.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Aaron Tate for this well deserved recognition by the Amgen Foundation. Thank you for your dedication to the future of science in our classrooms and your commitment to the community.

HONORING SABRINA SMITH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker I rise to honor a remarkable young woman,

Sabrina Smith, a recent graduate at Madison Shannon Palmer High School in Marks, Mississippi. Sabrina is the proud daughter of Sharon Smith and they reside in Lambert, Mississippi.

Her teachers consider her to be an ideal student because of her honesty, respectful behavior, and hard work. Sabrina is a recipient of numerous awards including the Honor Roll, Principal List, Superintendent List, Perfect Attendance, and special recognition from her teachers for making the highest grades in their classes. Her class work has always exhibited the highest standard of excellence. Every day she works to better herself in school, as well as in everything she undertakes because she understands a good education leads to success.

Sabrina has always been involved in extra-curricular activities. She is a former member of the Madison Shannon Palmer High School Choir, a member of the Student Council, Treasurer for the Sophomore Class of 2010, and Secretary for the Junior Class of 2011. Sabrina is also a member of the National Beta Club where she regularly participates in its book drives. She is a dedicated supporter of community service. Sabrina wanted to get an early start on her career aspirations, so she volunteered to participate in the Quitman County School District Job Shadow Program. Through this program, Sabrina learned valuable hands-on professional skills such as punctuality, the principles of business attire and good grooming, problem solving, oral communication, team spirit and compromise, and responsibility. She believes that these are some of the skills that are necessary for her to be successful in both her career and her life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Sabrina Smith as Valedictorian of Madison Shannon Palmer High School's Class of 2012.

DOMESTIC ENERGY AND JOBS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 2012

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4480) to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas exploration, development, and production under oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in response to a drawdown of petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, there are now 34 days left in this legislative session. We could—and should—be focusing our attention on serious legislation that will create jobs and make a real difference in the lives of our constituents. Like a long term transportation bill. Or preventing a doubling of student loan interest rates. Or the President's American Jobs Act.

Instead, under the pretense of lowering gas prices, we are dealing with this ill-considered collection of seven proposals that together would gut the Clean Air Act, trump responsible

public lands management, and needlessly encumber the President's ability to safeguard our energy security.

In a radical departure from over forty years of successful, science-based clean air regulation, this legislation would for the first time require the EPA to consider industry costs when determining what level of ozone is "safe" for Americans to breathe—which is like a doctor changing a patient's diagnosis based on the cost of the treatment. Costs clearly matter, and they are routinely incorporated into the scoping of compliance plans. But they should never be allowed to interfere with the initial, scientific determination as to what is safe for Americans and what is not. This kind of error is further extended to the public lands provisions of this bill, which elevate energy production over hunting, fishing, recreation, conservation and other management uses while imposing arbitrary deadlines for the approval of onshore drilling applications regardless of safety concerns. Finally, the President's ability to tap the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to respond to disruptions in our Nation's energy supply would for the first time be conditioned on a poorly defined new drilling plan that is completely unrelated to the purpose of the SPR.

Mr. Chair, this is not serious legislation. It is hastily thrown together legislative filler which everyone in this chamber understands is dead on arrival in the Senate. Given the magnitude of the challenges we face, we simply do not have this kind of time to waste.

WILFREDO HUERTA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Wilfredo Huerta for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Wilfredo Huerta is a 12th grader at Jefferson Senior High and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Wilfredo Huerta is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Wilfredo Huerta for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all his future accomplishments.

HONORING STANLEY HOWELL HALL

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the exceptional life of Mr. Stanley Howell Hall. "Stan," as he liked to be

called, was a trailblazing public servant who had the distinction of serving as one of the first African-American City Managers in the State of California. Known as a hard-working and talented colleague, a visionary consultant and a man of great faith, Mr. Hall has left an indelible mark on Bay Area communities. With his passing on May 31, 2012, we look to Stan Hall's public legacy and the outstanding quality of his life's work.

Born on June 11, 1946 to William and Hazel Hall, Stan was the sixth child of a family of eight children. He was named Outstanding Young Man of America twice by the U.S. Jr. Chamber of Commerce and was a high school honors graduate. Earning his bachelor's in History at San Francisco State University and a master's degree in Public Administration from Golden Gate University, Mr. Hall acquired a breadth of civic knowledge that he would use throughout his career. He settled in Richmond, California, working as the Administrative Assistant to the City Manager. Eight years later, he became the first African-American City Manager in Seaside, California. He did all of this by the young age of 32.

In addition to career milestones serving as Director of Governmental Affairs for the Port of Oakland, as well as City Manager for both East Palo Alto and Hollister, California, Mr. Hall became a sought-after consultant. He founded the government advocacy and consulting business, American Service Associates, which aided local community development through expertise in transportation, parking and project management.

Mr. Hall was also keenly committed to community leadership. Among his numerous accolades and associations, he was a three-term President and CEO of the Bay Area Urban League, as well as Principal Officer of West Coast Infrastructure for Amtrak. He had the distinction of being honored by the Congressional Black Caucus in Washington, DC and received awards from the Harbon Publishing Co. and the Gillette Co. for Achievement in Business and Professional Excellence. His awards from Members of Congress, the State Assembly and the State Senate speak to the quality of his prolific career. And most recently, he was recognized by the U.S. Department of the Treasury for Patriotic Service.

Active in 100 Black Men of the Bay Area and Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Mr. Hall was also a devoted church member. He served both Mt. Carmel Missionary Baptist Church in Richmond and Allen Temple Baptist Church, where he sang in the chorus and built a strong spiritual family. From his groundbreaking work in public service to his renowned work ethic, Mr. Hall never ceased to challenge himself. He was even an accomplished pianist.

On a personal note, I will miss Stan's smiles, his words of encouragement and his support. Stan held a very successful event for me at his home recently and he was as happy as I to be with long-time friends. He proudly showed me through his cozy house and he was especially delighted to show me his backyard, with its beautiful fruit trees and grass. When I visited him in the hospital a few days before his passing, he smiled. In his own way, he communicated the depth of love for his friends and me—and I felt that he was at peace and ready to meet the Lord. I will miss him tremendously.

Today, California's 9th Congressional District salutes and honors an outstanding indi-

vidual and a stalwart community leader, Mr. Stanley Howell Hall. He was a respected colleague, a beloved brother and a dear friend who will be deeply missed by an extended group of loved ones. I offer my sincerest condolences to Stan's surviving family and to the many friends and associates whose lives he touched over the course of his incredible life. May his soul rest in peace.

LAKELAND COLLEGE CELEBRATES
ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Lakeland College for 150 years of service as an undergraduate institution of higher education. Lakeland College is a private four year liberal arts college related to the United Church of Christ located near Sheboygan, Wisconsin—which is in my congressional district.

The college was founded in 1862 by a group of German immigrants to offer a traditional seminary curriculum to the local community. Over the years, it began to host additional courses and programs of study. The college adopted the name "Lakeland" in 1956 when the seminary program moved to Minnesota. In 1991, Lakeland opened a second campus in Shinjuku, Japan, to accommodate students with international interests.

Today, Lakeland College serves nearly 4,000 students and offers an 18 to 1 student to faculty ratio. It offers more than thirty degree programs and four graduate programs including education, counseling, business administration, and theology. Lakeland hosts a multicultural student body with students from over 30 countries.

Lakeland prides itself on its ability to foster an educational, covenantal, just, and global community, not only at its main campus near Sheboygan, but also at its campuses in Chipewewa Falls, Fox Cities, Green Bay, Madison, Milwaukee, and Wisconsin Rapids.

I have had the opportunity to visit the College on numerous occasions and commend retiring president Dr. Stephen Gould for his 42 years of service to Lakeland. In 2002, I was honored to have had the opportunity to speak at Lakeland's commencement ceremony. It is evident that the College instills strong community values in its students and alumni.

Strong institutions help make strong communities, and the people of Wisconsin, especially those in the Sheboygan area, are proud of the 150 years of service that Lakeland College has provided. To recognize this accomplishment, Governor Walker has declared June 23 as Lakeland College Day, a well deserved honor. Over 1,000 alumni will return to campus to celebrate June 21–24.

I extend my congratulations to Lakeland College on its 150th Anniversary and wish all its faculty, staff, students, and alumni continued success in their endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE "BROWARD IS GREATER THAN AIDS" CAMPAIGN ON THE OCCASION OF NATIONAL HIV TESTING DAY

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the "Broward is Greater than AIDS" (Broward > AIDS) campaign, an initiative of the Broward County Health Department (BCHD) to raise public awareness of the importance of knowing your HIV status and getting tested. The launch of the Broward > AIDS campaign takes place as we observe the 18th Annual National HIV Testing Day on June 27, 2012, a joint initiative between the National Association of People With AIDS (NAPWA) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) aimed at promoting HIV testing.

While advances in antiretroviral treatment now allow people living with HIV/AIDS to have longer, more productive lives than ever before, HIV continues to spread at a staggering rate. Nationwide, 1.2 million people in the United States are living with HIV/AIDS, and 50,000 individuals become newly infected with the virus each year. Furthermore, more than one in five HIV-positive individuals are unaware that they are infected, which not only increases their risk for developing worse health outcomes but also the likelihood of transmitting the virus to others.

Although HIV/AIDS knows no borders, race, or gender, it has taken a particularly devastating toll on South Florida and certain groups. Since 2008, Broward County has had the highest rate of HIV infection per-capita in the nation. Within the past year, new HIV infections rose by 25 percent while new cases of AIDS also increased significantly. In addition, according to the BCHD, HIV/AIDS continues to have a disparate impact on men who have sex with men (MSM) and black heterosexual women.

HIV/AIDS can happen to anyone, but we have the power to stop HIV and create an AIDS-free generation. It all begins with getting tested for HIV to find out your status and using this knowledge to take better care of yourself, your loved ones, and your community. Equally important is also knowing the status of your partner. Regular HIV testing has been proven to save lives and reduce new infections. The Broward > AIDS campaign is a vital tool to educate individuals and the community about the realities of HIV/AIDS, why they should get tested, and where testing is available.

