



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 12, 2013

No. 35

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 12, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JACKIE WALORSKI to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

LET'S GET SERIOUS ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, today, I rise as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus to talk about an important new report on climate change. Of late, the discussion over global warming has focused on temperatures in the last 118 years, when standardized record-keeping began. Primarily, the best and most comprehensive research on temperatures has gone back only as far as 2,000 years.

Climate change deniers are complaining these studies have been short-sighted, that they haven't taken into account that warming going on today could have happened naturally thousands of years ago. Climate change impacts today are a result of natural fluctuations, they say.

There is some scientific basis to that claim. Variations in how the Earth is tilted in its orbit around the Sun make for a pattern of planetary warming and cooling phases over thousands of years. During some phases the Earth heats up; in others it cools down.

Last week, scientists from Oregon State University, including two constituents of mine, Shaun Marcott and Alan Mix, joined with our colleagues from Harvard University and published a study in the journal *Science*, peer reviewed, that provides new context on today's climate and rising temperatures.

Instead of looking at temperatures from the last 118 years or even 2,000 years, Marcott, Mix, and their colleagues examined temperatures going back a little further, 11,300 years—the entire Holocene period. The findings are sobering and a wake-up call, and should be a wake-up call to the Members of this institution.

We already knew the Earth is warmer than it was over much of the last 2,000 years. That has been confirmed by a mountain of scientific evidence. But thanks to the work of Marcott, Mix, and their colleagues, we know it is warmer on Earth presently than over much of the past 11,300 years. In fact, we have experienced almost the same range of temperature change over the last 100 years, coinciding with the invention and widespread use of engines and turbines powered by fossil fuels, as over the previous 11,000 years of Earth history. I want to repeat that for emphasis. Rising temperatures over the last century have been greater than the temperature increases over the previous hundred centuries combined.

It shows that human activity reversed a cooling pattern of 5,000 years of 1.3 degrees Fahrenheit in 100 years. It is extraordinary. And their projections for the future are also very sobering.

Climate deniers are running out of excuses. They said, 118 years not enough, 2,000 years not enough. Well, how about 11,300 years of certified research? They say it is biased by region. This was done in 73 sites around the entire planet.

We have heard about solar insolation. Well, according to this claim, we should be now at the bottom of a long-term cooling trend. Whoops, that is not happening. That shows that this solar insolation theory doesn't hold up either.

In short, this confirms what those of us who believe in science already know: manmade climate change is real, it is progressing quickly, and we must take action. But that is not happening in the House of Representatives. During the last Congress, House Republicans voted 53 times to block action on climate change. Time and time again, they voted to know nothing and do nothing. They argued that science isn't settled, but they vote to cut funding for climate science.

Here are a few of my favorite quotes from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle:

Human-induced global climate change is one of the great hoaxes perpetuated out of the scientific community.

Another colleague: Media conspiracy to promote climate change.

Yet another one: Shady scientists.

And then my favorite:

Better known, however, is global warming movement's commitment to severely restrict the use of private automobiles. The rich will still have their limos, and, of course, their private jets. Carbon offsets will cede to that. The rest of us will not be able to travel by plane and will be stuck sitting at home or sitting next to a gang member on public transportation.

□ 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.

H1333

Yes, that was actually said on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, it's time to stop the nonsense and the blather and get serious about climate change. The evidence is in. The only question is whether the United States House of Representatives will listen and act.

PEEKING TOMCRATS SNOOPING THROUGH THE WINDOWS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, Linda Roberts from Kingwood, Texas, is one of my constituents. She received the American Community Survey and filled out only the information required by the Census Bureau and mailed it back to the Census Bureau.

Let me make this clear. The census every ten years counts the population with the census forms. But the Census Bureau also sends out a longer, larger, more intensive document called the American Community Survey to many Americans throughout the 10 years of the census.

Linda Roberts received this long form, the American Community Survey, and she did not fill out the survey. Later, she began to receive weekly calls from the Census Bureau telling her to complete the entire survey. When she refused to complete the survey, the calls increased from every week to multiple times each day. Now, this is a single mother working, trying to support her family, and she's being harassed by the Federal Government.

Finally, a Census Bureau employee showed up at her house, ringing her doorbell, and peeking through her windows to see if she was inside, trying to get her to come to the door to fill out this long survey by the Census Bureau.

The harassment didn't stop. On many occasions, Linda would come home from work and there would be a car from the Federal Government parked out there in front of her house trying to catch her as she went into her home to get her to fill out the American Community Survey. These are people from the Federal Government.

Mrs. Roberts explained that she not only felt uncomfortable providing the detailed information to the Federal Government, but she was afraid. No kidding.

Now, where, Madam Speaker, in the Constitution does it give the Federal Government the authority to do this? The Constitution does not authorize Peeking TomCrats to come from the Federal Government to snoop around our homes and get information from citizens.

Here's what she said:

Please do something about getting the Census Bureau to stop the harassment phone calls concerning the American Community Survey.

I've also received calls from other people. George from Baytown, Texas, says he refused to fill out the American

Community Survey so he started getting phone calls from all over the country from different area codes. He just regarded them as identity theft phishing scams, and so he didn't answer any of those calls.

Madam Speaker, George and Linda are just two of the many people who have contacted my office about the intrusive American Community Survey from the Federal Government demanding people fill this out. Once again, this is not the census questionnaire; this is the Census Bureau giving another questionnaire to the American public and expecting them, by law, to fill this out.

The questions are about 48 questions long. Here are some of the questions:

Do you have a flush toilet in your house?

What time do you go to work in the morning?

What time do you come home in the afternoon?

How much money do you make?

How much money does your spouse make?

Do you have a second mortgage on another home?

Where is that home?

Here is a good one:

Because of a physical mental, or emotional condition, does someone in the household have serious difficulty concentrating, remembering, or making decisions?

Now, isn't that lovely. The survey wants us to comment on the mental health of people that live in the house. I'm glad my wife didn't get this survey and fill it out talking about me.

Madam Speaker, the government has no business asking these personal questions. It infringes on the right of privacy of the American public. People are upset about this because they are forced to provide this information to Uncle Sam or pay a sanction of a \$5,000 fine. Government intimidation at its worst.

□ 1210

Yes, there may be some benefits. The government says we use this information so we can help businesses plan whether to put a store on this corner or that corner. That's fine, but the Constitution doesn't authorize this, in my opinion. So if the businesses want that information, let them pay for it. Go to a polling system.

So I think what we should do, Madam Speaker, is make this form voluntary. If people want to fill it out and give the Federal Government all this information, great, but they shouldn't be required to.

I've introduced legislation and RAND PAUL in the Senate has introduced legislation to make the American Community Survey voluntary. People shouldn't be required to fill it out.

What's next? Is the government going to start asking us how many guns we've got in our home? what kind of cars we drive, whether they're green cars or whether we're driving pickup trucks? Where's it going to stop? The

American Community Survey should be voluntary. Americans should not be required to fill it out, and we need to change the law to make it voluntary for the American public because freedom still means something in America. Keep the snoopers from Uncle Sam out of our lives.

And that's just the way it is.

CONGRATULATING CINTAS STATESVILLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, congratulations are due to the entire Cintas Corporation branch in Statesville, North Carolina, and to each of the Cintas team members who worked together to earn OSHA's Carolina Star distinction for their workplace.

This past week, I was honored to join the employees and management of Cintas Statesville and take part in the celebration of their shared achievement. The environment at Cintas was so impressive and collegial, I wanted to bring their story of success to Washington.

The Carolina Star Program considers more than just exemplary safety and health standards when it designates award winners. Companies are expected to show how they've built a culture where employees and management share the duties of keeping a safe workplace.

Every Cintas employee in Statesville takes ownership of this task, spotting and diffusing hazards together and teaching others to put safety first. Statesville's Cintas has an atmosphere of open dialogue and shared responsibility among all employees that sets it apart. Where collaboration, cooperation, and inclusion were weighed by the Carolina Star Program, Statesville's Cintas branch excelled.

Those are qualities that make for more than a safe workplace. They make for a good workplace and, in Cintas Statesville's case, a workplace that not only thrives but enables other businesses to thrive by providing key support services.

Again, congratulations to Cintas Statesville and their entire team on this achievement.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor quite often to remind the Congress that we're still at war. In fact, yesterday we had seven Americans killed in Afghanistan. This year alone, we've had three situations where the Afghans that we were training turned their weapons on the Americans who were trying to help them and killed them.

Our policy in Afghanistan is a total disaster. It is a failed policy, and we're not going to change one thing in Afghanistan. In fact, Madam Speaker, this past week, the new Secretary of Defense, Chuck Hagel, who's a friend of mine—I have great respect for him—was in Afghanistan, and Mr. Karzai accused Mr. Hagel and the American people of negotiating with the Taliban. The Taliban are our enemy and the enemy of Karzai. This just continues to show that this gentleman that leads Afghanistan is, quite frankly, corrupt, confused, and unpredictable.

But what amazes me is this Congress continues to spend \$6 billion to \$8 billion a month in Afghanistan, when we have this person who is leading that country who, from one day to the next, either likes the American people or he dislikes the American people. In fact, in December of this year, Karzai was quoted in *The Washington Post* as saying he now has three main enemies: the Taliban, the United States, and the international community; and if he had to choose sides today, he would choose the Taliban. And now he's accusing America of cutting deals with the Taliban.

Again, we had seven Americans killed yesterday. It's time for this Congress to wake up and stop spending money in Afghanistan. History has shown we will never change Afghanistan no matter what we do. Go back to Alexander the Great, Madam Speaker, and look at what he did there. Go to the English. Go to the Russians. Nobody is going to change that country. They don't want to be us to begin with.

So why are we going to cut programs in America for children and senior citizens to make sure that Karzai will get his money? In fact, the inspector general for the reconstruction of Afghanistan, John Sopko, he testified recently that we are averaging spending \$235 million a day—\$235 million a day—in Afghanistan, and half the projects that we are spending money on are blown up within a few weeks after they are completed by the Taliban.

I do not understand my own party, to say the least. I don't understand the Congress. Why do we want to keep spending money we don't have and deny the American people a fix for this economy and this country?

Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to say that I have introduced, along with my Democratic friend, ROSA DELAURO, H.R. 125, the Congressional Oversight of Afghanistan Agreement of 2013. All we're trying to do is to get a debate on the floor to say: Why would we agree to stay in Afghanistan after 2014 to 2024? This agreement signed by this administration has obligated America to be there 10 more years after 2014. How many more Americans will have to die? How much money will the American taxpayer have to spend in Afghanistan?

Ms. DELAURO and I would like to have a debate on the floor of the House if, for no other reason, if we can't even change the agreement that the Presi-

dent has signed, let the American people know that we want to debate staying there 10 more years and see young men and women die for a corrupt leader, a confused leader, and spend the money that we don't have for the American people. It makes absolutely no sense.

In closing, Madam Speaker, this is just another example of war. These marines are carrying a flag-draped coffin. How many more families have to cry and lose a loved one in a failed policy, a policy where we will never change Afghanistan no matter what we do?

In closing, Madam Speaker, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask God in His loving arms to hold the families who've given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq, and I ask God to please continue to bless America.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the House reassembles, there are new efforts at communication between the branches of our government to address the issues of our time.

May all Members of the people's House be led by Your Spirit in the negotiations taking place. May they possess an abundance of wisdom and good judgment, as well as a discerning ear, so that possible inroads to productive legislation might emerge.

Bless as well those from the executive branch as conversations resume in a more direct manner. Help all engaged in these efforts emerge as honorable statesmen and authors of a new chapter of great American history, where our system of government proves once again to be a model for all nations to respect.

May all that is done this day 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 Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. BEATTY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

LET'S PASS THE SKILLS ACT

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today, millions of Americans are looking for work. At the same time, there are 3.6 million jobs sitting vacant, in part because there aren't enough qualified applicants to fill them.

What can we do to erase the skills gap? Washington has tried, to the tune of \$18 billion, to run more than 50 different workforce education programs that are supposed to be teaching job seekers the skills and expertise required to compete for jobs.

Despite the hefty price tag, only a fraction of job seekers are completing these programs and many more are getting slowed in a maze of duplication and one-size-fits-all mandates. In 2012, President Obama said:

I want to cut through the maze of confusing job training programs, so that people have one program, one place to go for all the information and help that they need.

The SKILLS Act is the only plan on the table that treats job seekers as individuals and brings us closer to the President's stated target.

Let's pass the SKILLS Act.

OHIO PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION AND MENTAL HEALTH

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute the nationally recognized Ohio Psychological Association, founded in 1949, for their outstanding contributions to psychology and mental health development in Ohio. It is the seventh largest psychological State association in the country and it is located within my Third Congressional District.

They have taken psychology and mental health development to a new level of member service and effectiveness. They advocate for the continued advancement of the professional and

supportive legislative initiatives that include and improve Medicare for their patients.

I would like to recognize Executive Director Michael Ranney, Dr. James Mulick, and Dr. Bobbie Celeste for their hard work that has ensured that the profession of psychology has remained vital, relevant, and at the forefront in Ohio.

CHAIRMAN RYAN BALANCES BUDGET

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is budget week in Washington. Today, House Republicans, under the leadership of Chairman PAUL RYAN, unveiled the new budget.

Our Nation has racked up nearly \$17 trillion in debt due to out-of-control government spending. In order to prevent our children and grandchildren from paying higher taxes with no results, House Republicans have found a way to balance our budget over the next 10 years by cutting wasteful spending, reforming our Tax Code to create jobs, preserving entitlement programs, and expanding opportunities for all Americans.

House Republicans understand the severity of the issue and are willing to work with the Senate and the President to balance our budget. I am very pleased that due to the passage of the No Budget, No Pay Act, the Senate will return to regular order and pass a budget for the first time in 4 years. I look forward to working with the Senate and the President to cut spending and make substantial job-creating reforms that will encourage small businesses to create jobs.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the House's attention to the compelling issue of climate change that the House majority continues to refuse to address. There are a number of us who plan on speaking every day on the House floor on the need for Congress to take action on climate change. We are making this commitment because this Chamber is filled with such a large collection of climate deniers.

It is here in Congress, though, where a long-term strategy to address this issue will have to be crafted if we are to avoid the worst-case scenario and the catastrophic consequences of climate change.

Today, there should be complete consensus on the science of climate change: that the higher concentrations of greenhouse gases over the past 50

years are due to human activity; that the rapid increase in global temperature could not have been caused by natural factors alone; and that the severe temperatures and extreme weather events we have experienced in recent years, including the devastation brought by Hurricane Sandy, all fit into the predictive pattern of global climate change.

Failure to take action dooms future generations to more powerful and destructive weather events, alters our coastlines, and subjects our nation to more droughts and food scarcity.

Mr. Speaker, an overwhelming majority of the public accepts these scientific findings and understands a status quo energy policy heavily dependent on the burning of fossil fuels must change.

It is not only unsustainable but injurious to our nation's future.

In the coming weeks we will be highlighting the consequences of continued inaction and ways we can move forward with solutions.

□ 1410

BALANCING THE BUDGET

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ran for Congress to improve the lives of North Carolinians by advancing initiatives that reinvigorate our economy and put people back to work. To achieve this goal, we must curb Washington's spending addiction and balance our budget.

For the sake of our country and the sake of our children and grandchildren, we must stop the reckless spending of our taxpayer dollars. It has weakened our liberty; it has diminished our prosperity; and it has mortgaged our future. I cannot, in good conscience, stand by and watch our Nation self-destruct because our leaders don't have the discipline to say enough is enough.

Just yesterday, the White House said that the President is not looking to balance the budget. This comes on the heels of 4 long years of Senate inaction to even merely present a budget.

Mr. Speaker, leadership on this issue is clearly long overdue. Fortunately, that leadership Americans thirst for can be found in the Chamber today as Chairman PAUL RYAN presents a budget that balances in 10 years. I applaud his work and look forward to working against Washington's unbridled spending and for a path to economic prosperity.

THE HOUSE GOP BUDGET RESOLUTION

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Today, hard-working Hoosier families sit around their kitchen tables and make tough decisions to keep a balanced budget.

The Federal Government should do the same thing.

In the State of Indiana, we were able to balance our budget and get our fiscal house in order. We created jobs and we kept taxes low using a common-sense, step-by-step approach.

It's time for this Congress to pass a responsible budget that reins in spending and promotes economic growth and job creation. House Republicans have introduced a budget that balances in 10 years while protecting the most vulnerable among us. Proposals by the Senate Democrats never balance and will jeopardize our seniors and our poor by spending our country into bankruptcy.

We cannot afford to wait. I urge my colleagues to support the House Republican budget resolution.

RATE SHOCK AND THE PRESIDENT'S TAKEOVER OF HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, well, here we are. The Affordable Care Act is going to be 3 years old in just a few days, and we're continuing to uncover things within the law that nobody knew about. Remember all the stuff that was sold to the public because it was going to be "free"? But we all know nothing is free, so how do you pay for it?

Well, it turns out there's going to be tax on insurance companies and taxes on employers which, guess what? That's going to be passed on to the employees and the beneficiaries. The deadline is quickly approaching and plans are submitting their bids, but they're faced with no choice but to raise costs.

In response to the rate increases, the Federal Government is attempting to limit higher premiums by something they call rate review. But anytime you treat only the symptom of a disease and not the underlying cause, you're going to end up with something you didn't expect.

Continued regulatory pressure—continued pressure on employers and continued pressure on insurance plans—is going to result in actually further increasing rates. The government is attempting to control the market. But we all know this market is one the government cannot control, and the end result is that we'll all suffer.

Let's face it. Instead of "if you like what you have, you can keep it," what they really meant to say was "you're going to pay a lot more to get a lot less."

THE FEDERAL BUDGET

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

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, this week, the Senate is expected to unveil its first budget plan in nearly 4 years. It relies on the failed policy of raising taxes and increasing Federal spending and will not put into place a requirement for the government to balance its budget. How can this be taken seriously?

When our national debt is over \$16 trillion, how does spending more and increasing taxes make any sense? Why not simply stop spending money—money the government doesn't have to spend in the first place—on frivolous programs, for example, the \$2.2 billion spent last year on a program that hands out free cell phones or the \$17.6 million paid to PR firms to promote ObamaCare or the \$1.7 billion spent in 2010 on “operating costs” for the Federal buildings, Federal buildings that are no longer even in use? Madam Speaker, the list goes on.

We must make spending cuts and commonsense reforms. We need a budget that is reflective of growing our economy, not one that continues to grow our government.

WASHINGTON DYSFUNCTION

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

Mr. MULLIN. Oklahomans are ready for Washington dysfunction to stop and for this country to get back on stable fiscal footing. We must make commonsense cuts to Federal spending that do not threaten public safety, national defense, or our economy.

There is plenty of waste that can be trimmed from the Federal budget. For instance, the free cell phone program that has angered a number of people across Oklahoma, including myself, will cost the Federal Government \$2.2 billion this year alone, or the improper payments of \$115 billion made by the Federal Government to people who were not entitled to receive those payments or who had not provided the proper documentation to qualify for the payments. This one item alone would more than replace sequestration.

Clearly, Federal spending is out of control, and it is not difficult to find ways to cut. But that will require strong leaders who are willing to look past the next election, put party aside and put country first.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 12, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause2(h) of Rule II of

the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 12, 2013 at 10:00 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 166
That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 14

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 20

Appointments:
Senate National Security Working Group.
Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-15)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared on March 15, 1995, is to continue in effect beyond March 15, 2013.

The crisis between the United States and Iran resulting from the actions and policies of the Government of Iran has not been resolved. The actions and policies of the Government of Iran are contrary to the interests of the United States in the region and continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to Iran and to maintain in force comprehensive sanctions against Iran to deal with this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 12, 2013.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1701

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. STUTZMAN) at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

ELIMINATE PRIVACY NOTICE CONFUSION ACT

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 749) to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual privacy notice requirement.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 749

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 “Eliminate Privacy Notice Confusion Act”.

SEC. 2. EXCEPTION TO ANNUAL PRIVACY NOTICE REQUIREMENT UNDER THE GRAMM-LEACH-BLILEY ACT.

Section 503 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6803) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) EXCEPTION TO ANNUAL NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—A financial institution that—

“(1) provides nonpublic personal information only in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b)(2) or (e) of section 502 or regulations prescribed under section 504(b), and

“(2) has not changed its policies and practices with regard to disclosing nonpublic personal information from the policies and practices that were disclosed in the most recent disclosure sent to consumers in accordance with this section, shall not be required to provide an annual disclosure under this section until such time as the financial institution fails to comply with any criteria described in paragraph (1) or (2).”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 749.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 749, the Eliminate Privacy Notice Confusion Act.