Through the Broward > AIDS campaign, the BCHD seeks to encourage and increase HIV testing to reduce the spread of the disease as well as the stigma associated with it. The unfortunate fact remains that many individuals and communities do not talk about HIV/AIDS. We cannot hope to eliminate the stigma and reduce the spread of HIV/AIDS if we do not break the silence. HIV/AIDS is not just a personal health issue, it is a community health issue and we all have a responsibility to do our part to protect our families, friends, and neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, this National HIV Testing Day, I commend the Broward County Health Department and its comprehensive HIV/AIDS

outreach campaign, Broward > AIDS, for working to increase HIV testing and end stigma. Together with effective, evidence-based policies that address barriers to HIV testing and access to treatment and care, we know that we can overcome HIV/AIDS.

COLORADO RAILROAD MUSEUM

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and applaud the Colorado Railroad Museum for receiving the Living Landmark Award.

The Living Landmark Award is presented by the Golden Landmarks Association, a non-profit organization which works to preserve historic places and educate people about the wonderful history the Golden area has to offer.

The Colorado Railroad Museum has provided an interesting and colorful history of railroading unique to the Western United States. Railroads have been instrumental in Colorado's history by encouraging the economy, migration, and culture to flourish. In 1959, Robert W. Richardson and Cornelius W. Hauck opened the Colorado Railroad Museum in Golden.

The museum houses the largest repository for Colorado's railroad history and nearly 100,000 people visit the museum every year. In the late 90's the museum added a climate-controlled library to house books, photographs, and corporate records and added an authentic roundhouse and turntable to restore and maintain the historic equipment. To instill in today's youth a love for trains and railroads, The Colorado Railroad Museum offers train rides every weekend and hosts the Thomas the Tank Engine event every year.

The Colorado Railroad Museum is ranked among the top 25 Denver area historical and cultural attractions and has been recognized by the Smithsonian Institute, American Association of State and Local History, and Colorado Historical Society for its work preserving railroad history in the Rocky Mountains.

I am honored to congratulate the Colorado Railroad Museum; I know they will work to provide an understanding and passion of railroads for future generations.

A TRIBUTE TO COLONEL MICHEL RUSSELL

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Colonel Michel Russell, on the occasion of his return home from duty in Afghanistan.

In his role as a United States Army Brigade Commander, Mr. Russell was uniquely responsible for over 50,000 United States Army Soldiers, Department of Army Civilians and contractors from private industry, a command of equivalent size to an entire Army Corps.

Colonel Russell was commander of the 401st Army Field Support Brigade (AFSB) during a unique period in time. As a result of the

Presidential directed drawdown of military forces in Afghanistan, Colonel Russell was responsible for ensuring the redeployment of equipment in addition to the 401st AFSB's traditional functions of sustaining theater forces with quality of life products such as food, warfighting equipment such as MRAPS, and developing and fielding emerging technologies to increase force protection and quality of life for soldiers.

Colonel Russell and his team of soldiers, Department of the Army Civilians and private industry contractors created from scratch the Afghanistan redeployment process. This process is responsible for maintaining, repairing, and removing thousands of pieces of equipment out of Afghanistan and back to the Continental United States or other locations where United States Forces are stationed.

Colonel Russell and his team serve as the "Face to the Field" for the United States Army Materiel Command, the United States Army Sustainment Command and the 3rd Expeditionary Sustainment Command, providing all war fighters the equipment they need in the Afghanistan Theater to fight America's enemies who harbor ill-will toward freedom.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring Colonel Michel Russell for his steadfast commitment to the U.S. Army, his fellow soldiers, and his nation. We owe our freedom to men like Colonel Russell, whose devotion to our nation will forever be remembered and appreciated.

RECOGNIZING DR. RICHARD CROWE ASTRONOMER-IN-RESIDENCE, IMILOA ASTRONOMY CENTER OF HAWAII, AND CO-FOUNDER, ASTRONOMER PROGRAM—UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT HILO

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Richard A. Crowe of Hilo, Hawaii—an extraordinary man whose loss is deeply felt. For the past few decades, Dr. Crowe's leadership in the fields of astronomy and physics and his profound love of teaching has influenced generations of islanders throughout East Hawaii and our island state.

Dr. Crowe was a vital part of the University of Hawaii at Hilo: the co-founder of the astronomy program and the Astronomer-In-Residence at the Imiloa Astronomy Center of Hawaii, which is affiliated with the university. A beloved professor, Dr. Crowe inspired many to follow in his footsteps and pursue careers in astronomy.

Dr. Crowe also shared his passion for astronomy with Hawaii Island's younger students. His portable planetarium could be found in public school classrooms throughout Hilo, helping Dr. Crowe to get students excited about astronomy.

He was committed to community and public service—participating in the Hawaii County Band, the Kanihewa Chorale, and the local rotary club.

We remember and honor Dr. Crowe, and I join with his family, friends, colleagues, and students in giving thanks for his life of service and inspiration.

His greatest legacy continues to be the many who have discovered their own love for the stars and galaxies above us through his influence. Dr. Crowe and his teachings will never be forgotten.

Mahalo nui loa (thank you very much).

HONORING THE LADYWOOD BLAZERS

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to acknowledge the Ladywood Blazers, Michigan High Athletic Association Division II Softball Champions, from my hometown of Livonia upon winning their first state title.

Led by Head Coach Scott Combs, the Blazers won the Central Division of the Catholic High School League and went on to defeat Farmington Hills Mercy to earn the CHSL A-B Division championship.

Ladywood came out swinging in their opening round of district play, overpowering Livonia Clarenceville, 17-0. The Blazers eliminated Dearborn Divine Child, 4-0, in the District 58 final and advanced to regional competition. First round opponent Detroit Kettering forfeited but the down time did not affect the Blazers as they erased Center Line, 13-0 and claimed the Region 15 title. Advancing to quarterfinal action, Ladywood defeated St. Clair, 4-2 and then tamed the Wildcats of Wayland Union by an identical 4-2 score in the semi-final round to earn a berth in the state final.

The Blazers had been in the state final in 2009, losing a heartbreaker to Niles. It was a long ride home from Battle Creek as runners-up. This time Ladywood wouldn't be denied as they shutout Saginaw Swan Valley, 4-0 and hoisted the Division II State Championship Softball trophy on June 16, 2012 to close out a stellar 39-3 season.

Mr. Speaker, the Ladywood Blazers and Head Coach Scott Combs, having compiled an impressive 170-31 record over the last 5 years, deserve to be recognized for their determination, achievement, and spirit. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Ladywood Blazers for obtaining this spectacular title and honoring their devotion to our community and country.

VIRGINIA LARSON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Virginia Larson for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Virginia Larson is an 8th grader at Moore Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Virginia Larson is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Virginia Larson for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

IN HONOR AND RECOGNITION OF
JACKIE JENKINS

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and recognize Jackie Jenkins of Westminster, California, who was recently selected as one of the California School Employees Association's (CSEA) top five Members of the Year. She will receive the award at the 86th Annual CSEA conference later this year.

Mrs. Jenkins has served the Westminster School District for over 25 years as a parent, through the PTA, in many classified positions, and currently as the School Office Manager at the largest elementary school in the district.

Throughout her career, Mrs. Jenkins has exemplified professional service to parents, students, and staff. Not only does she expertly manage the school's office, but she is a mentor to others and her high standards of service are an example for other classified employees in the school district.

Mrs. Jenkins also consistently brings out the best in each and every student. She listens to them read, encourages to them to be better classmates, and even helps students carefully place their first lost tooth in a special container. It's clear to everyone she encounters that Mrs. Jenkins is a sensitive and caring confidant to all.

In addition to being a consummate office manager, Mrs. Jenkins serves as the CSEA President. In this role, she has motivated others to serve in CSEA and built the capacity of the organization so it can continue to ensure the success of every student in the school district.

According to her school principal, Linda Reed, and her many supportive colleagues at the Westminster School District, Mrs. Jenkins is a positive person that has a great sense of humor, and always encourages everyone to be the best they can be.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will join me in congratulating Mrs. Jenkins on this award and thank her for her humble service and dedication to ensuring that our children receive a rich and rewarding education.

HONORING THE MORRIS COUNTY
LIBRARY ON THEIR 90TH ANNI-
VERSARY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Morris County Library located in the Township of Whippany, Morris County, New Jersey who are celebrating their 90th anniversary.

The staff of the Morris County Library (MCL), through their dedicated hard work, has made the library a vibrant source of pride and activity for the local community. Following the passage of a bill in 1921 by the New Jersey Legislature to establish county libraries, the Morris County Library was formed in 1921 by a public vote. With over 10,000 books catalogued and a new book car to help their books reach the public, the library opened its doors in Morristown in 1922 to serve Morris County.

The MCL continued to grow in its early years and by 1927 established a children's book section, which by the end of the year, saw every book in circulation checked out. The MCL also opened its resources to the local community with donations of books to the State Hospital at Morris Plains, Civilian Conservation Corps and the Morris County Jail. The MCL played a significant role in our nation's defense during World War II by becoming a federal depository for government publications, as well as boasting a large collection of books on U.S. defense.

The MCL grew with the times, instituting an automated book catalog and circulation system in 1970 and a completely computerized catalog in 1987. This growth meant that a new building was required to contain the resources and accommodate the future growth of this Morris County institution. An architectural plan for a new library was unveiled in 1991 and by 2001 the new Morris County Library building in Whippany was dedicated. The new library contained group study rooms and public meeting rooms which instantly received high demand from the public. Their computer rooms also were capable of hosting training courses on a wide variety of subjects.