Businesses in America are drowning in a sea of red tape, and the never-ending regulatory onslaught threatens financial institutions' ability to lend to consumers. One banker that testified before the Financial Services Committee last year said that, as a senior executive, he currently spends as much as 80 percent of his time working on compliance-related issues, compared to approximately 20 percent as little as 3 years ago. As he said in that hearing:

Every dollar spent on compliance is a dollar less that we have to lend and invest in the communities we serve. Every hour I spend on compliance is an hour I could be spending with customers and potential customers, acquiring new deposits and making new loans.

In the Financial Services Committee, we have heard from countless bankers and credit unions that the costs associated with complying with rules and regulations are ballooning rapidly and diminishing financial institutions' ability to lend, forcing them to raise the fees they charge their customers for basic services. The costs stemming from red tape vary, from managerial expenses for monitoring employees' compliance, to printing and postage expenses to provide written disclosures to customers.

This bipartisan bill will help reduce compliance burdens and confusion among consumers. Federal law currently requires financial institutions to issue disclosure notices to consumers that detail the institution's privacy policies if it shares customers' nonpublic personal information, as well as the customer's right to opt out of sharing this information. These disclosures must be issued when a customer relationship is first established and annually in paper form, even if no policy changes have occurred. My bill would require institutions to provide these notices only if they have changed a policy or practice related to the privacy of the consumer.

This may seem like a simple change, but its impact on financial institutions is significant. Requiring these institutions to send annual notices even when no changes have been made is redundant, unnecessary, and costly.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would permit financial institutions to redirect these resources towards lending, staffing, and lowering the cost of financial services. For consumers, these mailings typically serve to clog up mailboxes and confuse even the best of us. In fact, a recent voter survey conducted by Voter/Consumer Research indicated that fewer than one-quarter of consumers read the privacy notifications they receive, and over three-quarters of consumers would be more likely to read them if they were only sent when a financial institution changed its policies.

This bill will make the mailings more significant to the consumer because they would only come after a change in policy. Let me reiterate: This legislation will only remove the

annual privacy notice requirement if an institution has not, in any way, changed its privacy policies or procedures. This legislation does not exempt any institution from an initial privacy notice, nor does it allow a loophole for an institution to avoid using an updated notice.

This language is not controversial; it does not jeopardize consumer privacy; and it does not exempt any institution from having to produce an initial or amended privacy notice. This legislation does eliminate millions of costly and confusing mailings.

H.R. 749 enjoys broad support within the financial services industry, from credit unions and community services to money center banks; and here in Congress, this bill is one of the few that both Republicans and Democrats can agree on. In fact, previous versions of this bill passed on voice vote in both the 111th and 112th Congresses, with the most recent vote occurring just before this past Christmas.

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for his work on this bill. He has been tireless; he has been relentless; he has been a huge supporter, and it is a big issue to him and his constituents as well. I also want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS for helping to ensure swift passage of this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to again voice their support in favor of this bill. H.R. 749 may be short and simple, but it will have a meaningful impact on financial institutions by increasing their resources so they can do what they do best—lend.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his tireless work on this.

We passed this bill in this exact form in the 111th Congress, the 112th Congress, and I think the third time will be the charm. We passed it by voice vote once; we passed it again; and this time we're sending it to the Senate with 22 months left to go, so they have little excuse for not somehow dealing with the bill. And by that, I mean passing the bill.

The bill is now narrowly tailored and is very straightforward. It simply revises disclosure requirements originally passed under the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to eliminate a costly and duplicative requirement that all financial institutions mail their customers a copy of their privacy notice each year, even if there has been no change in the policy. Under the bill, the only documents that won't have to be mailed are identical to what has been mailed to the same person at some previous time.

There may have been a time in our country, even a decade ago, where the natural thing was, Let's rummage around and try to find that privacy policy. Now everybody I know is going to go to the Web and look at it on the

day they want to look at it rather than wait for the annual time in which it is mailed to them.

Under the bill, the customer would receive a printed copy of the privacy policy when they become a customer of the financial institution and every time that policy changes. In addition, the privacy policy would be available on the institution's Web site for any customer to look at 24/7, 365.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very minor component of disclosure policy, but every year banks, credit unions, and other financial institutions have to spend millions of dollars to print and send to the same people what they have printed and sent to those people a year before. At best, this is an enormous waste of time, money, and paper. At worst, it causes customers to think there is something new when they are just getting what they got a year ago. It distracts consumers from reading those notices where there has been a change of policy and focuses their attention on something that is duplicative.

□ 1710

This bill makes a simple fix to this problem by requiring the financial institution to provide the privacy notice to their customers when they open the account and each time a change occurs that affects the policy or practice related to the privacy of the customer.

Institutions are still required to post these notices on their Web sites and to provide a toll-free number that customers can call to request a copy of that policy at any time. The bill simply says you don't have to mail out the same policy document year after year after year.

As a result, customers will know that when they get a privacy notice, it's something new and deserves their attention, or at least contains some new information. And banks and credit unions and other financial institutions that have been spending millions of dollars to mail out redundant policies can redirect those savings back to the customers.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank Mr. LUETKEMEYER, the Representative from Missouri, for his tireless leadership on this issue. This is a common-sense fix that both parties can agree on, and I hope that we can pass this bill by voice vote and go on to something else.

I see no Democratic speakers; and on that basis, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to again reiterate my thanks to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for his hard work on this issue. I know we had a little bump in the road last fall when we were working on this, and it was through his efforts that we were able to solve the problem.

He's been tireless on this, and again today he's brought a lot of energy and information to this issue, and we certainly appreciate his support.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to debate H.R. 749, the "Eliminate Privacy Notice Confusion Act," which seeks to eliminate wasteful and unnecessarily duplicative privacy notification requirements for financial institutions.

More specifically, H.R. 749 would amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to exempt from its annual privacy policy notice requirement any financial institution that:

(1) Provides nonpublic personal information only in accordance with specified requirements, and

(2) Has not changed its policies and practices with regard to disclosing nonpublic personal information from those disclosed in the most recent disclosure sent to consumers."

Under current law, financial institutions are required to give notices to customers that delineate their information-sharing practices. The Gramm-Leach-Bliley (GLB) Act of 1999 attempted to balance the information privacy interests of consumers with the need for financial institutions to share information for ordinary business purposes.

To that end, GLB required financial institutions to inform their customers, in the form of a privacy notice, about the types of information they collect as well as the types of businesses that may be provided that information.

In order to give the customer the choice of determining whether he or she is comfortable with the sharing of their information, the privacy notice is required to be issued upon the opening of a new account as well as once a year.

Financial institutions collect basic information from customers, such as your name, phone number, address, income, and details about your assets. Moreover, in determining whether someone qualifies for a particular product, such as a loan, a financial institution may collect additional details from other sources, such as credit reports from credit bureaus. Furthermore, some financial institutions track your use of products like credit cards and record information such as how much you borrow, how much you buy, where you shop, and whether you pay your balance in a timely fashion.

Some financial institutions share this collected information with other entities, including unaffiliated companies like retailers and telemarketers. This is why it is particularly important that customers know the privacy policies of their financial institutions; customers must make a determination as to whether they are comfortable with how their bank intends to share their information.

However, requiring financial institutions to submit annual privacy notices to customers when they remain unchanged can be considered wasteful. Moreover, because the notices must be issued with regularity, it may have the effect of lowering awareness on the part of consumers when a change to a privacy policy is in fact made.

H.R. 749 intends to eliminate this waste and potential for diminished customer awareness by removing the annual notification requirement for financial institutions, so long as the policy remains unchanged from the last notification and the financial institution otherwise complies with the requirements for notification.

For that reason, Members ought to copsider H.R. 749 in contemplation of the intent of the notification requirements in Gramm-Leach-Bliley.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 749.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDIES OF VOLUNTARY COMMUNITY-BASED FLOOD INSURANCE OPTIONS

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1035) to require a study of voluntary community-based flood insurance options and how such options could be incorporated into the national flood insurance program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1035

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

SECTION 1. STUDIES OF VOLUNTARY COMMUNITY-BASED FLOOD INSURANCE OPTIONS.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall conduct a study to assess options, methods, and strategies for making available voluntary community-based flood insurance policies through the National Flood Insurance Program.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—The study conducted under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) take into consideration and analyze how voluntary community-based flood insurance policies—

(i) would affect communities having varying economic bases, geographic locations, flood hazard characteristics or classifications, and flood management approaches; and

(ii) could satisfy the applicable requirements under section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a); and

(B) evaluate the advisability of making available voluntary community-based flood insurance policies to communities, subdivisions of communities, and areas of residual risk.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study required under paragraph (1), the Administrator may consult with the Comptroller General of the United States, as the Administrator determines is appropriate.

(b) REPORT BY THE ADMINISTRATOR.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report that contains the results and conclusions of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include recommendations for—

(A) the best manner to incorporate voluntary community-based flood insurance policies into the National Flood Insurance Program; and

(B) a strategy to implement voluntary community-based flood insurance policies that would encourage communities to undertake flood mitigation activities, including the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of levees, dams, or other flood control structures.

(c) REPORT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date on which the Administrator submits the report required under subsection (b), the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) review the report submitted by the Administrator; and

(2) submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report that contains—

(A) an analysis of the report submitted by the Administrator;

(B) any comments or recommendations of the Comptroller General relating to the report submitted by the Administrator; and

(C) any other recommendations of the Comptroller General relating to community-based flood insurance policies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 1035.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1035, legislation introduced by my Financial Services Committee colleague, Congresswoman GWEN MOORE, and chairman emeritus, SPENCER BACHUS.

H.R. 1035 would require the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the agency which administers the National Flood Insurance Program, or NFIP, to conduct a study on the advantages and disadvantages of providing voluntary community-based flood insurance through the NFIP and report its recommendations for implementation to Congress within 18 months.

Additionally, H.R. 1035 requires the Government Accountability Office to analyze FEMA's report and submit its comments or recommendations to Congress within 6 months.

Community-based flood insurance is an insurance technique where a risk assessment is made for all the buildings in the community, and then premiums to cover that risk are paid collectively by that community, rather than the current practice of assessing each building individually and having each individual owner pay a premium.

This innovative tool may represent a new and better way for some communities at risk of flooding to take the necessary steps to protect their citizens. In fact, FEMA has stated in congressional testimony that voluntary community-based flood insurance could help NFIP better account for the full cost of flood risk, as well as provide incentives to encourage communities to implement greater flood mitigation measures.

Thus, we think that it is appropriate to commission this study of the community-based flood insurance concept so that FEMA can understand how it could be put to its greatest benefit.

Congresswoman MOORE's community-based flood insurance study provision was originally included as part of H.R. 1309, the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011, the bipartisan, long-term NFIP reauthorization that passed the House with over 400 votes in 2011. It was also included as part of the long-term NFIP reauthorization efforts that passed the House three other times in different bills in 2012.

An identical bill passed as a stand-alone on September 10, 2012, by a vote of 346-11, so I think you can see that we've had this issue before us many times. It's always been supported. I urge the support for H.R. 1035.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would love to express my appreciation to my original cosponsors of this bill, chair emeritus, House Financial Service Committee Representative SPENCER BACHUS, for his support, and my other cosponsor and friend on the committee, Representative HINOJOSA.

I believe that a community-based flood insurance option may eventually provide a cost-saving option for communities within the larger framework of the overall National Flood Insurance Program. The potential for savings and community empowerment certainly merits a study.

Now, as Mr. LUETKEMEYER has indicated, this bipartisan bill has passed in various forms, the latest being in the 112th Congress, as H.R. 6186 last September, 364-11, so this is nothing new; and I would submit that we should support it here today.

This approach has merit because its potential lower rates are due to the streamlined underwriting, increased participation, the critical mass of citizens that are involved, and incentives for the community to mitigate future flood risk. There's also an option of providing lower-income households the use of vouchers to purchase flood insurance as part of the group.

An analogy for the concept applied is group or employee health insurance coverage versus individual coverage. We all understand that group coverage is less expensive than individual coverage due to many advantages of economies of scale.

Now, in this case, a community, rather than an individual, would be the policyholder. This brings me to another very important potential benefit of this approach, the increased incentives for communities to take preemptive action to mitigate future financial threats from floods in the community. Whereas an individual flood insurance holder has no incentive, nor means to build stronger levees or dikes, a community policyholder would have the means and incentives to take those kinds of precautions.

In theory, the homeowner would pay insurance, like a utility bill, on a monthly or quarterly basis, which also makes it easy to administer. This bill only asks FEMA to examine the costs and benefits of using this approach on an ongoing basis as an option for communities.

We need to continue to seek creative, market-based solutions to problems; and this study is the first good step toward new tools to strengthen the National Flood Insurance Program.

Seeing no other Democratic Members wishing to speak, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1035; I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1720

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. I want to again congratulate and thank the gentle lady from Wisconsin for her hard work on this issue. I know that it's something near and dear to her heart, and I think it's absolutely something that is a good way to approach this issue from the standpoint of let's get a study done to see if this is a viable option. If it is, it can be a really beneficial tool to a lot of our communities that are in some difficult positions because of the flood situations they may be in.

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

Mrs. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1035, a bill "To require a study of voluntary community-based flood insurance option and how such options could be incorporated into the national flood insurance program, and for other purposes."

More specifically, this bill directs FEMA to study options, methods, and strategies for making voluntary community-based flood insurance policies available through the National Flood Insurance Program. Moreover, this study would include a strategy to implement options that would encourage communities to undertake flood mitigation activities.

Flooding is the most common and costly natural disaster in the United States. 90 percent of all presidential-declared U.S. natural disasters involve flooding. Flooding occurs in all 50 states and chronically impacts many

communities, including my constituents in the 18th district of Texas.

In Houston, there are a number of areas which are frequently flooded from excessive rainwater in bayous. These areas include the Buffalo Bayou, the Greens Bayou, and the Halls Bayou. These areas, and others across this nation, could greatly benefit greatly from this study.

In 1968, the U.S. Congress established the National Flood Insurance Program, NFIP, to address the nation's flood hazard exposure and challenges inherent in financing and managing flood risks in the private sector.

The program has played a central role in U.S. flood risk management policy; that is, the prevention and recovery from flooding disasters. Under the NFIP, the federal government (1) identifies areas of flood risk; (2) encourages communities to implement measures to mitigate against the risk of flood loss; and (3) provides financial assistance, through contracts of insurance, to help individuals and small businesses recover rapidly from flood disasters.

Until 1986, the NFIP was financially self-supporting from policy premium revenue and fees that covered all expenses and claim payments.

However, because of its below-market insurance rates and catastrophic hurricane-related floods in recent years, the NFIP has accrued a substantial debt that as of September 30, 2011, stands at \$17.75 billion. Under current law, the funds borrowed from the U.S. Treasury must be repaid with interest.

Because the NFIP cannot charge risk-based premiums for all of its policies, hold loss reserve funds to offset unusually catastrophic losses, or purchase reinsurance, the program faces a constant risk of financial insolvency.

The NFIP currently covers approximately 5.6 million households and businesses across the country for a total of \$1.25 trillion in exposure.

The National Flood Insurance Program, NFIP, was established in response to increasing Federal Government spending for disaster relief.

Standard homeowners insurance does not cover flooding and therefore offers no protection from floods associated with hurricanes, tropical storms, heavy rains and other conditions. The NFIP mandates that federally regulated or insured lenders require flood insurance on properties that are located in areas that have a high risk of flooding.

Unlike private insurance programs, the NFIP is not actuarially sound; it is not designed to ensure that its premiums will cover the average claims and expenses expected over the long run. By law, some NFIP policyholders receive insurance at rates that are subsidized. Such subsidies are mainly granted to property owners whose properties were built before their communities joined the program and are intended to encourage communities to participate in the program and thus mitigate potential losses.

H.R. 1035 would study the means by which communities can enhance their own ability to recover from flooding. Giving communities the opportunity to effectively become the policyholder of a flood insurance program, rather than individual property owners, renters, or businesses, would potentially yield several benefits.

The study produced by H.R. 1035 would explore the policy of community-based flood insurance to find ways to incentivize communities to mitigate future flood losses, as well as to provide them with a greater role in determining flood risk assessment, mapping, and insurance pricing.

Furthermore, the study would allow communities to implement mandatory flood insurance purchase requirements tailored to a community's individual needs.

Moreover, the study would reveal the extent to which community-based flood insurance may produce economies of scale for a community, streamlined underwriting, as well as reduced administrative costs for the insurer.

Community-based flood insurance programs have the potential for the development of synergies between local communities and the National Flood Insurance Program.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the H.R. 1035, which directs FEMA to study how to improve our national system of disaster insurance with respect to community-based flood insurance. This bill is a timely response to recent flooding disasters wrought by Hurricane Sandy, as well as sensible way to address future floods that occur in communities across our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1035.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. 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 motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STUTZMAN) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 890, PRESERVING THE WELFARE WORK REQUIREMENT AND TANF EXTENSION ACT OF 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-15) on the resolution (H. Res. 107) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 890) to prohibit waivers relating to compliance with the work requirements for the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chair of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,

Washington, DC, March 12, 2013.

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

Dear Mr. Speaker: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has been served with a criminal trial subpoena for documents, issued by the United States District Court for the District of Arizona.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, the Committee has determined under Rule VIII that the documents sought are not "material and relevant," and that the subpoena is not "consistent with the privileges and rights of the House." Accordingly, the Committee intends to move to quash the subpoena.

Sincerely,

MIKE ROGERS, Chairman.

STUDIES OF VOLUNTARY COMMUNITY-BASED FLOOD INSURANCE OPTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1035) to require a study of voluntary community-based flood insurance options and how such options could be incorporated into the national flood insurance program, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 17, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]
YEAS—397

Aderholt	Edwards	Kinzinger (IL)
Amodei	Ellison	Kirkpatrick
Andrews	Ellmers	Kline
Bachmann	Engel	Kuster
Bachus	Enyart	LaMalfa
Barber	Eshoo	Lamborn
Barletta	Esty	Lance
Barr	Farenthold	Langevin
Barrow (GA)	Farr	Larsen (WA)
Barton	Fattah	Larson (CT)
Bass	Fincher	Latham
Beatty	Fitzpatrick	Latta
Becerra	Fleischmann	Levin
Benishek	Fleming	Lewis
Bera (CA)	Flores	Lipinski
Bilirakis	Forbes	LoBiondo
Bishop (GA)	Fortenberry	Loeb
Bishop (NY)	Foster	Lofgren
Bishop (UT)	Fox	Long
Black	Frankel (FL)	Lowenthal
Blackburn	Franks (AZ)	Lowe
Blumenauer	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Bonamici	Fudge	Luetkemeyer
Bonner	Gabbard	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Boustany	Gallego	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Brady (PA)	Garamendi	Lummis
Brady (TX)	Garcia	Maffei
Bridenstine	Gardner	Maloney
Brooks (AL)	Garrett	Carolyn
Brooks (IN)	Gerlach	Maloney, Sean
Brown (FL)	Gibbs	Marchant
Brownley (CA)	Gibson	Marino
Buchanan	Gingrey (GA)	Markey
Bucshon	Goodlatte	Matheson
Burgess	Gosar	Matsui
Bustos	Granger	McCarthy (CA)
Butterfield	Graves (MO)	McCarthy (NY)
Calvert	Grayson	McCaul
Camp	Green, Al	McClintock
Campbell	Green, Gene	McCollum
Cantor	Griffin (AR)	McDermott
Capito	Griffith (VA)	McGovern
Capps	Grijalva	McHenry
Capuano	Grimm	McIntyre
Cárdenas	Guthrie	McKeon
Carney	Gutierrez	McKinley
Carson (IN)	Hahn	McMorris
Carter	Hall	Rodgers
Cartwright	Hanabusa	McNerney
Cassidy	Hanna	Meadows
Castor (FL)	Harper	Meehan
Castro (TX)	Harris	Meeks
Chabot	Hartzler	Messer
Chaffetz	Hastings (FL)	Mica
Chu	Hastings (WA)	Michaud
Clarke	Heck (NV)	Miller (FL)
Clay	Heck (WA)	Miller (MI)
Cleaver	Hensarling	Miller, Gary
Clyburn	Herrera Beutler	Moore
Coble	Higgins	Moran
Coffman	Himes	Mullin
Cohen	Hinojosa	Holt
Cole	Holding	Murphy (FL)
Collins (NY)	Holt	Murphy (PA)
Conaway	Honda	Nadler
Connolly	Horsford	Napolitano
Conyers	Hoyer	Neal
Cook	Hudson	Negrete McLeod
Cooper	Huelskamp	Neugebauer
Courtney	Huffman	Noem
Cramer	Huizenga (MI)	Nolan
Crawford	Hultgren	Nugent
Crenshaw	Hunter	Nunes
Crowley	Hurt	Nunnelee
Cuellar	Israel	O'Rourke
Culberson	Issa	Olson
Cummings	Jackson Lee	Owens
Daines	Jeffries	Palazzo
Davis (CA)	Jenkins	Pallone
Davis, Danny	Johnson (GA)	Pascarell
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	Pastor (AZ)
DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.	Paulsen
DeGette	Johnson, Sam	Payne
Delaney	Jones	Pearce
DeLauro	Jordan	Pelosi
DelBene	Joyce	Perlmutter
Denham	Kaptur	Perry
Dent	Keating	Peters (CA)
DesJarlais	Kelly	Peters (MI)
Deutch	Kennedy	Peterson
Diaz-Balart	Kildee	Petri
Dingell	Kilmer	Pingree (ME)
Doggett	Kind	Pittenger
Doyle	King (IA)	Pitts
Duckworth	King (NY)	
Duffy	Kingston	

Pocan	Schakowsky	Tonko
Polis	Schiff	Tsongas
Pompeo	Schneider	Turner
Posey	Schrader	Upton
Price (GA)	Schwartz	Valadao
Price (NC)	Schweikert	Van Hollen
Quigley	Scott (VA)	Vargas
Rahall	Scott, Austin	Veasey
Rangel	Scott, David	Vela
Reed	Sensenbrenner	Visclosky
Reichert	Serrano	Wagner
Renacci	Sessions	Walden
Rice (SC)	Sewell (AL)	Walorski
Richmond	Shea-Porter	Walz
Rigell	Sherman	Wasserman
Roby	Shimkus	Wasserman
Roe (TN)	Shuster	Schultz
Rogers (AL)	Simpson	Waters
Rogers (KY)	Sinema	Watt
Rogers (MI)	Slaughter	Waxman
Rokita	Smith (NE)	Webster (FL)
Rooney	Smith (NJ)	Welch
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (TX)	Wenstrup
Roskam	Smith (WA)	Westmoreland
Ross	Southerland	Whitfield
Rothfus	Speier	Williams
Roybal-Allard	Stewart	Wilson (FL)
Royce	Stivers	Wilson (SC)
Ruiz	Stutzman	Wittman
Runyan	Swalwell (CA)	Wolf
Ruppersberger	Takano	Womack
Ryan (OH)	Terry	Woodall
Ryan (WI)	Thompson (CA)	Yarmuth
Salmon	Thompson (PA)	Yoder
Sánchez, Linda	Thornberry	Yoho
T.	Tiberi	Young (AK)
Sanchez, Loretta	Tierney	Young (FL)
Sarbanes	Tipton	Young (IN)
Scalise	Titus	

NAYS—17

Amash	Duncan (SC)	Radel
Bentivolio	Duncan (TN)	Ribble
Broun (GA)	Gowdy	Stockman
Collins (GA)	Graves (GA)	Walberg
Cotton	Massie	Weber (TX)
DeSantis	Poe (TX)	

NOT VOTING—17

Alexander	Lankford	Rush
Bralley (IA)	Lee (CA)	Schock
Cicilline	Lynch	Sires
Costa	Meng	Thompson (MS)
Gohmert	Miller, George	Velázquez
Labrador	Rohrabacher	

□ 1856

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

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE TED POE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable TED POE, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 12, 2013.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, purporting to require certain responses to a questionnaire in connection with a civil case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined under Rule VIII that the subpoena seeks information that is not "material and relevant" and that it is not "consistent with the privileges and

rights of the House." Accordingly, I intend to move to quash the subpoena.

God and Texas,

TED POE,
Member of Congress.

□ 1900

CONDEMNING ATTACK ON IRANIAN DISSIDENTS

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Judge POE's House Resolution 89, condemning the terrorist attack on February 9, 2013, at Camp Liberty in Iraq and requesting the prompt and safe return of the residents to Camp Ashraf.

This attack has demonstrated that the living conditions of the residents are being threatened and their safety is in jeopardy.

The United States needs to help facilitate the return of the residents for their own protection to Camp Ashraf, located also in Iraq, where they have safer facilities and a better infrastructure that may sustain future attacks—yes, future attacks. According to press reports, Mr. Speaker, the Iranian Quds Force intends to attack Camp Liberty again with rockets and mortars.

Mr. Speaker, time is of the essence. I urge the U.S. House of Representatives to debate the Poe bill on the floor immediately due to the urgent humanitarian situation that the residents are facing.

CONGRATULATING SERGEANT GEORGE FOR HIS PURPLE HEART

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the sacrifice and selfless service of Marine Sergeant Zachary George, who was born and raised in San Ramon, California. He and I even went to the same elementary school.

Sergeant George was wounded in Afghanistan on February 4 while honorably serving on his third tour of duty abroad. Last Tuesday, March 5, President Obama awarded Sergeant George the Purple Heart for his heroic efforts.

Last week, I had the honor of meeting Sergeant George at Walter Reed National Medical Center. His perseverance and positive outlook inspired me and should serve as an example to us all.

I thank Sergeant George for his brave actions, and I congratulate him on the prestigious achievement of a Purple Heart. His courage in combat and his honor to our country, our community, and the 15th District should forever be remembered.

Sergeant George exemplifies the Marine Corps' values of honor, courage, and commitment every day. His selfless service reminds us that, as a Nation, we must pledge that when our

troops return home we leave no servicemember behind.

Along with Sergeant George's fellow marines and servicemembers, I sincerely thank Sergeant George's family for their sacrifice and service to our country. I wish Sergeant George a speedy recovery in North Carolina, where he resides with his wife and infant daughter.

THE UNAFFORDABLE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve, on Wednesday, March 6, released an edition of its so-called "beige book" that said that the President's Affordable Care Act is being cited as a reason for layoffs and a slowdown in the economy and a slowdown in hiring. The beige book examines economic conditions of the Federal Reserve districts across the country through interviews with key business contacts, economists, and market experts in each district.

The Federal Reserve noted:

Employers in several districts cited the unknown effects of the Affordable Care Act as reasons for planned layoffs and reluctance to hire more staff.

Supporters of the Affordable Care Act refer to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, which noted the law will have only mildly negative employment effects. Such defenses are far cries from the claims used by supporters of the bill to force passage in 2009 and merely remind Americans of the countless broken promises that now define the so-called "Affordable Care Act."

The writing is on the wall, Mr. Speaker. The reality is the Affordable Care Act is costing American jobs. As more of its regulations go into effect, the more employers are going to alter their hiring decisions to account for its unaffordable costs.

THE PATH TO PROSPERITY IS A TRIP TO NOWHERE

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the so-called "Path to Prosperity" that was released today by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

As a freshman Member of Congress, I was hoping to look at the Republican budget with a fresh set of eyes and focus on areas where both parties, Democrats and Republicans, can agree. Too often Congress focuses on what divides us and not what unites us. But looking at the gentleman from Wisconsin's proposal, all he's given us are

vague bullet points that fail to say much.

Mr. RYAN says he'd like to eliminate loopholes. Great. Democrats would love to do that, too. But how can we do so when Mr. RYAN won't even specify which deductions or credits he'd eliminate?

I'd like to close the carried interest loophole and end tax breaks for private jets and luxury yachts, but what set of loopholes does Mr. RYAN want to close? It's a mystery. What tax breaks would Mr. RYAN like to cut? The home mortgage interest deduction? The child tax credit?

Let me stop you right there, Mr. RYAN, because cutting those programs will hurt the middle class residents of my district, and I will not support such cuts.

This is not a path to prosperity. For the middle class, it's a trip to nowhere.

Mr. RYAN says he is a serious policymaker, but looking at this proposal, I'm not sure what he's serious about.

TERRY HIGH SCHOOL 4A STATE CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, around midnight last Saturday, I was standing with a group of spirited Texans in the parking lot of B.F. Terry High School. We were waiting for the triumphant return of the Terry men's basketball team. Three hours earlier, the Rangers were cutting down the nets as the Texas 4A State champions.

The Rangers showed the heart of a true champion by defeating the two-time defending champions, Dallas Kimball, 55-47. Down eight at halftime, the Terry defense took over. In the second half, they held Dallas Kimball without a point for the last 3 minutes and 45 seconds.

Congratulations to Coach Michael Jackson, MVP Derrick Griffin, and the whole team for bringing the hardware home to Rosenberg.

LET'S DO THINGS THE RIGHT WAY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it's my intent to bring the House's attention to several important issues.

First of all, I would like to join in a mutual effort with Mr. POE to address the devastation of the people in Camp Ashraf and Camp Liberty. Those are Iranian refugees who have been attacked and who have been mistreated, and we must fight for them and ensure their safety.

I also want to comment on the introduction of a new budget by the House and to say that we have to come together and not be conflicting with programs or initiatives that will not happen; and to have a budget based upon

the elimination of the Affordable Care Act, it simply will not happen. We must come together.

Finally, America is ready for comprehensive immigration reform. In a meeting I held yesterday in Houston with over 90 to 100 persons, if you heard the story of a father who was told to leave his children behind and to leave the country, you would know this is not about immigration. It's about families. It's about humanitarianism. It's about bringing America and Americans together.

We have a few things to do in this country and a few things to do in this Congress. Let's get on with it and do it in the right way.

□ 1910

THE DISTINGUISHED WARFARE MEDAL

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Recently, the Pentagon proposed a new medal, the Distinguished Warfare Medal, to recognize those members of the armed services who operate the drones, which serve on vital missions over war areas. That's a good thing. However, they've also recommended that it take precedence over and be rated above the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart.

It is of great concern to a number of us in the House that this has taken place because we believe that those who fight and have the wounds of battle should have their medals take precedence over them.

I ask all Members to be in support of H.R. 833 and to sign on as cosponsors so that we can correct this problem and work together to make sure that the Bronze Star and Purple Heart are kept in their rightful order of medals, because these things do matter to our military.

GOODBYE, LEO

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I rise this evening just to honor and pay tribute to a dear, dear friend of mine and of the community in my congressional district, Leo Keating. He was the grandfather of my legislative director, Ryan Keating, and of his brother, who is a dear friend of mine, Brendan Keating.

Leo was one of these great World War II veterans who knew how to live life. He was a pilot. He was a lawyer. He loved baseball—and he was funny. He was a tremendous guy who helped me at a very, very young age get into politics. Today, as we went through his funeral mass, his son Dan, who practiced law with him, talked about these three Bronze Stars that he earned in the war.

Typical of that generation, nobody really knew about it because he didn't talk about it.

So I wanted to rise and honor that and honor him because I think, as we deal with a lot of the craziness that's going on here in Washington, D.C., it was a nice example today to see this man who was a hero to his country getting the military burial and what-not and to think he never even talked about it and how beautiful that was. He was just a great guy who knew how to live life. We will miss Leo Keating, and I know his family and his friends will miss him dearly, but he gave us one last gift going out: his family wanted him to have dialysis, and he said no.

Come on, Dad. Try it just one time. See if you like it. See if it helps.

No. I'm ready.

And he was ready. And he gave us one last example on how to live with grace and dignity.

So, goodbye, Leo.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA: THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTENGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

I am JOHN GARAMENDI from California, and I am joined by several of my colleagues here tonight. We want to go through a couple of things that are of the utmost importance to Americans. I had three townhalls on Saturday in California—it was about a 450-mile drive to get to all three of them—but at each and every one of them the concerns were very, very similar.

The first overriding concern was the economy. In California, there is this desire to get the economy going. There is a pent-up energy in the people—in the businesses, in the small businesses, in the farmers. It's not just because it's spring and the almonds are blossoming—or maybe it's the "a-munds" depending on what part of my district you're from. It's that there is this desire to get moving forward.

They keep asking me, What's going on in Congress? Why can't you guys get it together out there?

And we explained what's happening here.

We have been through five crises over the last 18 months—manufactured crises, things that didn't have to happen. Each and every time, the entire system of America's economy and politics comes to a stop, and we lurch up to that fateful cliff, and then we move on but not with the kind of robust energy that this economy is capable of. We need to get this continuing resolution and all of these fiscal cliffs out of the way to get the economy moving, and there are some very, very good examples of why the economy is poised to take off.

One of them is found here. If you take a look at this chart, these are the job creations or losses beginning way back in 2009, 2008. All of those red lines are the collapse of the economy. When the blue came in, that's when President Obama came in 4 years ago, and things were tough. We were in a free fall here in our economy; but with the stimulus bill, we began to climb out. After about 18 months, we began to see positive job growth—we were no longer seeing those job losses—and we've seen that all the way through. This last month was a terrific month. There were 247,000 new jobs created, and that was in February.

So what happens in March?

In March, we come up against another cliff, and now we have sequestration, leaving us 750,000 unemployed Americans. It's not a gain in the economy. The unemployment rate went down to 7.7 percent in the previous month, and now we have sequestration. We passed a bill out of here last week that was supposed to solve it. It really didn't. In fact, it maintained sequestration. It took care of a few things, but we've got to get past this. We need to grow this economy, and we need to make the investments. There are really only five critical investments that need to be made year after year after year, and we need to do these things repeatedly—every month, every year, in every budget:

Education—sequestration cuts education at all levels;

Research—sequestration cuts research. In my district, at the University of California at Davis, \$45 million of research projects will come to a screeching halt. Ph.D.s and others will be laid off;

Infrastructure—sequestration cuts infrastructure. Manufacturing matters. You've got to make things;

Those are the four. The fifth is you have to be willing to change, but you've got to change in a positive way.

What we're going to talk about with my colleagues here is this issue of how to move the economy forward. As we look at the past and at the success—modest, not enough, but on the right track—we need to keep in mind that it is the role of the government, dating back to George Washington and Alexander Hamilton when Washington asked Hamilton to develop an industrial plan for the United States and Hamilton did. He laid out in that plan the critical role of government in moving the American economy forward, and that was in the very first year of these United States. We should carry that tradition forward. So as we go into this, let's keep in mind that we've made progress and that we have much more to do.

Joining me tonight is a gentleman who has created many, many jobs, and now he has a new one. He is a Member of Congress from the great State of Maryland, and it's Mr. DELANEY.

Thank you very much for joining us. You have an exciting district. You

have a considerable amount of high-tech in your district.

Mr. DELANEY. I do.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So share with us your thoughts about how we can grow the economy, and maybe share some of your own experiences, because you've employed many, many people during your tenure in business.

Mr. DELANEY. That's right. I appreciate my friend from California for providing me with this opportunity to talk about what I think is important for our economy, to get our economy going to create jobs.

We spend a lot of time, both in this Congress and in Washington generally, talking about the economic challenges that this country faces and about the employment challenges this country faces, and those conversations often evolve into conversations about our tax policy and about the size of our government—two very important things for us to be spending time on as we talk about the fiscal trajectory of the country.

□ 1920

They are two things that actually have very little to do with what is important for creating jobs in this country, because what has really caused the employment challenges that we face today, what has really caused the economic challenges that this country faces are two things: globalization and technology. They are two trends that are gripping our society and really started about 20 or 25 years ago, and these trends are accelerating.

Many people have been benefited by these trends. Americans with great education have been blessed by these trends. Americans with access to capital have benefited because of these trends. And hundreds of millions of citizens around the world have benefited from these trends because they move from formerly not being in a modern economy to being in a modern economy.

The problem is that the average American has been negatively affected by these trends. It happened too quickly. We weren't quite prepared for it. We didn't invest in our future the way we need to to prepare a broader number of Americans for a world that is fundamentally changed because of these trends.

To me, this is the central issue we face as a country if we want to reverse the employment trends. By the employment trends, I don't just mean the headline unemployment number, which is tragic. I mean what happens if you look behind those numbers, if you look at the standard of living of the average American, which has consistently gone down now for two decades.

In order to reverse these trends, in order to take these trends—globalization and technology—and bend them to benefit a broader number of Americans, we fundamentally have to do things here in our country that involve investment.

We have to improve our educational system and invest in education. There has never been a stronger correlation in the history of this country between having a good education and one's ability to get a job.

We need a national energy policy that can lead us to the advanced energy economy which will be cleaner and more efficient and more economical. If you look back over the history of modern economies, the two most important numbers for an economy to be successful is the cost of money and the cost of energy. We have an opportunity if we lead in advanced energy to keep the cost of energy down.

We need to reform our immigration system. Half of the Fortune 500 companies in this country were founded by immigrants or children of immigrants. Immigrants fundamentally create jobs in this country.

And we need to invest in our infrastructure. We need to build a modern infrastructure for the future: transportation, communication, energy, educational facilities, all of the things that we need to do to be competitive. This will create jobs in the short term, and it will lay the groundwork for a more competitive America across the long term.

These are the things that we need to do to make our country more competitive so that we can create and attract and sustain jobs that have a high standard of living. That's the sacred trust we've been given as Members of Congress. And to do these things and to make the investments that are important in energy and education and infrastructure and in our immigration system, we need to be in a position fiscally to make investments, and that's a role of government that I strongly believe in.

To do that, we do have to change our fiscal trajectory, but we have to be honest about the drivers of our fiscal condition. We have to acknowledge that we do need comprehensive entitlement reform in this country so that our important entitlement programs don't crowd out all the other priorities we have in the Nation. And we also have to acknowledge that we need to reform our tax system, implement proposals like the Buffett rule that level the playing field and create more revenues. Our revenue as a percentage of our economy has never been lower.

If we do these two things, we create an opportunity for us to invest in our future. We create an opportunity to do the things that we need to do to make this country more competitive.

As someone who was the son of a union electrician, whose parents never went to college, who had the blessing of a good education and started two businesses from scratch that both became New York Stock Exchange companies and created thousands of jobs, I have an appreciation of what's important in terms of entrepreneurship in this country. These are the things that we need to do if we want to make a difference, and these are the things that I

care about as we try to work against these important trends.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. DELANEY. Well, you hit it right on the head: education, the technology issues that we have before us, the issue of globalization and how we deal with it here, and our energy policy. We are really blessed in the United States with energy that has suddenly come back to blossom, and that's natural gas. What an enormous asset for this country, and we need to really push that further along. And the immigration issue, all of these things are before us right now.

If we move forward aggressively with the kinds of things that you talked about, and we're spending time here on the floor, we can really move this country. And with the energy that businesses have and the experience that you know from your own experience in business, there is a pent-up demand. There's a lot of cash in the businesses of the Nation. We need the policies laid out there.

Perhaps you can take up the energy piece and elaborate a little more on how you see the use of natural gas as a bridge as you get to those clean energy issues you talked about.

Mr. DELANEY. I think you made a very good point about the amount of cash in our private sector. There is more cash in U.S. corporations than there's ever been, and there's more cash in our banks than there's ever been.

I believe the private sector creates the jobs, but there is a clear and distinct role for government to level the playing field and make the investments that are needed for the private sector to thrive. The energy industry is a terrific example of that. If we had a national energy policy that pointed us in a common direction where we could say this is where we want our energy production and utilization to be in the future, it would benefit Americans so much in the short term because of the quality of their life in terms of making us more competitive.

If you look back over the history of this country, it takes us about 50 years to change energy sources. It took about 50 years to go from wood to coal; it took about 50 years to go from coal to oil and natural gas; and it will take about 50 years to truly have this advanced, clean, efficient energy economy that we know we should have as a country. We should have policies in place that encourage that. And natural gas can be a fabulous bridge to that future.

There has to be accountability. We need to ensure that it is done in an environmentally sensitive way. I believe there is a role for the Federal Government to do that, and we should be embracing it because it can clearly bridge us in a cleaner way and in a cost-effective and competitive way to the future we all imagine for clean and advanced energy.

It will take time to get there. It is a massive investment to transform our

energy infrastructure, and we can do that, which, by the way, will create a lot of jobs while we do it, but we can get there. And natural gas can be a terrific bridge.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I really agree with all you said. And as we make that bridge to that clean energy future—you talked about those 50-year increments as we change from one source of energy to another. In that process, we, American taxpayers, seriously subsidized each and every one of those transitions. We now have to shift, it seems to me, shift some of those subsidies from the old energy sources, specifically oil, and shift that into long-term subsidies, encouragement to those clean energy issues. If we do that, I think we'll see that kind of growth that you're talking about.