Today, the Morris County Library serves 487,000 people with their collection of over 247,000 books and sees 521,000 borrows per year. In 2011 alone, their reference desk answered 63,815 questions, several for my office! The meeting rooms of the library have also seen significant use hosting thousands of meetings a year. The MCL continues to partner with community organizations such as the AARP, Carol G. Simon Cancer Center and the U.S. Veteran's Administration. The MCL has seen a number of awards during its history, including the NJ Library Association Swartzburg Preservation Award and Librarian of the Year from the New York Times.

The significant resources held in the library and these community partnerships would not be possible if not for the commitment shown by the staff of the Library. Their work on behalf of literacy and their community has made the Morris County Library a vital institution in Morris County and New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the staff of the Morris County Library as they celebrate their 90th anniversary.

HEALTH CARE COST REDUCTION
ACT OF 2012

HON. CHRISTOPHER S. MURPHY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the value of the med-

ical device industry in my State and our nation as a whole. This industry is working on some of the most exciting and cutting-edge technologies in the entire health care sector and has changed the lives of millions of Americans.

According to estimates, the medical device industry employs approximately 430,000 nationwide. My State is fortunate to have a vibrant medical device industry with nearly 8,000 individuals directly employed at companies, such as BD and Covidien. These companies also support approximately 12,000 more indirect jobs in my home state. Beyond providing quality, high-paying jobs, these businesses are responsible corporate citizens who are trying to enhance the communities where they are located and the people who live there. For example, employees at BD's plant in Canaan, Connecticut—which recently celebrated its 50th anniversary—have served as mentors to the Housatonic Valley Regional High School and have contributed generously to the United Way and other local charities. In line with a growing body of evidence on the positive impact bariatric surgery can have on diabetics, Covidien has worked with American Diabetes Association to fund new research on this potentially life-changing procedure.

Unfortunately, when the House recently considered the Health Care Cost Reduction Act of 2012 (H.R. 436), the majority included an offset that, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation, would result in 350,000 fewer Americans receiving health care coverage. As part of the Affordable Care Act, the Federal Government is set to provide millions of Americans with premium tax credits for the purchase of health insurance. This will not only increase rates of coverage but will also lead to lower overall health costs since more people are insured. The offset that was included in H.R. 436, known as the "true-up" provision, would have subjected these individuals to large repayment amounts if for some reason their income levels increased from the time that they were actually receiving coverage to the time they filed their taxes the following year. This could come as a result of the individual or spouse starting a new job or returning to work after school. While I could not support this legislation, I understand the need to reduce the medical device industry's burden in paying for health care reform.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we can all agree that to maintain our position as the world leader in biotechnology, the United States needs to foster innovation and growth within our health care industries. I am proud that I represent a number of those companies and hope that we will find bipartisan solutions to create an environment where they will continue to succeed and develop new breakthrough therapies.

IN TRIBUTE TO DR. DONALD
ZIMRING

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to Dr. Donald Zimring, who is retiring from the Las Virgenes Unified School District in Calabasas, California, to become head of

school for Brandeis Hillel schools in San Francisco and San Rafael.

I have known Don since I served on the Simi Valley City Council and he covered the meetings as a journalist. Fortunately, he found a more respectable line of work when he joined the Las Virgenes School District as its public information officer in 1979.

From there, Don became a middle school teacher, school principal, assistant superintendent of business services, deputy superintendent, and finally superintendent on July 2, 2007.

He is credited with bringing the first Spanish immersion program to the district, instituting a community service requirement for graduation, increasing technology in the classroom, adding high school performance arts centers, and renovating and expanding Lindero Canyon Middle School, where he began his teaching career.

Although Don left the classroom early in his career, he never left the kids. For 35 years, he has taken a group of eighth graders to Washington, D.C., over spring break. Don believes very deeply that students should know firsthand how their government works.

That belief stems from an earlier career before the call to teaching caught up with him. Don traveled the world as an administrative coordinator for the Los Angeles World Affairs Council and had a front-row seat to the decision-making processes of Secretaries of State, presidents, princes and kings.

But it was education that became his life. Don credits Bernard Cohen, his seventh- and eighth-grade teacher at Walter Reed Junior High in North Hollywood, for sparking his interest in teaching.

"Most kids get one teacher who ignited that spark and made learning exciting," Don told a local paper when he was named superintendent. "There wasn't one person who didn't respect him and look up to him. I thought that was cool."

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure many a Las Virgenes student has looked up to Dr. Donald Zimring and thought he was cool, too. I am equally sure my colleagues join me in thanking Don for his 37 years of professional service to Las Virgenes Unified School District and in wishing him the best in his new role at Brandeis Hillel.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CITY OF BURLINGAME'S ADOPTION OF B COMPANY, 1ST BATTALION, 327TH INFANTRY REGIMENT, 1ST BRIGADE, 101ST AIRBORNE DIVISION

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the city of Burlingame for its adoption in 2007 of B Company, 1st Battalion, 327th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade, 101st Airborne Division.

In 1967 a soldier in Vietnam named Sgt. Joe Artavia wrote a letter to his sister, Linda Patterson, asking her to convince the city of San Mateo to adopt his company. He thought an adoption would lift troop morale "as high as the sky." Patterson rallied the community to support her brother and his comrades. Within three months the San Mateo City Council passed a resolution to adopt the company.

Tragically, Artavia was killed three weeks later rescuing a fellow soldier, and the people of San Mateo joined together in mourning. Artavia's death solidified San Mateo's commitment to its adopted company and, in fact, in 1972 San Mateo was the only city in the United States to hold an official homecoming parade honoring Vietnam veterans.

Working with Patterson, the city of Burlingame adopted its own company of the 101st Airborne Division in 2003. Since that time the city has continuously supported B Company, 1st Battalion, 327th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade, 101st Airborne Division, visiting them in peacetime, establishing pen-pals and sending care packages.

In a few months Burlingame's adopted company will be re-deployed for another tour in Afghanistan. In commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the original welcoming-home parade, a new parade and festival will be held to honor past and present soldiers of the 1st Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault).

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House of Representatives join me in honoring the city of Burlingame for supporting B Company, 1st Battalion, 327th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade, 101st Airborne Division and its brave men and women who fill its ranks, especially those who gave their lives for our freedom.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$15,777,954,587,181.97. We've added \$5,151,077,538,268.89 to our debt in just over 3 years. This is debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

On this day in 1788, the Constitution of the United States went into effect when New Hampshire became the ninth state to ratify it. The Constitution, which strove to form a more perfect Union and promote the general Welfare, is being crushed by the weight of our national debt.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS ASSOCIATION (NATCA)

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 25th anniversary of the National Air Traffic Controllers Association (NATCA).

Since its establishment in 1987, NATCA has been a fierce advocate for its members and has been a strong proponent for aviation jobs, continuously working for improved working conditions and opportunities in the field for over 20,000 controllers, engineers and other safety professionals.

It is no easy task to manage the most complex airspace system in the world, but with diligent professionalism and outstanding quality, NATCA has been working for a quarter of a century to keep us all protected. It is because of their unwavering commitment to aviation safety that over 700 million passengers a year arrive safely at their destinations.

I congratulate all the professionals at NATCA for their 25 years of hard work. We look forward to many more years of safety in the skies.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE GIRL SCOUTS HEART OF CENTRAL CALIFORNIA AND THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GIRL SCOUTS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Girl Scouts Heart of Central California and the Girl Scouts of the United States of America as they celebrate their 100th anniversary. As Girl Scouts across the country and those in Sacramento gather to celebrate this remarkable milestone, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring the Girl Scouts' important role nationally and in the Sacramento community.

The Girl Scouts began under the guidance of Juliette Gordon Low who founded the organization with a handful of girls seeking new experiences and opportunities in their communities. Over the last century they have grown to a membership of over 3.2 million girls and adults, including nearly 29,000 girls and 11,000 adult volunteers in Sacramento and Central California.

Over the last one hundred years, the Girl Scouts of the United States of America has provided many services to their scouts' communities and to this country. During World War I, the Girl Scouts sold war bonds to help fund the war effort; the Great Depression saw them running food drives and volunteering in hospitals; they grew Victory Gardens during World War II; they supported the civil rights movement in the 1960s; and after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, they reached out to a shaken America with special services to the community and for first responders.

With the help of parent volunteers and other adults giving their time and effort to the organization, the Girl Scouts have been able to grow and continue their legacy as a resource for our daughters, nieces, and granddaughters. They cultivate service, character, appreciation for diversity, and confidence in young girls, fostering new generations of female leaders. The Girl Scouts Heart of Central California provides programs that include activities encouraging girls to explore careers in the STEM fields—science, technology, engineering and math; an outreach program for girls in underserved rural and urban areas; and a Latino initiative reaching out to encourage first-generation Spanish-speaking women to serve as Girl Scout leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to the Girl Scouts Heart of Central California and the Girl Scouts of the United States of America on its 100th anniversary. I am confident

that the Girl Scouts will continue to affect positive change and help inspire girls across the nation. I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring the Girl Scouts of the United States of America and their outstanding service to our country.

ZACHARY NIELSON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Zachary Nielson for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Zachary Nielson is an 8th grader at Moore Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Zachary Nielson is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Zachary Nielson for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all his future accomplishments.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON HUSKIES MEN'S CREW TEAM ON WINNING THE 110TH INTERCOLLEGIATE ROWING ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIPS

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Washington Men's Crew Team for winning the 110th Intercollegiate Rowing Association Championships (IRAs) on June 2, 2012.

From the moment that they began their grueling training, the University of Washington Huskies exemplified sportsmanship, athleticism and perseverance. Their discipline was rewarded when the Huskies won all five events at the IRAs—the first time in IRA history that a single program has swept five races. This victory marks the first time in more than 70 years that the Huskies have won consecutive national titles, and it finishes a season where the Huskies won every race in which they competed.

The Men's Varsity Eight—Sam Ojserkis, Dusan Milovanovic, Alex Bunkers, Ryan Schroeder, Mijo Rudelj, Sebastian Peter, Sam Dommer, A.J. Brooks, and Robert Munn—easily surpassed the standing record for the IRA championship. In fact, every Husky boat also set a championship record on their way to victory.