Mr. DELANEY. I absolutely agree with you.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. DELANEY, I know you have to leave, but thank you so very much for joining us.

Mr. DELANEY. Thank you for giving me this opportunity.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Also joining us tonight is Representative HIGGINS from the great State of New York.

We have talked here on the floor from time to time, Mr. HIGGINS, and you have a very serious issue about our infrastructure—or lack of good quality infrastructure in the United States. You have some plans for that. I don't know if that's what you want to talk about tonight, but I'm going to take you there either sooner or later. So please share with us your thoughts on growing jobs here in America.

Mr. HIGGINS. I thank the gentleman from California.

I think the infrastructure piece, as has been mentioned here previously, is a vehicle for growth. It is refreshing to see that this discussion tonight between three Members is about how to grow the economy. There is not an example in human history of an economy growing out of a recession from austerity measures. It didn't happen in Japan in the 1990s. It's not happening in Europe today, and it didn't happen in this country in 1937. So what we have to do is invest in education, as the gentleman has said, scientific research, and infrastructure.

This weekend, former Republican candidate for President Rudy Giuliani talked about the importance of investments that have a return, that grow jobs and reduce debt and deficit. He talked about transportation infrastructure and rebuilding the roads and bridges of this country.

The Republican budget that was released today, the Ryan budget, proposes to cut infrastructure spending over the next 10 years by \$5.7 trillion. I would submit to you that we are moving in the wrong direction. We need to make investments in this economy.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. HIGGINS, if I may interrupt you for just a second, I can't believe the number you just gave us. You said the Ryan Republican

budget that will come out this week does what to infrastructure?

Mr. HIGGINS. It cuts infrastructure spending by \$5.7 trillion over 10 years.

□ 1930

It doesn't do anything to the defense spending. So while we, the advocates of increased infrastructure spending, want to nation-build here at home, in America, the Ryan budget wants to continue to nation-build in Afghanistan and Iraq and other places.

World War II ended in 1945. We still have 52,000 U.S. soldiers in Germany. We still have 49,000 U.S. soldiers in Japan. We still have 10,000 U.S. soldiers in Italy. We need to bring them home and nation-build here.

And that's the PAUL RYAN budget, not the TIM RYAN budget.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. HIGGINS, you've really hit upon something that caught my attention. Also, we should be aware that this year, that is October 2012 until October 2013, we will spend \$100 billion in Afghanistan.

To what effect? To have our soldiers killed by Afghan policemen? To create an ongoing conflict in that area with the people that are living there?

To what effect? \$100 billion.

You talk about bringing home the soldiers, we should bring the soldiers home from Afghanistan. There will be some small unit left there to deal with al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations, but it's simply not working.

Think what \$100 billion could do to solve the sequestration issue, which is only \$85 billion.

Mr. HIGGINS. Can I just make another point before you turn it over to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN)?

A lot of people here, in the majority, do a lot of complaining about spending. The irony is, they did all the spending.

At the end of 2000 we had a budgetary surplus of \$258 billion. They took that surplus and financed two wars that took \$1.2 trillion out of the American economy. They financed a drug prescription program, unpaid for, that will cost us \$1 trillion over 10 years.

And they financed two tax cuts that didn't produce the kind of growth they were said to produce. In fact, after those tax cuts were enacted, disproportionately for the wealthy, we had the worst period of economic growth in the past 75 years.

The Clinton administration produced 22 million private sector jobs. We had 4 percent annual economic growth, sustained over an 8-year period. That produces budgetary surpluses and reduces the debt.

So that's the lesson that we should embrace, not the measures that the Republicans are proposing, because historically it hasn't produced the kind of growth that they promised that it would produce.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman would yield too, I'd just comment on the infrastructure piece.

So here we are today, needs abound in the country, both rail, combined

sewer, highways, bridges—I mean, each of our counties, you pull out how many bridges in our counties aren't up to specs; I think it's like 50 or 60 just in one of my bigger counties.

These projects are only going to get more expensive. The energy costs going in are going to get more expensive, the labor costs are going to get more expensive. Everything associated, the materials, everything associated with what needs to get done is going to become more expensive. So I think the good business move, on behalf of the taxpayer, would be to get this done now, get people back to work.

And I recognize that we're still running deficits. But the interest rate at which we're borrowing the money is minimal, 1, 2 percent.

So we're going to wait. Here's what's going to happen. We're going to wait. Accidents are going to happen, bridges are going to collapse, things are going to just need to get done, and then these local governments, State governments, we're going to have to go out and borrow the money at 4 or 5 percent, as opposed to 1 or 2.

So I think as we're thinking about this, it's not that we're sitting here saying, oh geez, we don't have anything better to do, let's just spend a bunch of government money. No, these are strategic investments. Like in Virginia, they're going to increase productivity so people aren't sitting in their cars. They're more productive, have a higher quality of life, more time with their families, all these things that we say are very important.

So, to your point, we're going backwards, because at some point this stuff's got to get done.

Mr. HIGGINS. According to Transportation for America, there are 69,000 structurally deficient bridges in this Nation. In my State of New York there are over 2,000 bridges that are structurally deficient. In western New York there are 99 bridges that are structurally deficient. Every second of every day, seven cars drive on a bridge that is structurally deficient.

And as the gentleman from Ohio had pointed out, public infrastructure is the public's responsibility. It's as old as Lincoln. He called them land improvements and railroads at the time.

So it's not a question of whether or not the public is going to improve the infrastructure. The question is when does it make the most sense. And we believe that money is as cheap as it's ever going to be, labor is as cheap as it's ever going to be, and equipment is as cheap as it's ever going to be.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. HIGGINS, you've raised, and Mr. RYAN, you've also raised the very same issue about the infrastructure. We can do this. We can really do it.

I couldn't believe that PAUL RYAN's going to introduce a budget in the next couple of days that's going to take \$5.7 trillion out of the infrastructure.

I often hear our Republican colleagues talk about the Founding Fa-

thers, and we ought to hearken back to the founding fathers. And indeed we should.

His first month in office, George Washington asked Alexander Hamilton, his Treasury Secretary, to develop an industrial plan for the United States. In that plan that Hamilton produced 3 months later was an infrastructure component. It said the United States Government should support the creation of ports, canals, and roads.

So right back to the very first days of this government, we have seen the role of the Federal Government in the infrastructure sector, and that is an investment.

And one thing I'll add before I turn it back to you gentlemen is that all of that's our tax money, all tax money from all 360 million Americans, coming in in one way or another, sometimes through the Federal excise tax on gasoline or income tax or other taxes. If we used that money to buy American-made steel—I think that's near your district, isn't it, Mr. RYAN?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think the gentleman from Buffalo knows a little bit about that too.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So we're talking about American-made steel for those bridges, or concrete or other kinds of equipment. And so if we do that, we'd create jobs in the United States.

The manufacturing sector lost 9 million jobs between 1990 and last year. This last year we've seen an additional about 600,000 new jobs coming back into manufacturing, but if we pass Buy American or Make It in America legislation, so that our tax money supports American-made products from American-made workers made in America, we can see a boom in manufacturing. It's certainly going to be important in my district, and I'm sure it is in yours.

Gentlemen, you're right on target here. These are the investments that George Washington and Alexander Hamilton said we ought to make.

Mr. RYAN, I know you have a few other things you'd like to toss into this.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Well, one of the things that you were talking about—and I just started to learn more and more about this new additive manufacturing. And there's a center in Youngstown, Ohio now that's a regional center for additive manufacturing.

So the old school manufacturing is you would cut things out, and they called it subtractive manufacturing. The new stuff is a printer that you have that would be like the printer you have in your office, except you pump material into it, and instead of ink on a piece of paper, it's a material that would make a component part. And the cost is down now to about \$700 or \$800 for these things. So this is the next generation of manufacturing.

And I bring it up because the President put together a proposal, Department of Energy, Department of Commerce, Department of Defense, to partner with the private sector to create

one of these innovation institutes. And he wants to do 15 more for a billion dollars.

If you would see the activity going on in Youngstown, Ohio now, the companies that are partnering with us, with the private sector, with Carnegie Mellon, it goes all the way to Pittsburgh, Carnegie Mellon, Case Western Reserve, Youngstown State, University of Akron, Lehigh, Penn State, West Virginia—we've got to get Buffalo in this somehow.

But the point is, public/private partnership to expedite the development of new technologies. And the President and his team get this. And Democrats, we get this.

We've got to get away from this narrative that anything the government spends money on is bad; it's a waste of your tax dollars. Whether it's infrastructure, whether it's public/private partnerships like this additive manufacturing institute or the other institutes that we need to create, that's the seed corn for the next generation of alternative energy, windmills, solar panels, whatever the case may be.

□ 1940

We don't know what it is. That's why the recipe has always been to invest in this basic research, put these public-private partnerships together, and magic will happen. Because you have the basic scientific intellect and intelligence there, partnering with the private sector, who has a profit motive, and magic happens. And now we've gotten a scenario where government has no role here. No role at all. And it's not either/or. So I'd like to ask my friends who think it's either/or, what other relationship with another human being do you have that that's that black and white?

This stuff is complicated. It's complex. It takes nuance. And that's what's happening in Youngstown, and I think it's a good example of what can happen around the country in older areas where we don't have the local tax base that we used to have, to have the Federal Government come in. And you should see the ripple effect already happening—and it's a beautiful thing—but it takes that kind of comprehensive plan.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. HIGGINS.

Mr. HIGGINS. I was just going to mention where TIM was talking about infrastructure, the New America Foundation has a study out called, "The Way Forward." And they propose spending \$1.2 trillion on infrastructure, primarily because of the reasons that we stated here. Money is as cheap as it's ever going to be. Labor is cheap and equipment is cheap. But they further explain that it will create 25 million jobs over the next 5 years—\$5 million the first year, reducing the unemployment rate from its current rate to 6.4 percent; \$5 million in the second year, reducing the unemployment rate further to 5.4 percent. These are proven growth vehicles. And that's exactly

what the economy does. And it will also put people back to work.

All the construction trades, to their considerable credit, have a program called Helmets to Hardhats, where they take veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan and they expedite their apprenticeship training and put them to work making \$60,000, \$70,000 a year. Do you really want to say thank you for your service on behalf of a grateful Nation? Put them to work rebuilding this Nation.

We will spend—the Federal Government—in transportation infrastructure this year \$53 billion. It's a disgrace. We're a Nation of 300 million people. You just spent as a Nation, the United States, \$89 billion rebuilding the roads and bridges of Afghanistan. You spent \$69 billion rebuilding the roads and bridges of Iraq. Those are nations of 30 million and 26 million respectively. But for a Nation of 300 million people you're going to spend \$53 billion.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And you look at what our top competitors are spending as a percentage of their GDP. I think we're at 1 percent of our GDP that we spend on infrastructure. It maybe went up to 2 during this recovery package. But if you look at India and China, it's 7 or 8 percent of their GDP. Now, granted, they're still developing in so many different ways. But for us to be at 1 and they're at 6, 7 or 8, how are we going to be able to keep up when our infrastructure is so much older?

It's time to rebuild America. And I don't know anybody in my district, Democrat or Republican, who's really not for that. I've had Republican friends of mine have the light bulb go off and they say, Wait a minute. We're going to have to do this at some point. And we've got a high unemployment rate and we've got low interest rates. This doesn't make any sense to put it off.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If not now, when? Mr. RYAN of Ohio. When?

Mr. GARAMENDI. When are we going to do it? We can do these things. We can do the wind turbines for the clean energy, as Mr. DELANEY was talking about, solar panels, and, of course, the transportation systems, which we're discussing here.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. As you said, you've got to ship that stuff. That stuff needs to be shipped. It needs manufactured and then it needs to be shipped somewhere on a road and over bridges and ports and airports and logistics facilities and everything else. You've got to make that investment, and that'll grease the wheels of the commerce.

Mr. GARAMENDI. George Washington and Alexander Hamilton at the very start of this Nation said, Build the infrastructure. Grow the economy.

Mr. HIGGINS. We need them back here.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We can use that again. The President has put it out there, too. In his State of the Union speech he spoke very clearly to the advanced manufacturing centers that you

talked about, Mr. RYAN. He talked about infrastructure. He's made proposals that have just been pushed aside by our Republican colleagues here, but there are proposals that would grow this economy and give us the foundation upon which we can then have additional growth.

I see that the Representative from the District of Columbia is here. Ms. NORTON, thank you very much for joining us. Gentlemen, thank you very much for this evening. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, thank you very much for joining us this evening.

Ms. NORTON. I want to thank my good colleague from California for keeping before the Congress the notion of making jobs in America. You were just talking about infrastructure. Infrastructure is all made in America, if we make sure that we don't build bridges, for example, from materials from China. But when it comes to the roads, when it comes to the cement, we don't get those from abroad. We make those here. And that's why infrastructure has always been the foremost way to stimulate an economy. It's interesting that it stimulates not only the construction trades, but it's best because it stimulates other parts of the economy below it. It's the way to get everything going.

I couldn't agree with you more in pointing out—and you and I are on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee—the importance of infrastructure. That used to be the great bipartisan issue of the Congress of the United States. And I think there is some chance it will be again. We note that the bill that we just passed in the last Congress, the Surface Transportation bill, will have to be renewed next year; and I certainly hope that becomes an opportunity to do a Surface Transportation bill for more than 2 years. That's where we have to get to work right now.

But I wanted to come to the floor today, in particular because the Ryan budget has come forward. And I note the very good news of the 246,000 jobs that the private sector, on its own, with no help from the public sector and no help from the Congress, has produced, cheering all of us up.

Mr. Speaker, I want to note that we are about to countermand all that the private sector is doing alone. The reason is that the Federal and the State sectors are doing just the opposite. They are reducing spending, the States and the cities are causing layoffs, and the result is that for every job that the private sector makes, we are moving in exactly the opposite direction because all oars are not in the water. Thank goodness we have a private sector that is beginning to say, we won't wait for the other oars—the Federal and the State oars. We're going in now. The rest of you should join us.

The very least we should do, however, is to cease making it worse for the private sector to keep doing what it's doing. The sequester, of course,

will do that. The markets have not reacted yet, but there is no way in which people in the private sector, particularly small business, is going to continue to add jobs if they see that the Federal and State governments are doing just the opposite. The reason the State governments are doing that is because when we make cuts, they pass through directly to them. So they're trying to protect themselves because they must produce annual balanced budgets. Since they must have a balanced budget, they are making cuts every single day, or at least reducing spending.

The Ryan budget comes forward and in a real sense it looks a lot like it's always looked. But look what it does: it makes half of its so-called savings from health care—Medicare, Medicaid, and, of all things, the Affordable Health Care Act. I guess we ought to say a budget is what, indeed, it always has been: it's a hope-for document. I hope that we don't get the Ryan budget. But I cannot believe that Mr. RYAN believes that at this late date, with an election having already taken place, with the benefits of the Affordable Health Care Act, flowing every day, that we're about to repeal that. Half of his savings are from Medicare, Medicaid, the Affordable Health Care Act, and he caps food stamps.

□ 1950

I want to say to my good friend from California, I think we ought to stop slapping the private sector in the face every time it makes jobs, making sure that we do cuts that take away the effects of those jobs. That's what we're doing.

I note that you have one of the posters that show how we hurt people. We ought to also understand we are hurting people and we are hurting the economy at the same time, and that's why CBO said 750,000 jobs are at risk because of the sequester alone, leave aside what the Ryan budget would do.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, thank you very much, Representative NORTON, and for your years of service here.

You were just moving to the Ryan budget, which I suspect he'll introduce maybe in the next day or two. This is the same old, same old, but this time it's worse than the old. He's talking about an austerity budget, a very stringent austerity budget on steroids that will clearly decimate the economy as those cuts are made.

You just said if the Federal Government makes a reduction, it comes right down to cities and States laying people off. We've had this growth just last month, 247,000 jobs, and here we go.

Let's understand what is being discussed by Mr. RYAN. Who are these people on Medicaid? He proposes to cut Medicaid by a third and block-grant it to the States, which means just give the States some money. But who are those people on Medicaid? Now, we call it Medi-Cal in California, but you can see that two-thirds of the Medicaid

money goes to seniors and disabled. So, Mr. RYAN, what are you doing? Who exactly are you pointing out for the reductions? You're going after seniors and the disabled.

Ms. NORTON. I think that point you just made about Medicaid needs to be said again. People think of Medicaid as somehow poor people, we'll let them fend for themselves. It turns out that almost all of the funds—two-thirds—go to seniors and disabled people. We're targeting the wrong people.

Mr. GARAMENDI. They think it's welfare. Well, these are seniors and disabled people that can't work, or people that are retired.

So, what does it mean? It slashes that budget for seniors that provides them with nursing homes. Principally, these folks are in nursing homes. So you're going to take a third of the money out of nursing homes. Now, just what are those seniors going to do? What are they going to do? You're taking a third of the money out by 2022.

You mentioned Medicare. Oh, yeah, Medicare. Mr. RYAN, proposes to end Medicare as we know it. He's going to give seniors a voucher. They can stay on Medicare, but they have a voucher to buy Medicare. The guarantee of affordable health care, quality health care for seniors terminates with the Ryan Republican budget.

Who are those people on Medicare? Well, let's see. About 3 percent earn over \$100,000 a year; 1 percent, somewhere around \$90,000 to \$100,000; but down here, here's where the Medicare beneficiaries are. They're earning somewhere, \$10,000 to \$20,000, or \$30,000—right here, 28, 20, 16. You're getting up to 50 percent right there of people below \$40,000. These are not wealthy people.

Medicare is there to provide people with the ability to have quality health care in their retirement years. But Mr. RYAN would end that and give them a voucher, and shift the cost to the individuals who would then have to go out and buy private health insurance.

I was the insurance commissioner in California for 8 years and I understand what the private insurance companies are all about. The private health insurance companies are all about their bottom-line profit. It's not people, it's profit. If that's what Mr. RYAN wants to do, we're going to fight vigorously and successfully to say no, no; the promise of Medicare is here to stay.

Ms. NORTON. Isn't that, by the way, exactly why we got Medicare—that seniors were left to the private market, and finally the Congress understood that the private market cannot accommodate people with \$22,000 annual income.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Exactly right. When I was young, before Medicare, we lived in a rural community, there was a county hospital. My dad took me to the county hospital to visit a rancher. We were ranchers. On the other side of the hill was another rancher that was elderly and was at the county hospital.

I will remember forever in my life going to that ward with maybe 15, 20 elderly people side by side in beds, the stench. The care was almost nonexistent. Poverty was everywhere. It was worse than horrible.

But in 1964 this Nation did something very, very important. Together with Social Security, they brought seniors out of poverty because it was the medical expenses that forced them into poverty. So Medicare brought seniors out of poverty. It went from, I don't know, I think it was almost 80 percent of seniors were in poverty to a situation today where maybe 8 to 10 percent are in poverty. Social Security, Medicare; absolutely critical. But any attempt to change that goes right to the heart of our values as Americans.

We will take care of our seniors. That's not to say changes are not possible. Of course changes ought to be public. For example, we ought to be negotiating with the drug companies over the price of prescription drugs. But, oh no. When the prescription drug benefit was passed, added into it and signed by George W. Bush was a paragraph that said the Federal Government is a price taker; it cannot negotiate the price of drugs. So we spend billions and billions where it's not necessary.

Ms. NORTON. And of course there are some agencies that do negotiate the price of drugs.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Exactly.

Ms. NORTON. I do want to point out, when you talk about the transfer of the expense, the cost of Medicare to seniors themselves—the costs we know they can't possibly bear—notice that hopes went up when Mitt Romney said, during the campaign, that we should reduce the loopholes. Well, note what Mr. RYAN does: he reduces the loopholes in order to give rich folks a further tax reduction.

So, where does the money go? The top rate now is 39.6 percent. Well, he wants to bring that top rate down to 25 percent. So he wants to close the loopholes all right—I'm not sure which ones he has in mind—but that savings would go back into the same 1 percent sector that already has gotten all the benefit from tax cuts until what we finally did in January, when others got some relief as well.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I'm going to pick up another chart. The issue you raised is one that we really ought to chart. Let me go get another chart. Just keep going there.

Ms. NORTON. I'm very glad my good friend from California does have a way to illustrate all of these points.