As we celebrate the long tradition of crew at the University of Washington, I want to commend Coach Michael Callahan, and all of the

talented athletes of the Husky Men's Varsity Crew Team for their truly historic season. I wish them continued success in the future.

HONORING MAUREEN WIGGINS SHOEMAKER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an advocate of literacy and research communications, Mrs. Maureen Wiggins Shoemaker.

Mrs. Shoemaker was born in Sumner, Mississippi. She attended R. H. Bearden Elementary School (formerly West District High School), and graduated from West Tallahatchie High School in 1974. She has received degrees from Coahoma Jr. College, Jackson State University, and also received a Master's in Elementary Education from Mississippi Valley University.

Mrs. Shoemaker's passion for literacy led her to continue her studies in Library Science at Southern University in Louisiana. Mrs. Shoemaker has served R. H. Bearden Elementary School and West Tallahatchie High School faithfully through her efforts to renovate and improve the technology sustainability in both libraries.

Mrs. Shoemaker has been an asset to the West Tallahatchie School District, due to her ability to recognize and address the dire needs of the students in the Tallahatchie School District. In addition, she has remained active in her community working with the Tallahatchie County Correctional Facility and Supporting Partnerships to Assure Ready Kids of Mississippi (SPARK). Through these partnerships, Mrs. Shoemaker has been able to spread her passion for literacy among supporters of all ages.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Maureen Wiggins Shoemaker for her continued efforts to support literacy in the State of Mississippi.

TRIBUTE TO RONALD BLOCKER

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the constituents of the Third Congressional District of Florida and myself, I rise now to offer tribute to the career and success of my friend, Mr. Ronald Blocker, who served as the Superintendent for Orange County Public Schools for the past 12 years. A visionary and scholar Mr. Ronald Blocker is a true leader of the Central Florida Community, and the great State of Florida.

We are encouraged by Mr. Blocker's accomplishments while serving as the superintendent since July 2000; it was under his leadership that the graduation rate in Orange County, Florida, is at the highest level it has ever been with the dropout rate at the lowest. A man dedicated to education, Ronald Blocker earned degrees in educational leadership and counselor education from the University of

Florida. He worked as a school psychologist and principal. As the districts first black superintendent, Mr. Blocker made a name for himself and in 2011 he was named Florida Superintendent of the Year by the Florida Association of District Superintendents.

Mr. Blocker has received many accolades and honors including the John M. Tiedtke Lifetime Achievement Award from United Arts of Central Florida; he was named the District Reading Leader of the Year by the Florida Department of Education's Just Read, Florida! Division; named the Florida Art Education Associations Superintendent of the Year; and received the Florida Superintendent's Award for Volunteer/Community Involvement. Recipient of the Chairman's Award from the Metro Orlando Economic Development Commission, Mr. Blocker has made a lasting contribution to the economy of Orange County. His influence in the Central Florida community has not gone unnoticed either, he was ranked eight on a list of the 50 most powerful people in Central Florida and among the top 25 most powerful by a panel of community leaders.

He served as the President of the Florida Association of District School Superintendents; a member of the American Association of School Administrators; Florida Association of School Administrators, and the Council of Great City Schools.

Described as an "advocate of children", and "a teacher's superintendent", Mr. Blocker was able to build new schools, and replace and upgrade 128 older facilities. With 33 new schools opened under his guidance and 62 replaced or restored, Mr. Blocker reduced overcrowding and removed 1,000 portable classrooms and raised the Orange County School District to an "A" Rating 3 years in a row.

Recently by virtue of Orange County and the School Board, he has been honored with the renaming of the Orange County Public School building to the "Ronald Blocker Educational Leadership Center." Mr. Blocker has worked to ensure healthy revenue that will continue to preserve the quality of education that the Third Congressional District and Central Florida Community deserves and needs, with his high expectations for employees and students. Mr. Blocker's theme of "One Vision, One Voice," is a message we can all truly stand by.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT T. SCHILLING

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. SCHILLING. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 18, 2012, I attended a visitation in the 17th District of Illinois and was unable to cast my vote for rollcall Nos. 379 and 380.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the bill by Senator MIKE LEE, S. 684, to provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of land to the town of Alta, Utah, which passed by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 383-3.

I would also have voted "yea" on the bill by Senator CARL LEVIN, S. 404, to provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of land to the town of Alta, Utah, which also passed by an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote of 380-0.

HONORING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHARTERING OF THE BOROUGH OF SOUDERTON

HON. CHARLES W. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 125th Anniversary of the chartering of the borough of Souderton, Pennsylvania and to pay tribute to the many contributions its inhabitants have made to the cultural fabric of eastern Pennsylvania.

Charted in 1887, Souderton's rich history actually began when the first inhabitants, the Lenni-Lenape or the Delaware Indians settled the area. They were some of the first native peoples to come in contact with Europeans in the early 1600's. The land that today comprises Souderton was originally purchased by William Penn from the Lenape. The first wave of European settlers were Welsh immigrants who gave Souderton the name of Welshtown. They were followed by German Mennonites in the early 1700's and by 1750 they would occupy most of the land. Some claim Souderton got its name from one of its early settlers, Henry O. Souder, but in fact the North Penn railroad company gave the location its name in 1863 to differentiate between the borough and the village of Soudersburg in Lancaster County.

While established as primarily an agricultural community, the railroad's arrival in 1857 encouraged rapid growth in the community. Textile and cigar factories brought prosperity and new populations to the borough. The borough's initial bank, Univest Corp. of Pennsylvania, was established in 1876 and remains an active and vital part of the community today.

When it was chartered as a borough in 1877, Souderton had a population of 600 people. In 1879, the first church in the community, the Souderton Mennonite Meetinghouse, opened on Christmas Day, and the first school in Souderton opened its doors that following year. The population had tripled by 1910. Citizens were able to access the nearby bustling city of Philadelphia via railroad on the North Penn lines, while the nearby community of Perkasio was connected by the Liberty Bell Trolley service. The first automobile arrived in town on May 1st, 1903, and residents soon began enjoying pleasant rides down Main Street, formerly known as Possum Lane. The borough's population doubled again by 1940. Following World War II, the demand for expensive labor in the textile industry declined but the community remained vibrant. Today, Souderton is mostly a quiet, family-oriented residential community.

To commemorate their 125th Anniversary, Souderton borough is hosting a year-long celebration that has included a community clean up day, a parade and fireworks show, historical trolley tours, and a memorial picnic.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me today in recognizing the 125th Anniversary of the Borough of Souderton, Pennsylvania.

IN HONOR OF MR. BLAISE J. DURANTE, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ACQUISITION INTEGRATION, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE FOR ACQUISITION

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of his retirement, I want to take this opportunity to honor Mr. Blaise J. Durante for his 45 years of dedicated service to our country. In his most recent assignment, he served as the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Acquisition Integration, in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition. In this role, Mr. Durante oversaw the integration of Air Force research, development and acquisition budget formulation and execution, and directed streamlined management team activities, including acquisition reform and reduction in total ownership cost efforts. Mr. Durante directed the development of acquisition policy and served as the Chief Financial Officer for the Air Force modernization accounts, managing all acquisition reporting systems along with the Air Force's international research, development and analysis programs. In over four decades of active duty military and civil service, he has held numerous director positions, leading both Air Force acquisition plans and policy, and joint service programs. Mr. Durante retired from the Air Force at the rank of Colonel in May 1992 after 25 years of active duty and was appointed to the Senior Executive Service in 1992. A native of Everett, Massachusetts, Mr. Durante began his career in the Air Force in 1966 after receiving his commission through the Officer Training School and graduating from Northeastern University. His active duty career included assignments to the Air Force Aero Propulsion Laboratory, Air Force Systems Command, Electronic Systems Command, and Headquarters, United States Air Force.

Success has followed Mr. Durante throughout his career, and he is known as the Air Force's premier troubleshooter for acquisition challenges. As just one example, when the Department of Defense cancelled the Tr-Service Standoff Attack Missile program in 1995 and the contractor subsequently filed a \$1.3 billion contractor claim, the Air Force hand-picked Mr. Durante to lead a tiger team that aided the General Counsel's office in eventually reaching an extremely favorable \$58.5 million settlement.

Mr. Durante has held his most recent post since 1994, during which time he has had a significant impact on Air Force acquisition processes and execution. His Directorate was responsible for integrating the Air Force's \$40 billion annual Air Force modernization budget, which accounted for nearly 30 percent of the total Air Force budget. In this role, he monitored performance of the Air Force's 400 plus program portfolio to achieve maximum efficiency for limited funding. In fiscal year 2011 alone, he executed over 255 actions valued at \$2.195 billion to fully fund priorities and support our ongoing Overseas Contingency Operations.

For over four decades, Mr. Durante has been a passionate advocate for the develop-

ment of a professional and competent acquisition force. Countless leaders today call him, "Mentor". He partnered with the Defense Acquisition University to better train program managers and led his team to develop a comprehensive Career Field Education and Training Plan that provided a roadmap for our young men and women to develop into the knowledgeable leaders of tomorrow. In 2008, he correctly identified a significant gap in leadership training for entry and intermediate level program office personnel, and launched the Acquisition Leadership Challenge Program. Since its inception, this program has graduated over 4000 Air Force acquisition leaders, and provided them with critical leadership training previously only available to senior managers. As further evidence of his dedication to professional development, Mr. Durante is a founding member of the Aerospace and Defense Advisory Board for the College of Business Administration at the University of Tennessee. He has since inspired the creation of the nation's only Executive Master of Business Administration program designed for aerospace and defense professionals, and sponsored over 48 military and civilian Airmen for this unique program.

Mr. Durante is also known for his dedicated championing of continuous process improvement (otherwise known as CPI). Over the past few years, he served as lead for several initiatives under the Secretary of the Air Force's "Acquisition Improvement Plan" and "CPI 2.0". He successfully filled civilian acquisition vacancies across the Air Force, increased civilian and military authorizations, balanced the mix of General Officers and Senior Executives, and provided 30 percent more training opportunities for acquisition personnel. To stabilize the acquisition budget and instill financial discipline in acquisition programs, Mr. Durante directed a significant increase in cost estimating confidence levels and established realistic baselines for cost, schedule and performance. He directed the analysis of contractor overhead rates and tied contractor profits directly to their performance. He worked directly with a number of industry partners to refine accounting and reporting processes to improve accuracy and reduce long-term costs to the government. Under CPI 2.0, he also simplified cumbersome bureaucracy and reduced oversight to provide acquisition programs more stability.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to Mr. Durante's dedication to success in our overseas conflicts. He personally drove the creation of the Iraqi and Afghan Transportation Networks as a method of advancing Counterinsurgency Operations, while minimizing the exposure of our troops to roadside bombs. This unique endeavor established a consortium of tribally owned and operated transportation companies that collectively provide secure, dependable transportation services throughout hostile territories. This method was used in both Iraq and Afghanistan, and the program is estimated to have taken 3.5 soldiers and 2.5 gun vehicles off the road for every 10 Network trucks in service. This is truly an amazing success and deserves proper recognition.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Durante leaves a legacy of integrity, innovation, and dedication to those who serve. I ask that my colleagues join me in expressing our sincere appreciation to Mr. Durante for his outstanding service to this

great Nation and the United States Air Force. His exemplary character and selfless service have resulted in a career of which he and his family can be very proud. I wish them the very best as they face new challenges in the coming years. Mr. Durante consistently conducted himself in a professional manner, which brought great credit upon himself and the United States Air Force. I know my fellow Members of the Senate will join me in thanking him for his commitment to this Nation and in wishing him all the best in the future.

TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Tobyhanna Army Depot, which will celebrate its 100th anniversary on June 23, 2012.

In the summer of 1912, the Army arrived in Tobyhanna, PA and established a temporary artillery training camp under Major Charles P. Summerall, Commander of the 3rd Field Artillery at Fort Myer, Virginia. Based on the camp's success, Congress authorized the Army to purchase land to create a permanent camp in 1913. Since then, it has been a military testing facility, a prisoner-of-war camp, and, since 1953, an Army facility that repairs communications equipment for all branches of the military.

Today, Tobyhanna Army Depot is the largest full-service electronics maintenance facility in the U.S. Department of Defense. With a regional economic impact of an estimated \$4.4 billion and more than 5,400 employees, Tobyhanna Army Depot is Northeastern Pennsylvania's largest employer. Its presence alone creates 19,300 regional jobs. In addition, Tobyhanna Army Depot employs an additional 300 personnel who permanently work at "forward repair activities," supporting our military personnel around the globe.

Tobyhanna Army Depot is the Department of Defense's recognized leader in the areas of automated test equipment, systems integration and downsizing of electronics systems. The Army has designated Tobyhanna as its Center of Industrial and Technical Excellence for Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C4ISR), and Electronics, Avionics and Missile Guidance and Control. The Air Force has designated Tobyhanna as its Technical Source of Repair for command, control, communications, and intelligence systems.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 100 years, the Tobyhanna Army Depot has been an incredible asset for Northeastern Pennsylvania and the United States. Therefore, I commend all those personnel—military and civilian—who have faithfully served our community and our country while stationed at the Tobyhanna Army Depot.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF RUTH KISAKO KAMEI

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ruth Kisako Kamei, a 50 year resident of Mountain View, California, who died at the age of 91. She was a loving wife, a devoted mother, a doting grandmother, a beloved sister, and a community leader.

Ruth Kamei was born in Mayfield, California, on September 20, 1920 to Niro Nishimoto and Kisaye Murakami. She was a graduate of Fremont High School in Sunnyvale, California. Before World War II, Ruth met and married her husband of 70 years, Kenzo. During the war, Ruth was interned in Heart Mountain, Wyoming where she worked in the camp cafeteria. Once the war was over, Ruth and Kenzo settled in Mountain View, California and founded Kamei Nursery, specializing in cut flowers.

Ruth was a very active member of the Mountain View Buddhist Temple, participating in the Buddhist Women's Association and a member of the original Temple Choir. She was also a member of the Ikenobo School of Ikebana. She also enjoyed gardening, Japanese cooking and needlework.

Ruth is survived by her husband, Kenzo, her sister Mary Sasaki, her son Kenneth, and daughters Eileen and husband Robert Eng, Judy and husband Steve Inamori, grandchildren Ami, Ellen and Jonathan Kamei, Emily Eng Holbrook, Laura Eng Dardener and Julia Eng, Bradley, Gregory and Kathryn Inamori, and numerous nieces and nephews. She was preceded in death by her brother Yoshio Nishimoto, and sisters Nobuko Kurotori and Grace Kashima.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life and accomplishments of Ruth Kamei and offering our deepest condolences to her family.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 1ST BRIGADE COMBAT TEAM, 101ST AIRBORNE DIVISION (AIR ASSAULT)

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the 1st Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), also known as the Bastogne Brigade Combat Team. This brief recitation of the history of these soldiers barely does them justice.

The Bastogne Brigade Combat Team fought in World War I and it was the first American expeditionary force to penetrate the Hindenburg Line, a vast system of defenses built by the Germans in northeastern France. Among many historic contributions during World War II, the Bastogne Brigade Combat Team played a vital role in Operation Overlord in 1944, the largest seaborne invasion in history. Later that year, they were part of the airborne invasion of Holland and secured control of supply routes and bridges in the German-occupied Netherlands.

In 1964, the 1st Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division was deployed to Viet-

nam and participated in more than 40 combat operations and fought for seven consecutive years without respite.

In 1991, they again played a vital role as part of the largest helicopter air-assault mission in military history during Operation Desert Storm. They have since taken part in peace-keeping operations throughout the world. In Iraq, they played a central role in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and in 2007, they were sent to the city of Tikrit, a safe haven for terrorist organizations.

In 2010 they were deployed to some of the most violent territories in Afghanistan and successfully carried out missions that prevented insurgents from carrying out violent acts against civilians and military targets. The soldiers of the Bastogne Brigade Combat Team will soon be re-deployed to Afghanistan where they will continue performing with valor, risking their lives to help make our own country more secure. Many of them will be on the front lines, doing foot patrols, creating security and interacting with Afghan civilians.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House of Representatives join me in honoring the brave soldiers of the 1st Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), especially those who gave their lives for our freedom.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. RAY BRASWELL, SUPERINTENDENT OF THE DENTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the leadership of Dr. Ray Braswell as Superintendent of the Denton Independent School District (DISD) for the last 14 years. After 33 years of distinguished service with Denton ISD, he is retiring.

Dr. Braswell has led the transformation of Denton ISD from a small school system to a large district with progressive and dynamic instructional programs. The population of the district more than doubled and has also added 20 schools and four other facilities.

Braswell was named one of the Top Five Superintendents in Texas in 2003 and 2009. During his tenure as superintendent, accountability test scores have improved every year and Denton ISD has twice attained the prestigious recognized status from the Texas Education Agency. One of Dr. Braswell's proudest accomplishments was the opening of the Advanced Technology Complex for the juniors and seniors of Denton ISD in 2006. This complex has afforded over 3,000 students the opportunity to attain certifications, technical skills, and credit for college level courses in such varied fields as health occupations, media technology and cosmetology.

In 1979, Dr. Braswell began his long career with the Denton ISD. He served as an interim superintendent and associate superintendent before being named superintendent in 1998. Dr. Braswell had been the executive director for policy, planning and evaluation, executive director of research and development and director of secondary education. He also served as associate principal and assistant principal at Denton High School. Dr. Braswell's sincere

compassion and strong rapport with his staff and students has helped him build and maintain strong partnerships within the district.

On behalf of the Denton Independent School District, faculty members, students, family and friends, I would like to congratulate Dr. Ray Braswell on his many years of public service, his accomplishments, and his commitment to Denton ISD. I am honored to represent Denton ISD and the 26th District in the U.S. House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN SCHATZ

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to the community of Orange County, California are exceptional. Orange County has been fortunate to have dynamic and dedicated community leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent to make their communities a better place to live and work. John Schatz is one of these individuals. On Friday, June 29, 2012, Schatz will end his tenure as the General Manager of the Santa Margarita Water District (SMWD) after 35 years of service to the community.

Schatz graduated from the University of Redlands with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Business Administration and received a Juris Doctor from Western State University College of Law in Fullerton in 1989. In 1998 Schatz was appointed by the State Legislature to the Commission on Local Governance for the 21st Century. From 2000 to 2004, he served as an instructor on "Water Policy in Southern California" at the University of California at Irvine. He was also a member of Association of California Water Agency's State Legislative Committee for several years.

Prior to becoming General Manager of Santa Margarita Water District, Schatz was the General Manager of Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD) in western Riverside County from 1984 to 1994. Before joining JCSD, he worked in a variety of positions, including Administrative Manager, for the Rancho California Water District in Temecula from 1977 to 1984.

At SMWD, Schatz established a culture of efficiency. Among his accomplishments were doubling the number of connections while reducing staffing from 163 to 122 employees by emphasizing cross-training and expanding the use of technology. During his tenure, Schatz helped keep SMWD's services affordable by holding the line on rate increases while finding cost-saving solutions. In the last 15 years, the District has raised rates only twice and decreased its rates six times. It has reaped an additional \$1 million in annual revenues and saved ratepayers \$6.9 million. Under Mr. Schatz's leadership, SMWD recently partnered with four other water agencies to complete the \$54 million Upper Chiquita Reservoir, creating the largest domestic water reservoir built in south Orange County in 45 years while helping to preserve the county's open space.

In light of all John Schatz has done for the community of Orange County, it is only fitting that he be honored for his many years of dedicated service. John Schatz's tireless passion

for conservation and public service has contributed immensely to the betterment of our community and I am proud to call him a fellow community member, American and friend. I know that many community members are grateful for his service and salute him as he retires.