Not only does RYAN reduce the top rate from 39.6—that's how much the very richest would pay—to 25 percent, but you may say, well, but he's got a 10 percent rate essentially for everybody else. Well, if everybody else paid 10 percent and the very richest paid 25 percent, there would be little revenue for the Federal Government. So what we're saying about Medicare and Medicaid is this would mean that there

would not be the revenue to fund them. And that seems to be his point: get so little revenue coming into the Federal Government that in and of itself that will mean you do not have to worry about cuts. You'll get rid of these programs that we have been building for 50 years.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I ran over and got this chart. I wasn't going to talk about this this evening, but you brought the issue up about where the money has gone and the issue of tax breaks.

□ 2000

This chart begins in 1979, and it shows the basic growth in income. So it starts down here in 1979, and the bottom 20 percent have really seen very, very little growth in their income. The next 20 percent, a little better, and this is the next quartile. These are the 1-percenters. We talked about the 99 percent. This is the 99 percent down here. These are the 1-percenters. These are the people that have seen extraordinary income growth. And it just happens to coincide right here, this income growth has coincided with the Bush tax cuts in the early 2000's. So we've seen this enormous percentage income, almost a 300 percent growth, 277 percent growth in their income, so that you're beginning to see the skewing of wealth in America.

This is the annual income. But if you take a look at wealth and you put another chart of wealth here, you'll see something the very same. So the rich get richer and the poor stay where they are, that old song.

Here we are. This is a result of multiple effects, but one of the principal ones is tax policy. And if Mr. RYAN's budget passes, as you have suggested, and the top tax rate goes from 39 to 25 percent, then that means that those who already have a lot will get a whole lot more. And I'm reminded of a quote by Mr. Roosevelt, President Roosevelt, and he said—this is a paraphrase. I wish I had it with me to be exact. He said: We're not measured by how much those who have get more, but rather by what we do for those who have little.

This is our great challenge. This is where the great buying power for America should be, in the bottom 99 percent, really in the bottom 50 or 60 percent.

I thank you for raising that point about the tax policy in the Ryan budget, but it will make this line just continue to go like that; and the rest, because of the elimination of the deductions, are going to see a stalling of their income.

Ms. NORTON. So he does get balance within 10 years, and look at how he gets it. You still do not have anything like a contribution, a real contribution from those who have benefited the most from the tax cuts. You're saying it continues to come from the lowest part of the income stream, income groups in the United States. I don't know when people will let the Congress know they're not going to take it anymore, but it seems to me the time has come.

Frankly, I was encouraged by the fact—I hope this works out—that the President reached out to at least some Senators to see whether or not there's somebody somewhere, and since Democrats controlled the House, perhaps we could get to a greater balance by bringing more people into the equation.

The Republicans are fond of saying that you can't spend yourself into prosperity. Well, you can't cut yourself into prosperity, either. That's why the notion of balance makes the most sense. That's why the President was elected because that apparently made the most sense to the American people.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Exactly. The President has proposed a balanced approach to sequestration, as well as to the long-term deficit plan, a combination of additional revenues, many of them from closing loopholes, and also some very wise cuts. There are things that can be done in Medicare. I talked earlier about the prescription drug benefit. But there's also the way in which Medicare is organized. The fee-for-service system encourages additional and often unnecessary procedures. There's a lot of fraud in the system. We need to deal with that. And the Affordable Care Act, interestingly enough, went right after every one of those, yet they want to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

What are they thinking? We know the Affordable Care Act works. We know that the inflation rate in Medicare, since the Affordable Care Act went into effect, has dropped precipitously. It's still growing, but it's growing slower than the general health care inflation rate in the Nation.

Ms. NORTON. That's the first time we've seen that in decades.

Mr. GARAMENDI. In decades. But we're seeing the changes.

The Affordable Care Act, a major part of that is an annual well person visit to the doctor, so critically important. Why? What's your blood pressure? How's your sugar? What's happening in your life? Can we prevent you from getting diabetes? Can we give you some really—some cheap pills to keep your blood pressure down, or are we going to have the blood pressure go up so you get a stroke and pay big-time for years and years with disabilities and medical care?

So the Affordable Care Act has the right incentives in it to bend the cost curve. And it is. It is actually working.

Ms. NORTON. It's working. And because it's working, we know good and well the last thing the American people would approve is snatching it back, particularly since, by 2014, it's going to reach everybody.

I agree with you. There are ways to cut. And unlike my friends on the other side, this side has never said no cuts. Their view is only spending cuts, but we have never had that view, only this or that. We really are open to the kinds of negotiation, tough negotiation it's going to take to come out with something.

Now, I'll say for the Ryan budget, he says he was questioned, "Well, do you

really think any of this is going to happen?" and he said words to the effect, "Well, you have to put down what you really want," I don't have any problem with that if they come to the table this time so that there can be a real negotiation and we can get to the kind of budget that I think really is doable.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I notice that our time is nearly over. If you'd like a few closing comments, I'm going to end in just a few moments, too.

Ms. NORTON. First, I want to thank my friend for keeping jobs before us. That's the bottom line. That's really what we've been talking about even as we talk about the Ryan budget.

I simply wanted to come forward because, when I heard you on the floor, it seemed to me almost everything you were saying fed into the news today from the Ryan budget. I ask people to try to follow the explanation of what that budget does when you hear that he can close the budget in 10 years rather than 25 years, understand that that is impossible if you want to grow this economy.

I thank you, once again, my good friend from California, for making all the important points this evening.

Mr. GARAMENDI. From Washington, D.C., your leadership in this community has been known for some time. I thank you very much for joining us tonight.

I want to do two things before I end. First of all, Medicare is back on the table. The Ryan budget takes up Medicare once again and provides a voucher which will basically destroy it.

I used this last time around. I'm going to change this. It says, Medicare 1965—that was President Johnson—until 2013; created by LBJ, destroyed by the GOP. I don't think so. Seniors don't want it. Americans don't want it. In the last campaign for the Presidency, this was one of the major issues, and yet Mr. RYAN is coming back with it. Bad idea, bad timing.

I want to end with this. This is a great country. There is no other place in the world like the United States. It is one terrific country. There's enormous energy in this country, the energy where people want to get a job, they want to go to work, businesses want to grow, and they want to hire people. All of that is waiting for Congress to get its act together, to get the sequestration out of the way, which is an austerity budget that has 750,000 jobs to be lost in it, get that out of the way. Look at the balanced proposal, as the President has suggested. End some tax loopholes. Make some cuts. Make wise, thoughtful cuts. And it's possible. It can be done, and it should be done.

Along the way, we can grow the economy. We can, once again, "Make it in America." Because when we make things in America, when we use our tax money to buy American-made equipment, supplies, and products, we're creating jobs here. We're putting people back to work.

George Washington said we ought to do it. Alexander Hamilton as Treasury

Secretary said we ought to do it. And we, the Democrats, say we ought to do this. We ought to have a buy American.

Mr. RAHALL, the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, has made it clear that, as a major part of the new transportation bill, there's going to be a major "Make it in America" component so that we're buying American-made goods once again. He's supported by every one of the ranking members of every subcommittee, and I add myself to that list.

For the last 3 years, I've carried specific bills that say our tax money, transportation tax money, would be used to buy American trucks, buses, bridges, and steel made here in America. If you're going to put up a solar panel on your house or a wind turbine and you expect a subsidy—and you should have one—then it should be an American-made solar panel or wind turbine.

We can make it in America when Americans, once again, make it. So, that's our message. Our message is to be wise about the cuts. Yes, we're going to make cuts. Balance it with appropriate revenue increases, which should be basically the elimination of many of the unnecessary subsidies that go out even to American corporations still receiving subsidies for offshoring jobs. No more. The President was right. Give a break to American companies that bring jobs back to the United States.

All of this is possible. This is what we are here for, 435 of us in the House of Representatives, to set policy. Mr. DELANEY talked about education, technology, energy policy, and we were joined this evening by our other friends, Mr. HIGGINS from New York, Mr. RYAN from Ohio, and Ms. NORTON from Washington, D.C. It's been a good evening.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CICILLINE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR THE 113TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,

Washington, DC, March 12, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with Clause 2 of Rule XI of the House of Representatives, I am submitting the Rules of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for printing in the Congressional Record. On February 13, 2013, the Committee

adopted these Rules by non-record vote with a quorum present.

Sincerely,

MIKE ROGERS,
Chairman.

1. MEETING DAY

Regular Meeting Day for the Full Committee. The regular meeting day of the Committee for the transaction of Committee business shall be the first Thursday of each month, unless otherwise directed by the Chair.

2. NOTICE FOR MEETINGS

(a) Generally. In the case of any meeting of the Committee, the Chief Clerk of the Committee shall provide reasonable notice to every member of the Committee. Such notice shall provide the time, place, and subject matter of the meeting, and shall be made consistent with the provisions of clause 2(g)(3) of House Rule XI.

(b) Hearings. Except as provided in subsection (d), a Committee hearing may not commence earlier than one week after such notice.

(c) Business Meetings. Except as provided in subsection (d), a Committee business meeting may not commence earlier than the third day on which Members have notice thereof.

(d) Exception. A hearing or business meeting may begin sooner than otherwise specified in either of the following circumstances (in which case the Chair shall provide the notice at the earliest possible time):

(1) the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines there is good cause; or

(2) the Committee so determines by majority vote in the presence of the number of members required under the rules of the committee for the transaction of business.

(e) Definition. For purposes of this rule, "notice" means:

(1) Written notification; or

(2) Notification delivered by facsimile transmission, regular mail, or electronic mail.

3. PREPARATIONS FOR COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) Generally. Designated Committee Staff, as directed by the Chair, shall brief members of the Committee at a time sufficiently prior to any Committee meeting in order to:

(1) Assist Committee members in preparation for such meeting; and

(2) Determine which matters members wish considered during any meeting.

(b) Briefing Materials.

(1) Such a briefing shall, at the request of a member, include a list of all pertinent papers, and such other materials, that have been obtained by the Committee that bear on matters to be considered at the meeting; and

(2) The Staff Director shall also recommend to the Chair any testimony, papers, or other materials to be presented to the Committee at the meeting of the Committee.

4. OPEN MEETINGS

(a) Generally. Pursuant to House Rule XI, but subject to the limitations of subsections (b) and (c), Committee meetings held for the transaction of business and Committee hearings shall be open to the public.

(b) Meetings. Any meeting or portion thereof, for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, or any hearing or portion thereof, shall be closed to the public, if the Committee determines by record vote in open session, with a majority of the Committee present, that disclosure of the matters to be discussed may:

(1) Endanger national security;

(2) Compromise sensitive law enforcement information;

(3) Tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; or

(4) Otherwise violate any law or Rule of the House.

(c) Hearings. The Committee may vote to close a Committee hearing pursuant to clause 11(d)(2) of House Rule X, regardless of whether a majority is present, so long as at least two members of the Committee are present, one of whom is a member of the Minority and votes upon the motion.

(d) Briefings. Committee briefings shall be closed to the public.

5. QUORUM

(a) Hearings. For purposes of taking testimony, or receiving evidence, a quorum shall consist of two Committee members, at least one of whom is a member of the Majority.

(b) Other Committee Proceedings. For purposes of the transaction of all other Committee business, other than the consideration of a motion to close a hearing as described in rule 4(c), a quorum shall consist of a majority of members.

6. PROCEDURES FOR AMENDMENTS AND VOTES

(a) Amendments. When a bill or resolution is being considered by the Committee, members shall provide the Chief Clerk in a timely manner with a sufficient number of written copies of any amendment offered, so as to enable each member present to receive a copy thereof prior to taking action. A point of order may be made against any amendment not reduced to writing. A copy of each such amendment shall be maintained in the public records of the Committee.

(b) Reporting Record Votes. Whenever the Committee reports any measure or matter by record vote, the report of the Committee upon such measure or matter shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of, and the votes cast in opposition to, such measure or matter.

(c) Postponement of Further Proceedings. In accordance with clause 2(h) of House Rule XI, the Chair is authorized to postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or adopting an amendment. The Chair may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time after reasonable notice. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(d) Availability of Record Votes on Committee Website. In addition to any other requirement of the Rules of the House, the Chair shall make the record votes on any measure or matter on which a record vote is taken, other than a motion to close a Committee hearing, briefing, or meeting, available on the Committee's website not later than 2 business days after such vote is taken. Such record shall include an unclassified description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each member voting in favor of, and each member voting in opposition to, such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members of the Committee present but not voting.

7. SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Generally.

(1) Creation of subcommittees shall be by majority vote of the Committee.

(2) Subcommittees shall deal with such legislation and oversight of programs and policies as the Committee may direct.

(3) Subcommittees shall be governed by these rules.

(4) For purposes of these rules, any reference herein to the "Committee" shall be interpreted to include subcommittees, unless otherwise specifically provided.

(b) Establishment of Subcommittees. The Committee establishes the following subcommittees:

(1) Subcommittee on Terrorism, Human Intelligence, Analysis, and Counterintelligence;

(2) Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence; and,

(3) Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

(c) Subcommittee Membership.

(1) Generally. Each member of the Committee may be assigned to at least one of the subcommittees.

(2) *Ex Officio* Membership. In the event that the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee do not choose to sit as regular voting members of one or more of the subcommittees, each is authorized to sit as an *ex officio* member of the subcommittees and participate in the work of the subcommittees. When sitting *ex officio*, however, they:

(A) Shall not have a vote in the subcommittee; and

(B) Shall not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum.

(d) Regular Meeting Day for Subcommittees. There is no regular meeting day for subcommittees.

8. PROCEDURES FOR TAKING TESTIMONY OR RECEIVING EVIDENCE

(a) Notice. Adequate notice shall be given to all witnesses appearing before the Committee.

(b) Oath or Affirmation. The Chair may require testimony of witnesses to be given under oath or affirmation.

(c) Administration of Oath or Affirmation. Upon the determination that a witness shall testify under oath or affirmation, any member of the Committee designated by the Chair may administer the oath or affirmation.

(d) Questioning of Witnesses.

(1) Generally. Questioning of witnesses before the Committee shall be conducted by members of the Committee.

(2) Exceptions.

(A) The Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may determine that Committee Staff will be authorized to question witnesses at a hearing in accordance with clause (2)(j) of House Rule XI.

(B) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member are each authorized to designate Committee Staff to conduct such questioning.

(e) Counsel for the Witness.

(1) Generally. Witnesses before the Committee may be accompanied by counsel, subject to the requirements of paragraph (2).

(2) Counsel Clearances Required. In the event that a meeting of the Committee has been closed because the subject to be discussed deals with classified information, counsel accompanying a witness before the Committee must possess the requisite security clearance and provide proof of such clearance to the Committee at least 24 hours prior to the meeting at which the counsel intends to be present.

(3) Failure to Obtain Counsel. Any witness who is unable to obtain counsel should notify the Committee. If such notification occurs at least 24 hours prior to the witness' appearance before the Committee, the Committee shall then endeavor to obtain voluntary counsel for the witness. Failure to obtain counsel, however, will not excuse the witness from appearing and testifying.

(4) Conduct of Counsel for Witnesses. Counsel for witnesses appearing before the Committee shall conduct themselves ethically and professionally at all times in their dealings with the Committee.

(A) A majority of members of the Committee may, should circumstances warrant, find that counsel for a witness before the Committee failed to conduct himself or herself in an ethical or professional manner.

(B) Upon such finding, counsel may be subject to appropriate disciplinary action.

(5) Temporary Removal of Counsel. The Chair may remove counsel during any proceeding before the Committee for failure to act in an ethical and professional manner.

(6) Committee Reversal. A majority of the members of the Committee may vote to overturn the decision of the Chair to remove counsel for a witness.

(7) Role of Counsel for Witness.

(A) Counsel for a witness:

(i) Shall not be allowed to examine witnesses before the Committee, either directly or through cross-examination; but

(ii) May submit questions in writing to the Committee that counsel wishes propounded to a witness; or

(iii) May suggest, in writing to the Committee, the presentation of other evidence or the calling of other witnesses.

(B) The Committee may make such use of any such questions, or suggestions, as the Committee deems appropriate.

(f) Statements by Witnesses.

(1) Generally. A witness may make a statement, which shall be brief and relevant, at the beginning and at the conclusion of the witness' testimony.

(2) Length. Each such statement shall not exceed five minutes in length, unless otherwise determined by the Chair.

(3) Submission to the Committee. Any witness desiring to submit a written statement for the record of the proceeding shall submit a copy of the statement to the Chief Clerk of the Committee.

(A) Such statements shall ordinarily be submitted no less than 48 hours in advance of the witness' appearance before the Committee and shall be submitted in written and electronic format.

(B) In the event that the hearing was called with less than 24 hours notice, written statements should be submitted as soon as practicable prior to the hearing.

(g) Objections and Ruling.

(1) Generally. Any objection raised by a witness, or counsel for the witness, shall be ruled upon by the Chair, and such ruling shall be the ruling of the Committee.

(2) Committee Action. A ruling by the Chair may be overturned upon a majority vote of the Committee.

(h) Transcripts.

(1) Transcript Required. A transcript shall be made of the testimony of each witness appearing before the Committee during any hearing of the Committee.

(2) Opportunity to Inspect. Any witness testifying before the Committee shall be given a reasonable opportunity to inspect the transcript of the hearing, and may be accompanied by counsel to determine whether such testimony was correctly transcribed. Such counsel:

(A) May review the transcript only if he or she has the appropriate security clearances necessary to review any classified aspect of the transcript; and

(B) Should, to the extent possible, be the same counsel that was present for such classified testimony.

(3) Corrections.

(A) Pursuant to Rule XI of the House Rules, any corrections the witness desires to make in a transcript shall be limited to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(B) Corrections may not be made to change the substance of the testimony.

(C) Such corrections shall be submitted in writing to the Committee within 7 days after the transcript is made available to the witnesses.

(D) Any questions arising with respect to such corrections shall be decided by the Chair.

(4) Copy for the Witness. At the request of the witness, any portion of the witness' testimony given in executive session shall be made available to that witness if that testimony is: subsequently quoted or intended to be made part of a public record. Such testimony shall be made available to the witness at the witness' expense.

(i) Requests to Testify.

(1) Generally. The Committee will consider requests to testify on any matter or measure pending before the Committee.

(2) Recommendations for Additional Evidence. Any person who believes that testimony, other evidence, or commentary, presented at a public hearing may tend to affect adversely that person's reputation may submit to the Committee, in writing:

(A) A request to appear personally before the Committee;

(B) A sworn statement of facts relevant to the testimony, evidence, or commentary; or

(C) Proposed questions for the cross-examination of other witnesses.

(3) Committee Discretion. The Committee may take those actions it deems appropriate with respect to such requests.

(j) Contempt Procedures. Citations for contempt of Congress shall be forwarded to the House only if:

(1) Reasonable notice is provided to all members of the Committee of a meeting to be held to consider any such contempt recommendations;

(2) The Committee has met and considered the contempt allegations;

(3) The subject of the allegations was afforded an opportunity to state either in writing or in person, why he or she should not be held in contempt; and

(4) The Committee agreed by majority vote to forward the citation recommendations to the House.

(k) Release of Name of Witness.

(1) Generally. At the request of a witness scheduled to be heard by the Committee, the name of that witness shall not be released publicly prior to, or after, the witness' appearance before the Committee.

(2) Exceptions. Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Chair may authorize the release to the public of the name of any witness scheduled to appear before the Committee.

9. INVESTIGATIONS

(a) Commencing Investigations. The Committee shall conduct investigations only if approved by the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

(b) Conducting Investigations. An authorized investigation may be conducted by members of the Committee or Committee Staff designated by the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, to undertake any such investigation.

10. SUBPOENAS

(a) Generally. All subpoenas shall be authorized by the Chair of the full Committee, upon consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, or by vote of the Committee.

(b) Subpoena Contents. Any subpoena authorized by the Chair of the full Committee, or the Committee, may compel:

(1) The attendance of witnesses and testimony before the Committee; or

(2) The production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other tangible item.

(c) Signing of Subpoena. A subpoena authorized by the Chair of the full Committee, or the Committee, may be signed by the Chair, or by any member of the Committee designated to do so by the Committee.

(d) Subpoena Service. A subpoena authorized by the Chair of the full Committee, or the Committee, may be served by any person designated to do so by the Chair.

(e) Other Requirements. Each subpoena shall have attached thereto a copy of these rules.

11. COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) Definition. For the purpose of these rules, "Committee Staff" or "Staff of the Committee" means:

(1) Employees of the Committee;

(2) Consultants to the Committee;

(3) Employees of other Government agencies detailed to the Committee; or

(4) Any other person engaged by contract, or otherwise, to perform services for, or at the request of, the Committee.