EMPOWERING LOCAL PARTNERS
TO PREVENT TERRORISM ACT
OF 2012

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill, the Empowering Local Partners To Prevent Terrorism Act of 2012, is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

IN HONOR OF MRS. CAROLYN
HENRY OF THOMASVILLE, GEORGIA

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to extend my personal congratulations to Mrs. Carolyn Henry, a beloved citizen of Thomasville, Georgia, who will be celebrating her 31st year as the Minister of Music and 51st year as a member of the First Missionary Baptist Church in Thomasville, Georgia. On June 23, 2012, Mrs. Henry's relatives, friends, colleagues and church family will pay tribute to her for her outstanding musical stewardship and years of dedicated service at First Missionary Baptist Church.

Mrs. Henry is a graduate of Fort Valley State University where she received her bachelor's degree in Music Education. Following her graduation from Fort Valley State University, Mrs. Henry enrolled in Valdosta State University where she would receive her master's degree in Music Education. She attended the University of Georgia for advanced studies in Vocal Pedagogy and received training in Choral Conducting from renowned conductors Rodney Eichenberger and Dr. Andre Thomas of Florida State University.

As an advocate for quality education and sound musical training for our nation's school children, Mrs. Henry served as a public school music teacher for 37 years in both Thomas County and Berrien County, Georgia. Over the course of her teaching career, Mrs. Henry also served as the Director of the Community Choir at Thomas University and as an Adjunct Music Instructor at Georgia Southwestern University.

To go along with her many academic and music education accomplishments, Mrs. Henry has received acclaim as a vocalist and music administrator. She is an original member of the world renowned Georgia Mass Choir and she was selected as one of the choir members to perform in the movie, "The Preacher's Wife," starring Whitney Houston and Denzel Washington.

Currently, Mrs. Henry is the Founder and Artistic Director of the C.H.A.R.M. School, a private music studio for voice and piano students in Thomasville, Georgia. This studio serves as a preeminent training center for future musicians and artist performers. In conjunction with her musical commitments at the C.H.A.R.M. School and at First Missionary Baptist Church, Mrs. Henry also serves as the Music Director of Bethany Congregational Church in Thomasville, Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Mrs. Carolyn Henry, a beloved educator, magnificent vocalist and outstanding role model, as she and her loved ones celebrate her many years of musical achievement and dedicated community service on behalf of First Missionary Baptist Church and the Thomas County, Georgia community.

Enjoy your anniversary celebration Mrs. Henry! May God continue to bless you and may you have many, many more years of musical excellence.

HONORING RICKY DIXON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a remarkable gentleman, Ricky Dixon. He was born April 7, 1994, in Greenville, Mississippi. He is the proud son of Ms. Hevonne Dixon and Mr. Collis Grisby.

Ricky's mother has truly been an inspiration to him. While raising Ricky, she obtained her college degree while also working a full time job. It was this example that inspired Ricky to always strive for greatness regardless of his circumstances.

Ricky is very competitive and a high academic achiever; his test score on the Algebra I state exam for the State of Mississippi subject area test ranked him in the top ten percentile among high school students in the State of Mississippi. The following year he was inducted into the National Honor Society.

In 2010, Ricky began his junior year in high school at Rosa Fort High School. During this time, he had the privilege of traveling to Washington, DC, to attend the Al Neuharth Free Spirit Journalism Conference. This experience broadened Ricky's knowledge and opened his eyes to what the world has to offer in terms of career opportunities. However, although Ricky knows that his education can offer him opportunities around the country, he wants to return to Rosa Fort and teach Algebra I so other students can go anywhere and be successful.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Ricky Dixon as the Salutatorian of Rosa Fort High School's Class of 2012.

RECOGNITION OF THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EVACUATION AND INTERNMENT OF JAPANESE AMERICANS

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 70th Anniversary of the evacuation and internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II.

The philosopher George Santayana once said: "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." Yet, during war-time, our nation repeatedly sacrifices civil liberties to appease unwarranted fears. As the United States fought against tyranny abroad, our government detained American citizens of Japanese descent, solely because of their race.

In 1942 Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, calling for the exclusion and internment of all Japanese Americans on the West Coast. Kiyō Yoshimura was one of the people interned. In 1942 government officials ordered Yoshimura and her family to board a bus, without telling them where it would take them.

They arrived at Tanforan, a horse stable, where they would live for about six months before being shipped off to a more permanent internment camp in Utah. At Tanforan they lived behind barbed wire, smelling the manure from the horses that had previously inhabited the same space. They were denied the dignity of privacy as they bathed or used the bathroom in public latrines. They were treated like enemies of the state and debased like animals.

The United States government interned 8,000 families at Tanforan, and 120,000 people of Japanese ancestry were sent to internment camps along the Pacific Coast. These Japanese-Americans were hardworking, law-

abiding people. Some of them served in the military and fought in Europe.

Most Japanese Americans chose to remain silent about their experiences at internment camps, but it had a lasting impact on them. The government took their homes and their possessions. They had to find new jobs, build new communities and pick up the pieces of their broken lives.

In 1988 Ronald Reagan signed legislation apologizing for the internment of Japanese Americans. The law stated that government actions were based on race prejudice, war hysteria and a failure of political leadership. Japanese Americans received reparations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House of Representatives join me in commemorating the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II. During this dark period of our nation's history fear eclipsed freedom and as national leaders, it is our duty to ensure that this never happens again.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed S. 3240, Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act, as amended.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4379–4431

Measures Introduced: Twelve bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 3325–3336, and S. Con. Res. 49. **Pages S4417–18**

Measures Reported:

S. 250, to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S4417**

Measures Passed:

Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act: By 64 yeas to 35 nays (Vote No. 164), Senate passed S. 3240, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, by the order of the Senate of Monday, June 18, 2012, 60 Senators having voted in the affirmative, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S4381–S4400**

Adopted:

By 95 yeas to 4 nays (Vote No. 162), Coburn Amendment No. 2214, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the use of public funds for political party conventions, and to provide for the return of previously distributed funds for deficit reduction. (Pursuant to the order of Monday, June 18, 2012, the amendment having achieved 60 affirmative votes, was agreed to.) **Pages S4384–85**

Murray Modified Amendment No. 2455, to require the Office of Management and Budget, the President and the Department of Defense to submit

detailed reports to Congress on effects of defense and nondefense budget sequestration for fiscal year 2013. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the requirement of a 60 affirmative vote threshold, be vitiated.) **Pages S4385–88**

Rejected:

By 47 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 158), Boxer Amendment No. 2456, of a perfecting nature. (Pursuant to the order of Monday, June 18, 2012, the amendment having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Pages S4381–82**

By 56 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 159), Johanns Amendment No. 2372, to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from conducting aerial surveillance to inspect agricultural operations or to record images of agricultural operations. (Pursuant to the order of Monday, June 18, 2012, the amendment having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Page S4382**

By 58 yeas to 41 nays (Vote No. 160), Toomey Amendment No. 2247, to reduce unnecessary paperwork burdens on community water systems. (Pursuant to the order of Monday, June 18, 2012, the amendment having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Page S4382**

By 26 yeas to 73 nays (Vote No. 161), Sanders/Boxer Amendment No. 2310, to permit States to require that any food, beverage, or other edible product offered for sale have a label on indicating that the food, beverage, or other edible product contains a genetically engineered ingredient. (Pursuant to the order of Monday, June 18, 2012, the amendment having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Pages S4383–84**

By 45 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 163), Rubio Amendment No. 2166, to amend the National Labor Relations Act to permit employers to pay higher wages to their employees. (Pursuant to the order of Monday, June 18, 2012, the amendment having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Page S4389**

A unanimous-consent request was granted permitting Senator Landrieu to change her yea vote to a nay vote on Vote No. 143 changing the outcome of the vote to 62 yeas to 37 nays relative to Coburn Amendment No. 2293 (adopted on June 20, 2012).

Page S4400

Church Plan Investment Clarification Act: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 33, to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to specify when certain securities issued in connection with church plans are treated as exempted securities for purposes of that Act, and the bill was then passed.

Page S4428

Commending the Women of the American Red Cross: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 471, commending the efforts of the women of the American Red Cross Clubmobiles for exemplary service during the Second World War, and the resolution was then agreed to, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto:

Page S4428

Reid (for Collins) Amendment No. 2466, to amend the preamble.

Page S4429

Measures Considered:

Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1940, to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund.

Pages S4379–81, S4400–09

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 96 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. 165), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill.

Page S4400

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill post-cloture at approximately 2 p.m., on Monday, June 25, 2012; and at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, after consultation with the Republican Leader, but no later than 5:30 p.m., the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, be agreed to.

Pages S4424–25

House Messages:

Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act—Agreement: Senate began consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 3187, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and medical devices, to

establish user-fee programs for generic drugs and biosimilars, taking action of the following motions and amendments proposed thereto:

Page S4409

Pending:

Reid motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill.

Pages S4409–10

Reid motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, with Reid Amendment No. 2461, to change the enactment date.

Page S4410

Reid Amendment No. 2462 (to Amendment No. 2461), of a perfecting nature.

Page S4410

Reid motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with instructions, Reid Amendment No. 2463, to change the enactment date.

Page S4410

Reid Amendment No. 2464 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 2463), of a perfecting nature.

Page S4410

Reid Amendment No. 2465 (to Amendment No. 2464), of a perfecting nature.

Page S4410

A motion was entered to close further debate on Reid motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, June 21, 2012, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, June 25, 2012.

Page S4429

Rosenbaum Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, at 11:30 a.m., on Tuesday, June 26, 2012, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Robin S. Rosenbaum, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nomination; and that no further motions be in order.

Page S4425

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

William B. Pollard III, of New York, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Military Commission Review.

Scott L. Silliman, of North Carolina, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Military Commission Review.

5 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

7 Army nominations in the rank of general.

7 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.