(b) Appointment of Committee Staff and Security Requirements.

(1) Chair's Authority. Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Committee Staff shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Chair and shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Chair.

(2) Staff Assistance to Minority Membership. Except as provided in paragraphs (3) and (4), and except as otherwise provided by Committee Rules, the Committee Staff provided to the Minority Party members of the Committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of such member.

(3) Security Clearance Required. All offers of employment for prospective Committee Staff positions shall be contingent upon:

(A) The results of a background investigation; and

(B) A determination by the Chair that requirements for the appropriate security clearances have been met.

(4) Security Requirements. Notwithstanding paragraph (2), the Chair shall supervise and direct the Committee Staff with respect to the security and nondisclosure of classified information. Committee Staff shall comply with requirements necessary to ensure the security and nondisclosure of classified information as determined by the Chair in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

12. LIMIT ON DISCUSSION OF CLASSIFIED WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

(a) Prohibition.

(1) Generally. Except as otherwise provided by these rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives, members of the Committee and Committee Staff shall not at any time, either during that person's tenure as a member of the Committee or as Committee Staff, or anytime thereafter, discuss or disclose, or cause to be discussed or disclosed:

(A) The classified substance of the work of the Committee;

(B) Any information received by the Committee in executive session;

(C) Any classified information received by the Committee from any source; or

(D) The substance of any hearing that was closed to the public pursuant to these rules or the Rules of the House.

(2) Non-Disclosure in Proceedings.

(A) Members of the Committee and the Committee Staff shall not discuss either the substance or procedure of the work of the Committee with any person not a member of the Committee or the Committee Staff in connection with any proceeding, judicial or otherwise, either during the person's tenure as a member of the Committee, or of the Committee Staff, or at any time thereafter, except as directed by the Committee in accordance with the Rules of the House and these rules.

(B) In the event of the termination of the Committee, members and Committee Staff shall be governed in these matters in a manner determined by the House concerning discussions of the classified work of the Committee.

(3) Exceptions.

(A) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a)(1), members of the Committee

and the Committee Staff may discuss and disclose those matters described in subsection (a)(1) with:

(i) Members and staff of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence designated by the chair of that committee;

(ii) The chairmen and ranking minority members of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and staff of those committees designated by the chairmen of those committees; and,

(iii) The chair and ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the House Committee on Appropriations and staff of that subcommittee as designated by the chair of that subcommittee, or Members of that subcommittee designated by the Chair pursuant to clause (g)(1) of Committee Rule 12.

(B) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a)(1), members of the Committee and the Committee Staff may discuss and disclose only that budget-related information necessary to facilitate the enactment of the annual defense authorization bill with the chairmen and ranking minority members of the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services and the staff of those committees as designated by the chairmen of those committees.

(C) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a)(1), members of the Committee and the Committee Staff may discuss with and disclose to the chair and ranking minority member of a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee with jurisdiction over an agency or program within the National Intelligence Program (NIP), and staff of that subcommittee as designated by the chair of that subcommittee, only that budget-related information necessary to facilitate the enactment of an appropriations bill within which is included an appropriation for an agency or program within the NIP.

(D) The Chair may, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, upon the written request to the Chair from the Inspector General of an element of the Intelligence Community, grant access to Committee transcripts or documents that are relevant to an investigation of an allegation of possible false testimony or other inappropriate conduct before the Committee, or that are otherwise relevant to the Inspector General's investigation.

(E) Upon the written request of the head of an Intelligence Community element, the Chair may, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, make available Committee briefing or hearing transcripts to that element for review by that element if a representative of that element testified, presented information to the Committee, or was present at the briefing or hearing the transcript of which is requested for review.

(F) Members and Committee Staff may discuss and disclose such matters as otherwise directed by the Committee.

(4) Records of Closed Proceedings. Any records or notes taken by any person memorializing material otherwise prohibited from disclosure by members of the Committee and Committee staff under these rules, including information received in executive session and the substance of any hearing or briefing that was closed to the public, shall remain Committee material subject to these rules and may not be publicly discussed, disclosed, or caused to be publicly discussed or disclosed, unless authorized by the Committee consistent with these rules.

(b) Non-Disclosure Agreement.

(1) Generally. All Committee Staff must, before joining the Committee Staff, agree in writing, as a condition of employment, not to divulge or cause to be divulged any classified information which comes into such person's possession while a member of the Com-

mittee Staff, to any person not a member of the Committee or the Committee Staff, except as authorized by the Committee in accordance with the Rules of the House and these Rules.

(2) Other Requirements. In the event of the termination of the Committee, members and Committee Staff must follow any determination by the House of Representatives with respect to the protection of classified information received while a member of the Committee or as Committee Staff.

(3) Requests for Testimony of Staff.

(A) All Committee Staff must, as a condition of employment, agree in writing to notify the Committee immediately of any request for testimony received while a member of the Committee Staff, or at any time thereafter, concerning any classified information received by such person while a member of the Committee Staff.

(B) Committee Staff shall not disclose, in response to any such request for testimony, any such classified information, except as authorized by the Committee in accordance with the Rules of the House and these rules.

(C) In the event of the termination of the Committee, Committee Staff will be subject to any determination made by the House of Representatives with respect to any requests for testimony involving classified information received while a member of the Committee Staff.

13. CLASSIFIED MATERIAL

(a) Receipt of Classified Information.

(1) Generally. In the case of any information that has been classified under established security procedures and submitted to the Committee by any source, the Committee shall receive such classified information as executive session material.

(2) Staff Receipt of Classified Materials. For purposes of receiving classified information, the Committee Staff is authorized to accept information on behalf of the Committee.

(b) Non-Disclosure of Classified Information. Any classified information received by the Committee, from any source, shall not be disclosed to any person not a member of the Committee or the Committee Staff, or otherwise released, except as authorized by the Committee in accordance with the Rules of the House and these rules.

(c) Exception for Non-Exclusive Materials.

(1) Non-Exclusive Materials. Any materials provided to the Committee by the executive branch, if provided in whole or in part for the purpose of review by members who are not members of the Committee, shall be received or held by the Committee on a non-exclusive basis. Classified information provided to the Committee shall be considered to have been provided on an exclusive basis unless the executive branch provides a specific, written statement to the contrary.

(2) Access for Non-Committee Members. In the case of materials received on a non-exclusive basis, the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may grant non-Committee members access to such materials in accordance with the requirements of Rule 14(f)(4), notwithstanding paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of Rule 14.

14. PROCEDURES RELATED TO HANDLING OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

(a) Security Measures.

(1) Strict Security. The Committee's offices shall operate under strict security procedures administered by the Director of Security and Registry of the Committee under the direct supervision of the Staff Director.

(2) U.S. Capitol Police Presence Required. At least one U.S. Capitol Police officer shall be on duty at all times outside the entrance to Committee offices to control entry of all persons to such offices.

(3) Identification Required. Before entering the Committee's offices all persons shall identify themselves to the U.S. Capitol Police officer described in paragraph (2) and to a member of the Committee or Committee Staff.

(4) Maintenance of Classified Materials. Classified documents shall be segregated and maintained in approved security storage locations.

(5) Examination of Classified Materials. Classified documents in the Committee's possession shall be examined in an appropriately secure manner.

(6) Prohibition on Removal of Classified Materials. Removal of any classified document from the Committee's offices is strictly prohibited, except as provided by these rules.

(7) Exception. Notwithstanding the prohibition set forth in paragraph (6), a classified document, or copy thereof, may be removed from the Committee's offices in furtherance of official Committee business. Appropriate security procedures shall govern the handling of any classified documents removed from the Committee's offices.

(b) Access to Classified Information by Members. All members of the Committee shall at all times have access to all classified papers and other material received by the Committee from any source.

(c) Need-to-know.

(1) Generally. Committee Staff shall have access to any classified information provided to the Committee on a strict "need-to-know" basis, as determined by the Committee, and under the Committee's direction by the Staff Director.

(2) Appropriate Clearances Required. Committee Staff must have the appropriate clearances prior to any access to compartmented information.

(d) Oath.

(1) Requirement. Before any member of the Committee, or the Committee Staff, shall have access to classified information, the following oath shall be executed:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will not disclose or cause to be disclosed any classified information received in the course of my service on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, except when authorized to do so by the Committee or the House of Representatives."

(2) Copy. A copy of such executed oath shall be retained in the files of the Committee.

(e) Registry.

(1) Generally. The Committee shall maintain a registry that:

(A) Provides a brief description of the content of all classified documents provided to the Committee by the executive branch that remain in the possession of the Committee; and

(B) Lists by number all such documents.

(2) Designation by the Staff Director. The Staff Director shall designate a member of the Committee Staff to be responsible for the organization and daily maintenance of such registry.

(3) Availability. Such registry shall be available to all members of the Committee and Committee Staff.

(f) Requests by Members of Other Committees. Pursuant to the Rules of the House, members who are not members of the Committee may be granted access to such classified transcripts, records, data, charts, or files of the Committee, and be admitted on a non-participatory basis to classified hearings of the Committee involving discussions of classified material in the following manner:

(1) Written Notification Required. Members who desire to examine classified materials in the possession of the Committee, or to attend Committee hearings or briefings on

a non-participatory basis, must notify the Chief Clerk of the Committee in writing. Such notification shall state with specificity the justification for the request and the need for access.

(2) Committee Consideration. The Committee shall consider each such request by non-Committee members at the earliest practicable opportunity. The Committee shall determine, by record vote, what action it deems appropriate in light of all of the circumstances of each request. In its determination, the Committee shall consider:

(A) The sensitivity to the national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States of the information sought;

(B) The likelihood of its being directly or indirectly disclosed;

(C) The jurisdictional interest of the member making the request; and

(D) Such other concerns, constitutional or otherwise, as may affect the public interest of the United States.

(3) Committee Action. After consideration of the member's request, the Committee may take any action it deems appropriate under the circumstances, including but not limited to:

(A) Approving the request, in whole or part;

(B) Denying the request;

(C) Providing the requested information or material in a different form than that sought by the member; or

(D) Making the requested information or material available to all members of the House.

(4) Requirements for Access by Non-Committee Members. Prior to a non-Committee member being given access to classified information pursuant to this subsection, the requesting member shall:

(A) Provide the Committee a copy of the oath executed by such member pursuant to House Rule XXIII, clause 13; and

(B) Agree in writing not to divulge any classified information provided to the member, pursuant to this subsection, to any person not a member of the Committee or the Committee Staff, except as otherwise authorized by the Committee in accordance with the Rules of the House and these rules.

(5) Consultation Authorized. When considering a member's request, the Committee may consult the Director of National Intelligence and such other officials it considers necessary.

(6) Finality of Committee Decision.

(A) Should the member making such a request disagree with the Committee's determination with respect to that request, or any part thereof, that member must notify the Committee in writing of such disagreement.

(B) The Committee shall subsequently consider the matter and decide, by record vote, what further action or recommendation, if any, the Committee will take.

(g) Admission of Designated Members of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (f), the Chair may admit no more than three designated Members of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations to classified hearings and briefings of the Committee involving discussions of classified material. Such Members may also be granted access to classified transcripts, records, data, charts or files of the Committee incident to such attendance.

(1) Designation. The Chair may designate three Members of the Subcommittee to be eligible for admission in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, of whom not more than two may be from the same political party. Such designation shall be effective for the entire Congress.

(2) Admission. The Chair may determine whether to admit designated Members at each hearing or briefing of the Committee involving discussions of classified material. If the Chair admits any of the designated Members to a particular hearing or briefing, all three of the designated Members shall be admitted to that hearing or briefing. Designated Members shall not be counted for quorum purposes and shall not have a vote in any meeting.

(3) Requirements for Access. Prior to being given access to classified information pursuant to this subsection, a designated Member shall:

(A) Provide the Committee a copy of the oath executed by such Member pursuant to House Rule XXIII, clause 13; and

(B) Agree in writing not to divulge any classified information provided to the Member pursuant to this subsection to any person not a Member of the Committee or a designated Member or authorized Staff of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, except as otherwise authorized by the Committee in accordance with the Rules of the House and these rules.

(h) Advising the House or Other Committees. Pursuant to Section 501 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413), and to the Rules of the House, the Committee shall call to the attention of the House, or to any other appropriate committee of the House, those matters requiring the attention of the House, or such other committee, on the basis of the following provisions:

(1) By Request of Committee Member. At the request of any member of the Committee to call to the attention of the House, or any other committee, executive session material in the Committee's possession, the Committee shall meet at the earliest practicable opportunity to consider that request.

(2) Committee Consideration of Request. The Committee shall consider the following factors, among any others it deems appropriate:

(A) The effect of the matter in question on the national defense or the foreign relations of the United States;

(B) Whether the matter in question involves sensitive intelligence sources and methods;

(C) Whether the matter in question otherwise raises questions affecting the national interest; and

(D) Whether the matter in question affects matters within the jurisdiction of another Committee of the House.

(3) Views of Other Committees. In examining such factors, the Committee may seek the opinion of members of the Committee appointed from standing committees of the House with jurisdiction over the matter in question, or submissions from such other committees.

(4) Other Advice. The Committee may, during its deliberations on such requests, seek the advice of any executive branch official.

(i) Reasonable Opportunity to Examine Materials. Before the Committee makes any decision regarding any request for access to any classified information in its possession, or a proposal to bring any matter to the attention of the House or another committee, members of the Committee shall have a reasonable opportunity to examine all pertinent testimony, documents, or other materials in the Committee's possession that may inform their decision on the question.

(j) Notification to the House. The Committee may bring a matter to the attention of the House when, after consideration of the factors set forth in this rule, it considers the matter in question so grave that it requires the attention of all members of the House, and time is of the essence, or for any reason the Committee finds compelling.

(k) Method of Disclosure to the House.

(1) Should the Committee decide by record vote that a matter requires the attention of the House as described in subsection (i), it shall make arrangements to notify the House promptly.

(2) In such cases, the Committee shall consider whether:

(A) To request an immediate secret session of the House (with time equally divided between the Majority and the Minority); or

(B) To publicly disclose the matter in question pursuant to clause 11(g) of House Rule X.

(1) Requirement to Protect Sources and Methods. In bringing a matter to the attention of the House, or another committee, the Committee, with due regard for the protection of intelligence sources and methods, shall take all necessary steps to safeguard materials or information relating to the matter in question.

(m) Availability of Information to Other Committees. The Committee, having determined that a matter shall be brought to the attention of another committee, shall ensure that such matter, including all classified information related to that matter, is promptly made available to the chair and ranking minority member of such other committee.

(n) Provision of Materials. The Director of Security and Registry for the Committee shall provide a copy of these rules, and the applicable portions of the Rules of the House of Representatives governing the handling of classified information, along with those materials determined by the Committee to be made available to such other committee of the House or non-Committee member.

(o) Ensuring Clearances and Secure Storage. The Director of Security and Registry shall ensure that such other committee or non-Committee member receiving such classified materials may properly store classified materials in a manner consistent with all governing rules, regulations, policies, procedures, and statutes.

(p) Log. The Director of Security and Registry for the Committee shall maintain a written record identifying the particular classified document or material provided to such other committee or non-Committee member, the reasons agreed upon by the Committee for approving such transmission, and the name of the committee or non-Committee member receiving such document or material.

(q) Miscellaneous Requirements.

(1) Staff Director's Additional Authority. The Staff Director is further empowered to provide for such additional measures, which he or she deems necessary, to protect such classified information authorized by the Committee to be provided to such other committee or non-Committee member.

(2) Notice to Originating Agency. In the event that the Committee authorizes the disclosure of classified information provided to the Committee by an agency of the executive branch to a non-Committee member or to another committee, the Chair may notify the providing agency of the Committee's action prior to the transmission of such classified information.

15. LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

(a) Generally. The Chief Clerk, under the direction of the Staff Director, shall maintain a printed calendar that lists:

(1) The legislative measures introduced and referred to the Committee;

(2) The status of such measures; and

(3) Such other matters that the Committee may require.

(b) Revisions to the Calendar. The calendar shall be revised from time to time to show pertinent changes.

(c) Availability. A copy of each such revision shall be furnished to each member, upon request.

(d) Consultation with Appropriate Government Entities. Unless otherwise directed by the Committee, legislative measures referred to the Committee may be referred by the Chief Clerk to the appropriate department or agency of the Government for reports thereon.

16. COMMITTEE WEBSITE

The Chair shall maintain an official Committee web site for the purpose of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee members and other members of the House.

17. MOTIONS TO GO TO CONFERENCE

In accordance with clause 2(a) of House Rule XI, the Chair is authorized and directed to offer a privileged motion to go to conference under clause 1 of House Rule XXII whenever the Chair considers it appropriate.

18. COMMITTEE TRAVEL

(a) Authority. The Chair may authorize members and Committee Staff to travel on Committee business.

(b) Requests.

(1) Member Requests. Members requesting authorization for such travel shall state the purpose and length of the trip, and shall submit such request directly to the Chair.

(2) Committee Staff Requests. Committee Staff requesting authorization for such travel shall state the purpose and length of the trip, and shall submit such request through their supervisors to the Staff Director and the Chair.

(c) Notification to Members.

(1) Generally. Members shall be notified of all foreign travel of Committee Staff not accompanying a member.

(2) Content. All members are to be advised, prior to the commencement of such travel, of its length, nature, and purpose.

(d) Trip Reports.

(1) Generally. A full report of all issues discussed during any travel shall be submitted to the Chief Clerk of the Committee within a reasonable period of time following the completion of such trip.

(2) Availability of Reports. Such report shall be:

(A) Available for review by any member or appropriately cleared Committee Staff; and

(B) Considered executive session material for purposes of these rules.

(e) Limitations on Travel.

(1) Generally. The Chair is not authorized to permit travel on Committee business of Committee Staff who have not satisfied the requirements of subsection (d) of this rule.

(2) Exception. The Chair may authorize Committee Staff to travel on Committee business, notwithstanding the requirements of subsections (d) and (e) of this rule.

(A) At the specific request of a member of the Committee; or

(B) In the event there are circumstances beyond the control of the Committee Staff hindering compliance with such requirements.

(f) Definitions. For purposes of this rule the term "reasonable period of time" means:

(1) No later than 60 days after returning from a foreign trip; and

(2) No later than 30 days after returning from a domestic trip.

19. DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS

(a) Generally. The Committee shall immediately consider whether disciplinary action shall be taken in the case of any member of the Committee Staff alleged to have failed to conform to any rule of the House of Representatives or to these rules.

(b) Exception. In the event the House of Representatives is:

(1) In a recess period in excess of 3 days; or

(2) Has adjourned sine die; the Chair of the full Committee, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may take such immediate disciplinary actions deemed necessary.

(c) Available Actions. Such disciplinary action may include immediate dismissal from the Committee Staff.

(d) Notice to Members. All members shall be notified as soon as practicable, either by facsimile transmission or regular mail, of any disciplinary action taken by the Chair pursuant to subsection (b).

(e) Reconsideration of Chair's Actions. A majority of the members of the full Committee may vote to overturn the decision of the Chair to take disciplinary action pursuant to subsection (b).

20. BROADCASTING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Whenever any hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee is open to the public, a majority of the Committee may permit that hearing or meeting to be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, subject to the provisions and in accordance with the spirit of the purposes enumerated in the Rules of the House.

21. COMMITTEE RECORDS TRANSFERRED TO THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

(a) Generally. The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Notice of Withholding. The Chair shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to the Rules of the House of Representatives, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the full Committee for a determination of the question of public availability on the written request of any member of the Committee.

22. CHANGES IN RULES

(a) Generally. These rules may be modified, amended, or repealed by vote of the full Committee.