31 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Foreign Service, Marine Corps, and Navy. **Pages S4429–31**

Executive Communications: **Pages S4416–17**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S4417**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4418–19**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:
Pages S4419–23

Additional Statements: **Pages S4414–16**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S4423–24**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S4424**

Record Votes: Eight record votes were taken today. (Total—165) **Pages S4382–85, S4389, S4397–98, S4400**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned at 5:40 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, June 25, 2012. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4429.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel concluded a hearing to examine Department of Defense programs and policies to support military families with special needs in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2013 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Karen Guice, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs, and Rebecca Posante, Deputy Director, Office of Community Support for Military Families with Special Needs, both of the Department of Defense; John O'Brien, Director of Healthcare and Insurance, U.S. Office of Personnel Management; Vera F. Tait, American Academy of Pediatrics, Chicago, Illinois; Geraldine Dawson, Autism Speaks, Chapel Hill, North Carolina; and Jeremy Hilton, Burke, Virginia.

MONEY MARKET MUTUAL FUND REFORMS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine perspectives on money market mutual fund reforms, after receiving testimony from Mary L. Schapiro, Chairman, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission; Nancy Kopp, Maryland State Treasurer, Annapolis, on behalf of the National Association of State Treasurers; Paul Schott Stevens, Investment Company Institute, Washington, D.C.; J. Christopher Donahue, Federated Investors, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Bradley Fox, Safeway, Inc., Pleasanton, California;

and David S. Scharfstein, Harvard Business School, Boston, Massachusetts.

NOMINATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Michael Peter Huerta, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Boxer, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported:

H.R. 1160, to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey the McKinney Lake National Fish Hatchery to the State of North Carolina;

S. 1324, to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit the importation, exportation, transportation, and sale, receipt, acquisition, or purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species;

S. 1201, to conserve fish and aquatic communities in the United States through partnerships that foster fish habitat conservation, to improve the quality of life for the people of the United States;

S. 2018, to amend and reauthorize certain provisions relating to Long Island Sound restoration and stewardship;

S. 3264, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the Lake Pontchartrain Basin Restoration Program;

S. 2104, to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to reauthorize grants for and require applied water supply research regarding the water resources research and technology institutes established under that Act;

S. 3304, to redesignate the Environmental Protection Agency Headquarters located at 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., in Washington, D.C., as the "William Jefferson Clinton Federal Building", to redesignate the Federal building and United States Courthouse located at 200 East Wall Street in Midland, Texas, as the "George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush United States Courthouse and George Mahon Federal Building", and to designate the Federal building housing the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives Headquarters located at 99 New York Avenue NE., Washington D.C., as the "Eliot Ness ATF Building";

H.R. 1791, to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 101 South United States Route 1 in Fort Pierce, Florida, as the "Alto Lee Adams, Sr., United States Courthouse";

S. 3311, to designate the United States courthouse located at 2601 2nd Avenue North, Billings, Montana, as the “James F. Battin United States Courthouse”;

Proposed resolutions relating to the General Services Administration; and

The nominations of Allison M. Macfarlane, of Maryland, and Kristine L. Svinicki, of Virginia, both to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

RUSSIA’S WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION ACCESSION

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Russia’s World Trade Organization accession, focusing on the Administration’s views on the implications for the United States, after receiving testimony from Ron Kirk, United States Trade Representative; Thomas J. Vilsack, Secretary of Agriculture; and William J. Burns, Deputy Secretary of State.

NEW START TREATY

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine implementation of the New Start Treaty, and related matters, after receiving testimony from Thomas P. D’Agostino, Undersecretary of Energy for Nuclear Security and Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration; Rose Gottemoeller, Acting Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security; and Madelyn Creedon, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Global Strategic Affairs.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Katherine C. Tobin, of New York, who was introduced by Senator Reid, and James C. Miller III, of Virginia, both to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

SECURITY CLEARANCE REFORM

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia concluded a hearing to examine security clearance reform, focusing on sustaining progress for the future, after receiving testimony from Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office; Daniel I. Werfel, Controller, Office of Management and Budget; Elizabeth A. McGrath, Deputy Chief Management Officer, Department of Defense; Mertown W. Miller, Associate Director, Office of Personnel Management; and Charles B. Sowell, Dep-

uty Assistant Director for Special Security, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

OLMSTEAD ENFORCEMENT UPDATE

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine an update on Olmstead enforcement, focusing on using the Americans with Disabilities Act to promote community integration, after receiving testimony from Thomas E. Perez, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice; Henry Claypool, Principal Deputy Administrator, Administration for Community Living, Department of Health and Human Services; Rita M. Landgraf, Delaware Department of Health and Social Services Secretary, New Castle; Zelia Baugh, Alabama Department of Mental Health Commissioner, Montgomery; and Ricardo Thornton, Sr., Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 250, to protect crime victims’ rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, with amendments; and

The nominations of Brian J. Davis, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, Grande Lum, of California, to be Director, Community Relations Service, and Jamie A. Hainsworth, to be United States Marshal for the District of Rhode Island, John S. Leonardo, to be United States Attorney for the District of Arizona, and Patrick A. Miles, Jr., to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Michigan, all of the Department of Justice.

UNIVERSAL MUSIC GROUP/EMI MERGER

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights concluded a hearing to examine the Universal Music Group/EMI merger and the future of online music, after receiving testimony from Lucian Grainge, Universal Music Group, Santa Monica, California; Roger Faxon, EMI Group, and Edgar Bronfman, Jr., Warner Music Group, both of New York, New York; Irving Azoff, Live Nation Entertainment, Inc., Los Angeles, California; Martin Mills, Beggars Group,

London, United Kingdom; and Gigi B. Sohn, Public Knowledge, Washington, D.C., on behalf of Consumer Federation of America.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 31 public bills, H.R. 5986–6016; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 698–700, were introduced. **Pages H3974–75**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3976–77**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 697, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5973) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 112–545). **Pages H3973–74**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Poe (TX) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H3917**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:34 a.m. and reconvened at 10:59 a.m. **Page H3930**

Strategic Energy Production Act of 2012: The House passed H.R. 4480, to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas exploration, development, and production under oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in response to a drawdown of petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, by a recorded vote of 248 ayes to 163 noes, Roll No. 410. Consideration of the measure began yesterday, June 20th. **Pages H3918–45**

Rejected the Slaughter motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 166 yeas to 243 nays, Roll No. 409.

Pages H3942–44

Agreed to:

Westmoreland amendment (No. 20 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that lessens the regulatory burden on deli-style display cases by making Service-Over-the-Counter (SOTC) refrigerator units into a separate product classification; **Pages H3921–22**

Hanabusa amendment (No. 24 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that requires the Secretary of Interior in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture to include in their Quadrennial Federal Onshore Energy Production Strategy, the best estimate, based upon commercial and scientific data, of the expected increase in domestic production of geothermal, solar, wind, or other renewable energy sources on lands designated as Hawaiian Home Lands; **Page H3925**

Hastings (WA) Manager's amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that was debated on June 20th that makes technical corrections, eliminates the designation of the Colville River as an Aquatic Resource of National Importance, and requires additional right of ways planned into and out of the National Petroleum Reserve Alaska (by a recorded vote of 253 ayes to 163 noes, Roll No. 392); **Page H3930**

Amodei amendment (No. 14 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that was debated on June 20th that prohibits the Secretary of the Interior from moving any aspect of the Solid Minerals program administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to the Office of Surface Mining, Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM) (by a recorded vote of 257 ayes to 162 noes, Roll No. 399); **Pages H3935–36**

Landry amendment (No. 16 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that was debated on June 20th that raises the cap of revenue shared among the Gulf States who produce energy on the Outer Continental Shelf starting in FY2023 from \$500 million to \$750 million (by a recorded vote of 244 ayes to 173 noes, Roll No. 401); **Page H3937**

Rigell amendment (No. 17 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that was debated on June 20th that requires the Secretary of the Interior to include Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Lease Sale 220 off the coast of Virginia in the 5 Year Plan for OCS oil and gas

drilling and to conduct Lease Sale 220 within one year of enactment. In addition, the amendment would also ensure that no oil and gas drilling may be conducted off the coast of Virginia which would conflict with military operations (by a recorded vote of 263 ayes to 146 noes, Roll No. 402); and

Pages H3937–38

Wittman amendment (No. 19 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that streamlines the process for the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) to approve temporary infrastructure, such as towers or buoys, to test and develop offshore wind power in the Outer Continental Shelf (by a recorded vote of 256 ayes to 161 noes, Roll No. 404).