(b) Notice of Proposed Changes. A notice, in writing, of the proposed change shall be given to each member at least 48 hours prior to any meeting at which action on the proposed rule change is to be taken.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 166. An act to designate the new Interstate Route 70 bridge over the Mississippi River connecting St. Louis, Missouri and southwestern Illinois as the "Stan Musial Memorial Bridge"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 13, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

652. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Carter F. Ham, United States Army, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

653. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to The Milestone Aviation Group Limited of Dublin, Ireland pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

654. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's semi-annual Implementation Report on Energy Conservation Standards Activities, pursuant to Section 141 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

655. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's FY 2011 annual performance report to Congress required by the Prescription Drug User Fee Act of 1992 (PDUFA), as amended, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 379g note; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

656. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-05, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

657. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Editorial Correction to the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No.: 120320203-2295-03] (RIN: 0694-AF63) received February 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

658. A letter from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for FY 2012 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

659. A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a copy of the Institution's audited financial statement for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

660. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GA 8 Airvan (Pty) Ltd Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1007; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-031-AD; Amendment 39-17274; AD 2012-24-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

661. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0075; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-104-AD; Amendment 39-17336; AD 2013-03-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

662. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1223; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-154-AD; Amendment 39-17348; AD 2013-03-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

663. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DG Flugzeugbau GmbH Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1250; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-043-AD; Amendment 39-17344; AD 2013-03-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

664. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0725; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-207-AD; Amendment 39-17343; AD 2013-03-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

665. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30883; Amdt. No. 3518] received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

666. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Lincoln, ME [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0764; Airspace Docket No. 12-ANE-12] received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

667. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30883; Amdt. No. 3517] received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

668. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1002; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-052-AD; Amendment 39-17346; AD 2013-03-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

669. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Ontonagon, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1404; Airspace Docket No.: 11-AGL-30] received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

670. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting First Quarterly Report of FY 2013 under The Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2008; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 803. A bill to reform and strengthen the workforce investment system of the Nation to put Americans back to work and make the United States more competi-

tive in the 21st century, with an amendment (Rept. 113-14, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 107. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 890) to prohibit waivers relating to compliance with the work requirements for the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, and for other purposes. (Rept. 113-15). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on the Judiciary, Agriculture, Veterans' Affairs, Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration H.R. 803 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. HURT, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. CONAWAY):

H.R. 1062. A bill to improve the consideration by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the costs and benefits of its regulations and orders; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 1063. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an assessment of the capability of the Nation to meet our current and future demands for the minerals critical to United States manufacturing and agricultural competitiveness and economic and national security in a time of expanding resource nationalism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. BARR, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. MATHE-SON, Mr. LANCE, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 1064. A bill to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr.

DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 1065. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the Federal tax on fuels by the amount of any increase in the rate of tax on such fuel by the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 1066. A bill to amend the Indian Arts and Crafts Act to clarify the definition of Indian and Indian organization for the purposes of that Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. GOODLATTE (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1067. A bill to make revisions in title 36, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1068. A bill to enact title 54, United States Code, "National Park Service and Related Programs", as positive law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1069. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to implement a drug screening and testing program for applicants for and recipients of assistance under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 1070. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening; 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. HANNA (for himself, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 1071. A bill to specify the size of the precious-metal blanks that will be used in the production of the National Baseball Hall of Fame commemorative coins; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 1072. A bill to require that the Federal Government procure from the private sector the goods and services necessary for the operations and management of certain Government agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 1073. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for protection of maritime navigation and prevention of nuclear terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROE of

Tennessee, Mr. MAFFEI, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 1074. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes and diabetes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, and Mrs. CAPITO):

H.R. 1075. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Defense to provide support for Boy Scout Jamborees; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALL (for himself and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H.R. 1076. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for savings to the Federal Government by permitting pass-through funding for State authorized public entity health benefits pools; 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. HUIZENGA of Michigan (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 1077. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. JONES, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HALL, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 1078. A bill to make participation in the American Community Survey voluntary, except with respect to certain basic questions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 1079. A bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice to eliminate the authority of the convening authority to modify the findings and sentence of a court-martial as a matter of command prerogative involving the sole discretion of the convening authority; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 1080. A bill to amend the Sikes Act to promote the use of cooperative agreements under such Act for land management related to Department of Defense readiness activities and to amend title 10, United States Code, to facilitate interagency cooperation in conservation programs to avoid or reduce adverse impacts on military readiness activities; to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 1081. A bill to require that all foreign terrorists with links to terrorist networks

who attack the United States or its Government be considered enemy combatants to be tried by military tribunals instead of civilian courts; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. BUCSHON (for himself, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 1082. A bill to provide that compensation of the President shall be held in escrow upon failure to submit his budget in a timely manner; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 1083. A bill to amend the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 to establish prohibitions to prevent the use of an unmanned aircraft system as a weapon while operating in the national airspace system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1084. A bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Muhammad Ali in recognition of his contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 1085. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to extend to 2025 the production certificate program that allows refunds of duties on certain articles produced in United States insular possessions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 1086. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the taxation of income of controlled foreign corporations attributable to imported property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 1087. A bill to provide for the adjustment of status of certain nationals of Liberia to that of lawful permanent residents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 1088. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to develop a rule that does not allow Federal funds under the disadvantaged business enterprise program to be used for any enterprise that is no longer eligible under such program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, 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. HONDA (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of

California, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 1089. A bill to stimulate collaboration with respect to, and provide for coordination and coherence of, the Nation's science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education initiatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 1090. A bill to establish an Elementary Educator Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Content Coach program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JORDAN (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BARR, Mr. COLE, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. JONES, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HALL, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BARTON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MICA, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GARRETT, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BOUTSTANY, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. KELLY, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 1091. A bill to implement equal protection under the 14th article of amendment to the Constitution for the right to life of each born and preborn human person; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 1092. A bill to designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the "Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 1093. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to prohibit airplane passengers from bringing aboard a passenger aircraft any item that was prohibited as of March 1, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MORAN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LANCE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. JONES, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 1094. A bill to prohibit the sale or transport of equines and equine parts in interstate or foreign commerce for human consumption; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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. MILLER of Florida (for himself and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H.R. 1095. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to transfer unclaimed money recovered at airport security checkpoints to nonprofit organizations that provide places of rest and recuperation at airports for members of the Armed Forces and their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 1096. A bill to provide funds to State courts for the provision of legal representation to parents and legal guardians with respect to child welfare cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. COLE, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. HUELSKAMP):

H.R. 1097. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to ensure that on-duty time does not include waiting time at a natural gas or oil well site for certain commercial motor vehicle operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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

H.R. 1098. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to traumatic brain injury and to trauma research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 1099. A bill to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. RUSH, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. TONKO, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 1100. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve mental and behavioral health services on college campuses; 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. SIRES:

H.R. 1101. A bill to strengthen America's financial infrastructure, by requiring prefunding for catastrophe losses using private insurance premium dollars to better prepare and protect homeowners from natural catastrophes and to protect taxpayers from massive bailouts, and to provide dedicated funding from insurance premiums to improve catastrophe preparedness, loss prevention and mitigation, and to improve the availability and affordability of private market homeowners insurance coverage for catastrophic events, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Ms. CATOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MICHAUD, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1102. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require

the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate covered part D drug prices on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries; 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. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1103. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide that Alexander Creek, Alaska, is and shall be recognized as an eligible Native village under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Ms. CHU, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KEATING, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.J. Res. 34. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to restore the rights of the American people that were taken away by the Supreme Court's decision in the Citizens United case and related decisions, to protect the integrity of our elections, and to limit the corrosive influence of money in our democratic process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H. Res. 106. A resolution calling for the protection of religious minority rights and freedoms in the Arab world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. WATT):

H. Res. 108. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the landmark case Gideon v. Wainwright, in which the Supreme Court held that counsel must be provided to indigent defendants in all felony cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H. Res. 109. A resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H. Res. 110. A resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to provide members of the public with Internet access to certain Congressional Research Service publications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STEWART (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. SALMON):

H. Res. 111. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should refrain from any further taxpayer-funded vacations until the White House can be re-opened for public tours; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 1062.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 (“The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States”), 3 (“To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes”), and 18 (“To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof”).

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 1063.

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

Article IV, Section 3

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 1064.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 1065.

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

Tenth Amendment to 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.”

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 1066.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 1067.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. This legislation makes revisions in title 36, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements. Making revisions to the United States Code is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 1068.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers

on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. This legislation restates certain existing laws as part of a positive law title of the United States Code. Enacting titles of the United States Code is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1069.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 1070.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 1071.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 states: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures."

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 1072.

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

Article 1, Section 8—this bill regulates Commerce among the several states.

Amendment V—the bill assures that citizens' liberty and property (their businesses and livelihood) are not deprived, that the government does not take property (market share, potential for profit and livelihood) without just compensation.

Amendment X—Nothing in the Constitution authorizes the Federal government to do anything other than those things enumerated (coin money, enter into treaties, conduct a Census—which are inherently governmental). Thus, under Amendment X, the right to carry out commercial activities is reserved to the people. Note that the Constitution authorizes the Post Office. The bill exempts the Postal Service.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1073.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, of the Constitution

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, of the Constitution

Article II, Section 2, Clause 2, of the Constitution

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 1074.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 1075.

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

According to Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to raise and support armies, provide and maintain a Navy and make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 1076.

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 to:

1. regulate commerce . . . among the several states . . . as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, and

2. provide for the general welfare of the United States as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 1077.

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

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1078.

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

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

Amendment IV—The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, and papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 1079.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 1080.

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

Clause 14 of section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 1081.

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

The constitutional authority on which this resolution rests is the power of Congress as enumerated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUCHON:

H.R. 1082.

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

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1083.

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

The attached language falls within Congress' delegated authority to legislate interstate commerce, found in Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution. Further, Congress' authority to authorize the FAA to regulate airspace within the U.S. has been found to be within its authority under the General Welfare clause of the U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, clause 1.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1084.

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

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 1085.

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

"Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress the au-

thority to make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States and Article 1, section 7 which provides that all Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 1086.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 1087.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, 4, and 18

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 1088.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 1089.

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

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 1090.

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

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. JORDAN:

H.R. 1091.

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

This legislation makes clear that human life begins at the moment of conception and, therefore, the unborn are entitled to the same rights and protections afforded to all American citizens under the U.S. Constitution. In affirming human life begins at conception, the unborn are granted the right to due process under Section 1 of the 14th Amendment which explicitly states, "No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The Life at Conception Act allows for constitutional protection for the unborn that they not "be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law" afforded under the 5th Amendment.

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 1092.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, clause 2 (related to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States) of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1093.

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

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 1094.

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

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution which reads: The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1095.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 1096.

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

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 1097.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 1098.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 1099.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

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

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1100.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SIRE:

H.R. 1101.

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

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1102.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the power to make 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.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1103.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.J. Res. 34.

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

Article V of the Constitution: The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 22: Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 45: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 61: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 62: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 93: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 104: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 129: Ms. EDWARDS and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 139: Ms. BASS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CHU, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KIND, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUILLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 140: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 147: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 148: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 149: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 164: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 176: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 177: Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 182: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 184: Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 198: Mr. MORAN and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 200: Mr. PAYNE and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 207: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 217: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 239: Mr. DAINES and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 258: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 276: Mr. GRIMM, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 282: Mr. MESSER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 283: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 288: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 292: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 324: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. COLE, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POMPEO, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH

of Texas, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 351: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 357: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 366: Mr. CLAY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 411: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 416: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 418: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 419: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 433: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 435: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 447: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 452: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 460: Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 481: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 485: Mr. SIRE, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 490: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 497: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 503: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 505: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 506: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 507: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 519: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HOLT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 523: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 525: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 528: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 530: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 532: Mr. MORAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WATT, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 541: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 543: Mrs. LOWEY and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 544: Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 565: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 569: Mr. LANCE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 570: Mr. LANCE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 588: Mr. BARBER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. WALZ, Mr. MATHESON, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 594: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 599: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 627: Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 629: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 630: Ms. LEE of California, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 636: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SABLON, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 647: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HANNA, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 649: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CARDENAS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

- H.R. 661: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 662: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 664: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 666: Mr. KEATING, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 671: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 673: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 677: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 688: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 690: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 693: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 698: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 702: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 714: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 721: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HALL, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 725: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 726: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 732: Mr. DENHAM and Mr. GOWDY.
H.R. 740: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 742: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 749: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. PITTENGER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FLEMING, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 755: Mr. BARR, Mr. WATT, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. MARINO, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 756: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 761: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GRIMM, and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 762: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 766: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 772: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 785: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 794: Mr. RUSH and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 798: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 803: Mr. FLORES and Mr. KELLY.
H.R. 805: Mr. KLINE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 809: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 810: Mr. BUSHON.
H.R. 811: Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 813: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 814: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 823: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 833: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. LONG, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. KLINE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 841: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 842: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 846: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 847: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. HAHN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CLAY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 850: Mr. OWENS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BARBER, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 853: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 861: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 867: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 874: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FARR and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 875: Mr. PETRI and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 900: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 904: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 914: Mr. JONES and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 915: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 918: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HOLT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PETRI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 919: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 920: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 921: Mr. ENYART and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 931: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 938: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. POSEY, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HANNA, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 940: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MARINO, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 946: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 955: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. CLARKE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 958: Ms. MOORE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 960: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. CLARKE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 961: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 963: Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 966: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 967: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 974: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 976: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 978: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 985: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 997: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 1000: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1002: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1005: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. HALL.
H.R. 1014: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 1015: Mr. POSEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1017: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1018: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1019: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1020: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 1024: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. KIND, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 1026: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 1029: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1030: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1035: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1037: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1039: Mr. LANCE, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1040: Mr. JONES.
H.J. Res. 11: Mr. ROKITA.
H.J. Res. 28: Mr. WALBERG.
H. Con. Res. 21: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. LEWIS.
H. Res. 10: Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Res. 30: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BERA of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. KEATING.
H. Res. 71: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. GERLACH.
H. Res. 72: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. STIVERS.
H. Res. 76: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H. Res. 87: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. LANCE.
H. Res. 89: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H. Res. 91: Mr. MCCAUL.
H. Res. 94: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MAFFEI, and Mr. Andrews.
H. Res. 95: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H. Res. 98: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. LATTA.
H. Res. 101: Mr. ISRAEL.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

6. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Aventura, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 2013-08 supporting a Legislative Proposal designed to reduce gun violence; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 12, 2013

No. 35

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable WILLIAM M. COWAN, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray:

Eternal God, we place our hopes in You for our future is in Your hands. Strong deliverer, be our shelter in these challenging times. Lord, give our lawmakers the understanding, humility, and clarity they need to keep America strong. May they be good stewards of the generous gifts you have showered upon our land, laboring valiantly to assure that justice and righteousness will prevail. Help them to commit their plans to You, believing that You know what is best for our Nation and world. We pray in Your gracious Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable WILLIAM M. COWAN 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. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U. S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 12, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable WILLIAM M. COWAN, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will be in morning business until 12:30 today. The majority will control the first 30 minutes, the Republicans the second 30 minutes. Chairman MIKULSKI and Ranking Member SHELBY are expected to make opening statements about 11 o'clock this morning.

Just as an aside, this is a new day in the Senate. We are so grateful for the hard work of Senators MIKULSKI and SHELBY. The amendment is offered as their substitute amendment. I am very proud of the work they did. We are going to have to work through a number of amendments, but when it is all over, we are going to send over a bill I hope the House will accept. If not, we will have a quick conference—I hope that is not necessary—and continue the work on our other appropriations bills and finish the problems we have had in being behind.

The CR will fund the government until October 1. We hope by then we can complete work on our appropriations bills, so in 2014 we don't have to go through all this again—CRs and omnibuses and all that kind of stuff.

We are going to recess from 12:30 to 2:30 p.m. today for weekly caucus meetings. We have extended that for an extra 15 minutes because the President is going to be here today.

We expect to begin consideration of H.R. 933, which is the appropriations bill I just talked about, following the caucus meetings we are going to have.

THE RYAN BUDGET

Mr. REID. Earlier this year, with November election losses fresh in their minds, top Republicans promised a kinder, gentler Republican Party, a Republican Party that cared about "every American . . . achieving their dreams." Republicans banded about words such as "fairness" and "opportunity." They made overtures toward women and Hispanics. They promised cooperation and an end to brinkmanship. House Majority Leader CANTOR even spoke of "an agenda based on a shared vision of creating the conditions for health, happiness, prosperity for more Americans and their families."

Rebranding, we thought, was underway. Then a few weeks passed and the Republican emphasis on fairness and equity made a direct U-turn back to where they started. Today the House Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN will unveil an extreme budget that is anything but balanced. This budget reflects the same skewed priorities the Republican Party has championed for years, the same skewed priorities Americans rejected in November. The Ryan budget will call for more tax breaks for the wealthy, an end of Medicare as we know it, and Draconian cuts to education and other programs to help America's economy grow and prosper.

We have heard it many times and I will repeat it. Yogi Berra famously said, "It's déjà vu all over again," and it really is. We have seen this before, déjà vu all over again. The Ryan budget will shower more tax breaks on millionaires and continue to tilt the playing field to the advantage of big corporate interests and raise taxes for the middle class.

I know Congressman RYAN is held out to be this guru who understands things so well. What he understands is gimmickry and that is what he has done so well. He has pulled the wool over the eyes of those people in the House and they continue following him, but his

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1671

budget is anything but balanced, anything but fair. Members of the House should look at what they are being led into—or out of.

This plan, just like last year, refused to close a single tax loophole in order to reduce the deficit. Yet it guts investments in education, health care, public safety, scientific research, and job-creating clean energy technology. The Ryan budget would end the Medicare guarantee and force seniors into a voucher program. It would ax preventive health care such as cancer screenings and charge seniors more for prescriptions and further reduce the funding for food inspectors, police, and first responders generally. As if protecting the wealthy special interests is not bad enough, the Republican budget also devastates the economy, costing jobs and slowing economic growth.

Not only is this a wrong approach, it is the same old approach. To make matters worse, the Paul Ryan Budget No. 3—he has done it two other times—used the same fuzzy math and gimmickry as his previous two budgets, relies on accounting that is creative at best and fraudulent at worst to inflate its claims of deficit reduction. We believe it is critical to stabilize the deficit, but it will take more than accounting gimmicks to achieve real deficit reduction.

At a time when corporations are making record profits, the stock market is soaring, and wealthy Americans' income continues to rise, the deficit reduction should not have to be at the expense of middle-class families, senior citizens, and the poor. Americans have demanded a fair approach to deficit reduction for all Americans—Democrats, Independents, and Republicans. They want a fair approach to deficit reduction that makes sensible cuts and asks profitable corporations and the wealthiest among us to share the burden—balanced.

We have been listening. That is why this week Budget Committee Chair PATTY MURRAY will introduce a budget that reflects those balanced priorities. Her plan, the Democratic plan, will cut wasteful spending and reduce the deficit, close tax loopholes that benefit the rich, and invest where the economy needs to grow, to go really hard, to continue to build, to grow. It will create a strong middle class.

Congressman RYAN and his Republican colleagues in Congress have taken a different approach, an approach that makes it plain they missed the message in the November elections. Their budget once again will put moneyed special interests ahead of middle-class families, and no amount of rebranding will hide that.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

BUDGET PREVIEW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as we know, President Obama missed this year's legal deadline to submit a budget to Congress, just like he has nearly every year of his presidency. But this year it is even worse—we now know he does not even plan to submit a budget until after the House and the Senate have acted to pass one.

That has never happened in the more than 90 years that have gone by since the modern budgeting process was established in the 1920s. Somehow, Presidents managed to submit budgets on time in the middle of World War II, during the Great Depression—but not today? There is simply no excuse.

Rather than helping lead Congress toward a reasonable outcome, it appears the President is happy to drop a bomb on the congressional budget process instead by releasing his budget plan after the House and Senate have acted—presumably so he can campaign against Republicans if the process fails as he hopes. Let's hope he does not trot out that tired political playbook again.

The President should send over his budget now—not next week or next month, but today—so both sides can consider it at a time when it might be helpful, rather than destructive, to the process.

And speaking of serious delays, for 4 years my constituents in Kentucky and Americans across the country have been asking Senate Democrats a simple question: "Where's the budget?" Most families put one together. They want to know what Democrats who run the Senate have planned.

But for 4 years, Senate Democrats have ignored these concerns. Year after year, they have neglected one of their most important legislative responsibilities.

Evidently that is about to change. Senate Democrats are now pledging to finally—finally—produce a budget. I will be interested to see what they put forward.

I hope Senate Democrats take this exercise seriously and propose real spending reforms that can put our country on a stronger, more sustainable fiscal path, reforms that can control spending and lead to robust private-sector growth and job creation. We will see.

What about Republicans? Well, Republicans lead the House, and they have proposed budgets every year, right on schedule—budgets that would finally put our country on a path to growth and job creation, and that would put our creaky entitlement programs on a sound fiscal footing so they are around when people need them.

Today, House Republicans will unveil this year's budget blueprint. If the past is any indication, the reforms it contains would jump-start our economy, help more Americans join the middle class, and begin to tackle the debt that threatens all of our futures because Republicans understand we need to grow the economy, not the government.

What's more, it would get us back to a balanced budget within just a few short years.