Pages H3920–21, H3939

Rejected:

Bass (CA) amendment (No. 27 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that sought to establish an Office of Energy Employment and Training, as well as an Office of Minority and Women Inclusion that would be responsible for all matters relating to diversity in management, employment, and business activities;

Pages H3927–30

Waxman amendment (No. 7 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that was debated on June 20th that sought to provide that the rules described in section 205(a) shall not be delayed if the pollution that would be controlled by the rules contributes to asthma attacks, acute and chronic bronchitis, heart attacks, cancer, birth defects, neurological damage, premature death, or other serious harms to human health (by a recorded vote of 164 ayes to 249 noes, Roll No. 393);

Pages H3931–32

Connolly amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that was debated on June 20th that sought to define the term “public health” in the Clean Air Act (by a recorded vote of 177 ayes to 242 noes, Roll No. 394);

Pages H3932–33

Gene Green (TX) amendment (No. 9 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that was debated on June 20th that sought to strike section 206 of the bill, which would require the consideration of feasibility and costs in revising or supplementing national ambient air quality standards for ozone (by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 244 noes, Roll No. 395);

Page H3933

Rush amendment (No. 11 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that was debated on June 20th that sought to provide that Sections 205 and 206 shall cease to be effective if the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration determines that implementation of this title is not projected to lower gasoline prices and create jobs in the United States within 10 years (by a recorded vote of 164 ayes to 255 noes, Roll No. 396);

Pages H3933–34

Holt amendment (No. 12 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that was debated on June 20th that sought to reduce the number of onshore leases on

which oil and gas production is not occurring as an incentive for oil and gas companies to begin producing on the leases that they already hold (by a recorded vote of 164 ayes to 256 noes, Roll No. 397);

Pages H3934–35

Connolly amendment (No. 13 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that was debated on June 20th that sought to clarify that the section requiring a \$5,000 protest fee shall not infringe upon the protections afforded by the First Amendment to the Constitution to petition for the redress of grievances (by a recorded vote of 190 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 398);

Page H3935

Markey amendment (No. 15 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that was debated on June 20th that sought to prohibit oil and gas produced under new leases authorized by this legislation from being exported to foreign countries (by a recorded vote of 161 ayes to 256 noes, Roll No. 400);

Pages H3936–37

Holt amendment (No. 18 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that sought to end free drilling in the Gulf of Mexico by requiring oil companies to pay in order to receive new leases on public lands (by a recorded vote of 168 ayes to 250 noes, Roll No. 403);

Pages H3918–20, H3938–39

Bass (CA) amendment (No. 21 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that sought to require the Transportation Fuels Regulatory Committee to conduct an analysis of how to shield American consumers and the United States economy from gasoline price fluctuations and supply disruptions in the oil market by reducing the dependence of the United States on oil (by a recorded vote of 186 ayes to 233 noes, Roll No. 405);

Pages H3922–23, H3939–40

Capps amendment (No. 23 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that sought to remove the requirements in Title II of the bill to conduct an analysis, issue a report, and delay rules if the Secretary of Energy determines that the analyses are “infeasible to conduct, require data that does not exist, or would generate results subject to such large estimates of uncertainty that the results would be neither reliable nor useful” (by a recorded vote of 162 ayes to 254 noes, Roll No. 406);

Pages H3923–25, H3940–41

Speier amendment (No. 25 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that sought to strike language in the underlying legislation that would require drilling permits to be deemed approved a 60 day deadline, which could expose public lands to undue risk (by a recorded vote of 162 ayes to 255 noes, Roll No. 407); and

Pages H3925–26, H3941

DeLauro amendment (No. 26 printed in H. Rept. 112–540) that sought to require \$128 million received from the sale of new leases to be made available to fully fund the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to limit speculation in energy markets

(by a recorded vote of 180 ayes to 235 noes, Roll No. 408).

Pages H3926–27, H3941–42

H. Res. 691, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to yesterday, June 20th.

Motion to Instruct Conferees: The House agreed to the McKinley motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 4348 by a yea-and-nay vote of 260 yeas to 138 nays, Roll No. 411. The motion was debated yesterday, June 20th.

Pages H3945–46

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, June 25th.

Page H3948

Motion to Instruct Conferees: The House debated the Representative Hoyer motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 4348. Further proceedings were postponed.

Pages H3948–52

Motion to Instruct Conferees: The House debated the Representative Black motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 4348. Further proceedings were postponed.

Pages H3952–55

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and 18 recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3930–31, H3931–32, H3932–33, H3933, H3933–34, H3934–35, H3935, H3936, H3936–37, H3937, H3938, H3938–39, H3939, H3940, H3940–41, H3941, H3942, H3943–44, H3944–45, and H3945. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISMANAGEMENT OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS WITHIN THE NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Mismanagement of Appropriated Funds within the National Weather Service”. Testimony was heard from Jane Lubchenco, Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere and NOAA Administrator; and Kathryn D. Sullivan, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Environmental Observation and Prediction/Deputy Administrator and Acting Chief Scientist.

THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH—A REVIEW OF ITS REFORMS, PRIORITIES, AND PROGRESS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “The National Institutes of Health—A Review of Its Reforms, Priorities, and Progress”. Testimony was heard from

Francis Collins, Director, National Institutes of Health.

ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF HAZARDOUS WASTE MANIFESTS—MODERNIZING FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy held a hearing entitled “Electronic Submission of Hazardous Waste Manifests—Modernizing for the 21st Century”. Testimony was heard from Suzanne Rudzinski, Director, Office of Resource Conservation and Recovery Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Environmental Protection Agency; and public witnesses.

SAFE AND FAIR SUPERVISION OF MONEY SERVICES BUSINESSES

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing entitled “Safe and Fair Supervision of Money Services Businesses”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

U.S.-CARIBBEAN BORDER: OPEN ROAD FOR DRUG TRAFFICKERS AND TERRORISTS

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Oversight Investigations and Management held a hearing entitled “U.S.-Caribbean Border: Open Road for Drug Traffickers and Terrorists”. Testimony was heard from Luis Fortuño Governor, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; Rear Admiral William Lee, Deputy for Operations, Policy, and Capabilities, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security; Janice Ayala, Assistant Director for Operations, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security; Kevin McAleenan Assistant Commissioner, Office of Field Operations Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; Michael Kostelnik, Assistant Commissioner, Office of CBP Air and Marine Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013; AND AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 5972, the “Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013”; and H.R. 5973, the “Agriculture, Rural Development, Food

and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013". The Committee granted, by voice vote, an open rule for H.R. 5973. The rule also provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the Congressional Record. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The resolution further provides an open rule for H.R. 5972. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI except for section 169C (regarding fuel for vehicle operations). The rule provides that the amendment specified in section 3 of the resolution inserting the caption for the Spending Reduction Account shall be considered as adopted. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the Congressional Record. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Finally, the rule provides for consideration of concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July. Testimony was heard from Representatives Latham, Olver, Price (NC), Kingston, and Farr.

SMALL BUSINESS LENDING: PERSPECTIVES FROM THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Energy and Environment held a hearing entitled "Department of Energy User Facilities: Utilizing the Tools of Science to Drive Innovation through Fundamental Research". Testimony was heard from Persis Drell, Director, SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory; Suzy Tichenor, Director, Industrial Partnerships Program, Computing and Computational Sciences, Oak Ridge National Laboratory; and public witnesses.

SMALL BUSINESS LENDING: PERSPECTIVES FROM THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Investigations, Oversight and Regulations held a hearing entitled "Small Business Lending: Perspectives from the Private Sector". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, held a hearing on the following measures: H.R. 4115, the "Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2012"; H.R. 4740, the "Fairness for Military Homeowners Act of 2012"; H.R. 3860, the "Help Veterans Return to Work Act"; and H.R. 5747, the "Military Family Home Protection Act". Testimony was heard from the following Representatives: Garamendi; Stivers; and Cummings; Mike Frueh, Director, Loan Guaranty Service, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; John K. Moran, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Operations and Management, Veterans' Employment and Training Services, Department of Labor; Frederick E. Vollrath, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Readiness and Force Management, Department of Defense; and public witness.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security held a hearing entitled "The 2012 Annual Report of the Social Security Board of Trustees". Testimony was heard from Charles P. Blahous III, Trustee, Social Security and Medicare Boards of Trustees; and Robert D. Reischauer, Trustee, Social Security and Medicare Boards of Trustees.

ONGOING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing on ongoing intelligence activities. This was a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 22, 2012

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, June 25

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1940, Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization Act, post-cloture. At 5:30 p.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Reid motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 3187, Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2 p.m., Monday, June 25

House Chamber

Program for Monday: The House will meet in pro forma session at 2 p.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barletta, Lou, Pa., E1128
 Bass, Charles F., N.H., E1109
 Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1102, E1129
 Bonner, Jo, Ala., E1110
 Brady, Robert A., Pa., E1104
 Brown, Corrine, Fla., E1126
 Bucshon, Larry, Ind., E1108
 Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E1128
 Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E1113
 Calvert, Ken, Calif., E1120, E1129
 Chandler, Ben, Ky., E1104
 Clarke, Yvette D., N.Y., E1112, E1129
 Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1125
 Costello, Jerry F., Ill., E1125
 Crenshaw, Ander, Fla., E1111
 DeFazio, Peter A., Ore., E1106
 Dent, Charles W., Pa., E1127
 Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E1113
 Dicks, Norman D., Wash., E1113
 Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E1128
 Farr, Sam, Calif., E1105, E1107, E1111

Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E1124
 Gallegly, Elton, Calif., E1102, E1119, E1124
 Gerlach, Jim, Pa., E1111
 Griffin, Tim, Ark., E1112
 Guthrie, Brett, Ky., E1123
 Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1122
 Hirono, Mazie K., Hawaii, E1123
 Keating, William R., Mass., E1110
 Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E1107, E1108
 Lee, Barbara, Calif., E1121
 Lewis, Jerry, Calif., E1112
 Lewis, John, Ga., E1108
 Loeb sack, David, Iowa, E1101
 Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E1105
 Lowey, Nita M., N.Y., E1109
 McCotter, Thaddeus G., Mich., E1123
 McDermott, Jim, Wash., E1126
 Marino, Tom, Pa., E1108, E1109
 Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E1125
 Moran, James P., Va., E1105
 Murphy, Christopher S., Conn., E1124
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E1114
 Paul, Ron, Tex., E1106

Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E1111, E1112, E1114, E1118,
 E1119, E1121, E1121, E1123, E1123, E1126
 Petri, Thomas E., Wisc., E1122
 Poe, Ted, Tex., E1106
 Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1120
 Rogers, Mike, Ala., E1107
 Ross, Mike, Ark., E1109
 Sánchez, Linda T., Calif., E1101, E1120
 Sanchez, Loretta, Calif., E1124
 Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E1107
 Schilling, Robert T., Ill., E1126
 Scott, Robert C. "Bobby", Va., E1119
 Sensenbrenner, F. James, Jr., Wisc., E1114
 Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E1103
 Speier, Jackie, Calif., E1101, E1102, E1103, E1103,
 E1104, E1119, E1125, E1128, E1130
 Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E1101, E1104, E1108,
 E1113, E1118, E1121, E1126, E1129
 Tiberi, Patrick J., Ohio, E1110
 Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1121
 Young, C.W. Bill, Fla., E1127



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.