Call me a skeptic, but there is little chance the budget my Senate Democrat friends put forward will balance—either today, 10 years from today, or ever. And I doubt it will contain much in the way of spending reform either. We will probably just get more of what we have come to expect from them the past few years: lots of budget gimmickry, tons of wasteful spending, and even more tax hikes. That type of budget won't grow the economy or shrink the debt.

But here is the thing. The budgeting process is a great way for both parties to outline their priorities for the country, and that is something Senate Democrats have refused to do until now.

So, if they want to put forward a budget that allows Medicare to go bankrupt, that hikes up taxes on the families and small businesses that can least afford them, and that proposes a future of massive deficits without end—if that is really how they want to define themselves for the American people—then let the battle of ideas begin.

But we need to see their budget first, so it is time to end the years of delays and put those ideas on the table. And it is well past time for the President to do the same—not after Congress acts, but before.

Republicans have managed to play by the rules every year and produce serious budgets for our country. I hope Democrats are finally ready to get to work to do the same.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first 30 minutes and Republicans controlling the second 30 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I understand that the Democrats have the first half of morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

CONTRASTING BUDGETS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this is a historic week because we will see congressional presentations of the congressional budgets, and I believe we will see stark contrasts.

Congressman RYAN of Wisconsin—nearly my home State of Illinois—is going to prepare and present to the Republicans in the House of Representatives a budget that he says will bring our overall Federal budget into balance over 10 years. It is a daunting task, and I commend him for his effort. I also have to say that we have been there before. We have heard this budget before. We know what it contains. There are several elements in the Ryan budget—as some have announced in advance—that repeat the mistakes of his earlier budgets, and some of them are grievous.

We understand we need entitlement reform to make sure important programs such as Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid continue for years to come. We understand there will be some hard choices associated with efforts to make these programs more solvent.

The Ryan approach continues to have something called premium support. What it boils down to is this: In the outyears, Congressman RYAN and the House Republicans want to offer seniors across America less money to pay for their Medicare insurance. They want to privatize the Medicare insurance system.

Our side of the aisle—both in the House and the Senate—is dedicated to some basic principles. One of the first is to make sure men and women across America who are from working families have a fighting chance, to make sure the Tax Code is responsive to their needs, to make sure the programs they count on will be there when they need them.

Every hour of every day most American workers in States such as Massachusetts and Illinois pay into our Social Security and Medicare system with the belief that when the time comes for retirement, Social Security and Medicare will be there. Unfortunately, what Congressman RYAN is proposing is to really break that promise and to say to seniors across America: You can pay into it for a lifetime, but when the time comes and you really need Medicare and health insurance during your retirement, you probably won't be able to afford it. You won't be able to come up with the premiums.

What good is a Medicare system that a worker has paid into for a lifetime if it cannot provide the basic protections they will need during retirement? They can balance the books—at the cost of coverage and the cost of the Medicare promise that has been made for generations.

Therein lies the real crux of the difference between Democrats and Republicans when we look at these entitlement programs. We know that reform is necessary, but reform should be based on best medical practices, on reducing the obvious waste in the Medicaid Program, and not on penalizing seniors who are on a fixed income who cannot afford increasingly high Medicare premiums. That is the PAUL RYAN

approach—privatizing Medicare. It is not a good approach for America. That is the real difference.

Of course, there is this dedication on the part of Congressman RYAN to reduce the tax rates for the wealthiest people in America. Those rates, after the fiscal cliff negotiation, go as high as 39 percent on the highest income. PAUL RYAN's budget wants to bring them down to 25 percent, which is a dramatic decline in the income tax rate for the wealthiest Americans. How will he achieve this? He says he will achieve it by changing the Tax Code to bring the rate down to 25 percent. I sat through the negotiations in the Bowles-Simpson Commission and other places, and the math does not work. If they are going to try to bring down the income tax rate for the wealthiest to 25 percent, sadly, they will eliminate the most basic income tax deductions for working and middle-income families across America. That is the reality; otherwise, they cannot reach that number.

We have to look at this. If the PAUL RYAN budget means the wealthiest Americans get a tax cut while working families see a tax increase and if the PAUL RYAN budget means Medicare will be fiscally solvent but unaffordable for most working Americans, this is a budget we need to reject out of hand.

We will see that budget in its entirety today, and by tomorrow the Democratic alternative here in the Senate, which has been worked on and prepared by Senator PATTY MURRAY of Washington and her colleagues in the Senate Budget Committee, will be presented as well, and it will be a stark contrast. What Senator MURRAY and the Senate Budget Committee will produce is a balanced approach that says: Yes, there will be deficit reduction, but it will be the right way. We need to make sure we have revenues coming from those who can afford to pay in the highest income categories. Yes, we need spending cuts, and they will continue. We need entitlement reform that is thoughtful and sensitive. We need reform that really makes sure these programs are here for generations to come.

I think America will applaud the efforts on the Senate side. I think they will have many questions to ask on the House side, and then the debate begins. Those of us on the Appropriations Committee wait for this to be completed because the budget resolution is basically our blueprint for what we can achieve during the remainder of the year and for the next budget year that starts October 1.

There are a couple of things that are part of the budget process that I will address very quickly.

SEQUESTRATION

I am very concerned about the impact of sequestration on health care. Reporters in Illinois asked me over the weekend: What is the big deal? Sequestration came and life didn't end. It seems as though we are going on in a normal way.

Unfortunately, they overlooked some obvious impacts. For example, community health centers are the frontline for primary health care across America. I visit them and always leave with a sense of hope and a positive feeling. The community health centers in Chicago and across Illinois are quality medical institutions. They serve people with limited insurance or no insurance, and they serve them in the most professional way. I have said with confidence that if I happen to get sick someday or someone in my family did, I would feel confident walking into these community health centers—they are that good.

Some 22 million people in more than 9,000 locations across America rely on them. As the point of care for uninsured and low-income people, community health centers provide preventive services that help avoid expensive procedures and emergency room visits.

At a time when 30 million new Americans are about to get health insurance so they can afford to get care, these across-the-board cuts are taking \$115 million out of community health centers this year alone. Nationally, almost 900,000 patients will lose access. Community health center funding in Illinois will be cut by \$6.2 million. Erie Family Health Center in Chicago is one of the best. They will do their best to protect clinical care, but the wrap-around services that make Erie so effective, not to mention cost-effective, will be reduced.

Now is not the time to cut community health center funding. Instead, we should expand the centers so hard-working and low-income families get the care they need.

Regardless of where someone lives or where they go to see the doctor, the \$1.6 billion cut to the National Institutes of Health threatens all of us. And that is what these cuts are going to do to medical research—cutting \$1.6 billion from the National Institutes of Health. I have always said that I will take this issue to any corner of America, any group—liberal or conservative, young or old—and make my case that investment in health care research is one of the most important investments our government makes. When we short-change medical research, we short-change our future.

Great medical care is only as good as the science behind it. Drugs and devices work only as well as our understanding of the medical conditions they are treating. Our country is rich with promising research. We lead the world and should be proud of it. We have the bright minds, the curious scientists, and the innovative labs. Today countless people are engaged in work that will lead to better treatments for arthritis, Alzheimer's, AIDS, diabetes, cancer, and the list goes on.

Biomedical research supported by the NIH has established America as the leader in the world, and we are right on the verge of making life-changing discoveries through this research. But sequestration—which is now in place—

will have a ripple effect that could curb medical discoveries and weaken the economies across the country.

Dr. Francis Collins, Director of the NIH, says there is no question that sequestration will slow the development of an influenza vaccine and cancer research.

Eli Zerhouni, head of NIH under President George W. Bush, said:

We are going to maim our innovation capabilities if we do these abrupt deep cuts at NIH. It will impact science for generations to come.

Right now, when so much good research is moving us forward, we should be doubling down on medical education, innovation, and infrastructure. Cutting back on NIH and biomedical research is so shortsighted. Medical research saves lives, keeps America's place as a leader in science and medicine, and it generates economic growth. Frankly, these cuts shake the confidence of people in this field. Trying to decide whether they should dedicate their lives to medical research with the uncertainty of sequestration and budget cuts is unfair.

For over a century, NIH-supported scientists have led the way for important breakthroughs to improve health and save lives through the discovery of things such as the MRI, extending the life expectancy for people with cystic fibrosis, revolutionizing our thinking about cancer, improving our understanding of stroke and heart disease, and creating new vaccines that save lives.

President Obama has called on congressional leaders to come together to create an alternative to the sequestration. A balanced mix of smarter spending cuts and revenue from closing loopholes that benefit higher income individuals will mean we can keep our commitment to medical research.

This week we are going to start the debate on the continuing resolution. One of the early amendments that is likely to be offered will be by Senator HARKIN, who chairs the Labor, Health and Human Services Subcommittee in Appropriations. I have spoken to Senator HARKIN. He is determined to do everything he can to give the Senate the opportunity to continue to cut the deficit but to do it in a way that will not make dramatic negative cuts in medical research.

I hope we can get a bipartisan consensus. Diseases and the threats of ill health strike all of us regardless of party affiliation. We should come together on a bipartisan basis to support increasing medical research and maintaining America's lead in the world.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING BORAH VAN DORMOLEN

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to start my remarks today by remembering a great Texan who passed away just yesterday. Sandy, my wife, and I are deeply saddened by the loss of Borah Van Dormolen, a remarkable patriot, a respected leader, and a loving wife.

Borah rose through the ranks of the U.S. Army, achieving the rank of lieutenant colonel. After more than two decades serving her Nation in the uniform of the U.S. Army, she poured her energy and sense of duty into helping our State. Frequently offering frank advice in only the way Borah could, she was a leader by example and a great friend.

Borah's legacy will live in many ways, including in the young Texans she helped me select for nominations to our Nation's military academies through her service on my Military Academy Selection Committee.

Sandy joins me in sending our thoughts and prayers to Borah's husband, LTC Rich Castle, their families, and all those whom Borah touched throughout her journey in life.

THE BUDGET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would like to mark this 1,413th day that the Senate has not had a budget. We will be talking a lot about the budget this week, as we should, in a debate that has been long overdue.

Since the Budget and Accounting Act was passed in 1921, no President has missed the legal deadline for submitting a budget to Congress. Unfortunately, for the fourth time in 5 years, President Obama will miss that deadline.

Given that our gross national debt is already larger than our entire economy, and given that we are facing more than \$100 trillion in unfunded liabilities, one would think the President would make this a priority and he would feel a greater sense of urgency about America's fiscal dilemma.

In fact, not only will President Obama be late with his budget this year, he will not even be submitting it to the House and the Senate until after we have released our own budgets. So the President will not have any input whatsoever by submitting his budget—which he should have done on February 4—he will not have any input whatsoever on the deliberations of the House and Senate as we take up our proposed budgets.

As I say, since the Budget and Accounting Act was passed in 1921, no U.S. President has ever done that. The White House has always gone first. In fact, the President is the leader of our Nation not only as Commander in Chief but also as the one the Constitution looks to in the law to bear the responsibility to make at least an initial budget proposal. The White House has

always gone first, providing a blueprint that helped guide negotiations on Capitol Hill, but not under this President.

The budget process is an opportunity for the President to outline his priorities. It is an opportunity for the President to tell the American people what we can afford and how we are going to pay for it. Above all, it is an opportunity for the President to show real leadership on issues of national importance.

As ADM Mike Mullen, the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said: The greatest national security threat to the United States is our budget. What he meant by that is, unless the Federal Government gets its fiscal house in order, we are not going to be able to afford even the safety net for the most vulnerable of our people, nor are we going to be able to afford the national security that helps keep America strong and America and its allies safe.

Unfortunately, the President has failed to demonstrate the required leadership in this area. He has also ignored the recommendations of his own bipartisan fiscal commission. He submitted two consecutive budget proposals that failed to receive a single vote in this Chamber. His administration has racked up \$6 trillion in new debt since he became President, and he created a massive new entitlement funded by a trillion-dollar tax increase—something known as ObamaCare. Now he is refusing to send us a budget until after the Senate and the House vote on their own budget proposals.

If the President really wants to play a constructive role in the budget process, he will send us his proposal right away. Further delays will only complicate and hinder our negotiations.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. SCHATZ) Without objection, it is so ordered.

TERRORISTS TRIALS

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about an issue I am very concerned about, which involves a man who was recently captured overseas. His name is Sulaiman Abu Ghaith, and he is Osama bin Laden's son-in-law. Here is a photo of him sitting next to Osama bin Laden. In fact, he appeared with Osama bin Laden right after the 9/11 attacks on our country.

He is Osama bin Laden's son-in-law, captured overseas and brought to the United States of America. The Attorney General has made the announcement Osama bin Laden's son-in-law

will be tried in New York City in a civilian trial rather than being brought to Guantanamo Bay for further interrogation and held in military custody.

I am very concerned about this issue as this is a man who, based upon the relationship he had with Osama bin Laden in 2001 and 2002, served as a spokesman for al-Qaida. He urged others to swear allegiance to Osama bin Laden. On September 12, 2001, he appeared with Osama bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahiri. He is shown in this photo.

He warned the United States and its allies, "A great army is gathering against you." He also called on all Muslims to battle the Jews, Christians, and Americans. He also promised more 9/11-style attacks. Right after our country was attacked on September 11, he appeared with Osama bin Laden warning of more September 11 attacks. He said, "The storms shall not stop, especially the airplane storms."

In 2002, he reportedly arranged to be smuggled to Iran where he was held under some form of house arrest. Obviously, we need to understand why the Iranians were allowing such a prominent member of al-Qaida to be kept in their country. We have deep concerns about Iran, which is the largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world. It is threatening our country and right now marching toward nuclear weapons capability. It has threatened to annihilate Israel and threaten our country, while he was under loose house arrest following his direct allegiance with Osama bin Laden.

In addition, American authorities have tied him to an October 8, 2002, attack on the U.S. Marines while training on an island off the coast of Kuwait. This was a situation where one of our marines was killed and another was seriously injured.

The attack was conducted by al-Qaida fighters with direct ties to Mr. Abu Ghaith, who is Mr. Osama bin Laden's son-in-law. Kuwait actually stripped Mr. Abu Ghaith of his citizenship because of his role in recruiting Kuwaitis to become members of al-Qaida.

Last week he pled guilty to charges in Federal court in New York City. I am concerned when we take a top member of al-Qaida after his capture overseas, such as Osama bin Laden's son-in-law, bring him to our courts in New York City, and then all the full rights of our civilian court system apply to this individual. This includes the right, when one is in custody and interrogated, to hear Miranda rights.

My former role was as attorney general for the State of New Hampshire. I have great respect for our civilian system; however, our civilian system was not designed to deal with situations where we are at war. Mr. Abu Ghaith falls clearly within the definition of what this body has authorized as the use of military force against an enemy belligerent. When we bring him to New York City, we must Mirandize him and

inform him he has the right to remain silent. We lose valuable opportunities to gather intelligence, to protect our country, and to discover if he was with Osama bin Laden.

We have photos of him one day after the September 11 attack. What does he know about al-Qaida? Who else was involved? What does he know about their network? During the time he spent in Iran, was he still communicating with members of al-Qaida? Obviously, he was because we allege he helped commit an attack in 2002 in Kuwait which killed at least one marine.

Who was he communicating with? What future attacks are they planning? What associations has he made with members of al-Qaida? When we tell someone such as this he has the right to remain silent and give him a lawyer, we lose opportunities to protect our country.

When we are at war, as we are with al-Qaida, we need to focus to discover as much information as possible about al-Qaida: who they are targeting and who are the members of al-Qaida. Obviously, all of us supported the President's decision to take out Osama bin Laden. Who are the other members of his network? What information are we losing when we bring him to a civilian court system instead of bringing him where he belongs as an enemy belligerent in Guantanamo Bay?

It seems to me inconsistent that the administration would take the position—and I support them on this—they would kill top members of al-Qaida overseas. Yet they are so averse—when they capture someone—to bringing them to Guantanamo Bay. It is their preference to take them into a civilian court system in the United States of America, where they must read Miranda rights to that individual rather than take them where they belong, to Guantanamo Bay.

I have visited Guantanamo, which is a secure detention facility where people are treated humanely, kept very securely, but not on U.S. soil. We may keep them in Guantanamo Bay under the law of war and interrogate the individual as long as we need to.

Let me remind everyone the intelligence we gathered, which allowed us to find and take out Osama bin Laden, took a matter of not just months but years to gather. To take someone such as Sulaiman Abu Ghaith and immediately, after he is captured, very quickly bring him to New York City, we lose the opportunity to go back to him over time to understand the full amount of information he may have about al-Qaida. This is why we have a distinction under our law between the law of war and our civilian system.

He is not a bank robber. He is not an average criminal who should be treated the same way as any other criminal in America. He is someone who has sworn to kill Americans and has asked others to take the oath for al-Qaida, which is at war with our country. I am very worried about the fact the administra-

tion seems to be bent on bringing these foreign terrorists to the United States to give them all of the rights of our civilian court system rather than focusing on ensuring we have all the intelligence we need to protect our country.

I would like to also speak about another individual and the inconsistency we have here. This is Anwar al-Awlaki. Anwar al-Awlaki was an American citizen. He was radicalized, possessed both American and Yemeni citizenship, and became a leader for al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula. He advocated for violent jihad against the United States and has been linked to a dozen terrorist investigations in the United States. These include links to the September 11 attacks against our country and links to the November 5, 2009, Fort Hood shooting.

The administration made the decision in September 2011 to take out Mr. al-Awlaki overseas in Yemen. I certainly support their decision in that regard.

I want to point out how inconsistent it is that we are willing to use the drone program to take out someone like al-Awlaki, and yet we will not use all the tools in our toolbox to ensure Osama bin Laden's son-in-law is held at Guantanamo and fully interrogated to give us the time we need to gather the full information he has. It is very inconsistent, and I think the administration should be detaining enemy belligerents in Guantanamo and ensuring they are interrogated.

I wish to mention one final person, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed. Let's not forget the administration's first decision with the mastermind of 9/11, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, was to bring him to New York City for a civilian trial in New York close to Ground Zero, as they are now making the decision with Osama bin Laden's son-in-law.

The public outrage was great over bringing Khalid Shaikh Mohammed to New York City due to the amount of security it would take to secure someone like him. There was the concern he should be treated as an enemy of our country and tried by a military commission in Guantanamo. He was transferred there eventually by the administration, but only after great pressure from both sides of the aisle in Congress to say it would be appropriate that the mastermind of 9/11 belongs in Guantanamo before a military commission.

I think we find ourselves in the same situation now with Osama bin Laden's son-in-law. There can be no doubt he is a top member of al-Qaida; that he had close relationships with Osama bin Laden; that he is charged with conspiring to kill Americans. These are very serious charges, and there can be no doubt that he falls within our operation and the use of military force; that he is an enemy of our country and that we should be treating him in a similar fashion as to how we treated Khalid Shaikh Mohammed.

Most of all, we need to prioritize intelligence gathering to prevent future

attacks against our country rather than focusing on bringing them immediately into our civilian court system. A man such as Osama bin Laden's son-in-law should never hear the words "You have the right to remain silent." We can't afford to have him be silent. We need to know everything he knows to protect our country, its citizens, and to prevent future attacks on America and our allies.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: Has all time expired from the respective parties utilizing their morning business allocation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am rising to speak on the continuing resolution to keep government funded for the rest of the year.

I chair the full committee of the Appropriations Committee. My very able and esteemed colleague, Senator SHELBY, is the vice chairman. We come to the floor to talk about our legislation, which is an amendment to the House CR to fund the Federal Government for the rest of the fiscal year. It continues the bipartisan tradition of the Appropriations Committee working closely with both sides of the aisle, and I wish to thank Senator SHELBY for his excellent cooperation and his wise counsel in doing this and actually cosponsoring this.

Our leadership, Senators REID and MCCONNELL, has been critical to allowing us to come to the floor and have our bill be debated openly, to have appropriate amendments, and then to have it voted on by the full Senate. In today's toxic environment in Washington, I must say our conversations have been characterized by civility, collegiality, and absolute candor—what we can do; what we can't do, not what we would like to do but what we must do to keep the government's doors open.

I also want to comment on the excellent tone and conversation we have had with the House, specifically our House counterparts, HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, and Congresswoman NITA LOWEY. We have talked with each other and worked together, and if we continue to do that without other intervening dynamics, we can get this bill done.

Before I go into our bill to offer its content, I want everybody to understand there are three things at play in Washington this week. We use arcane language, so nobody knows what is going on. There is the sequester, there is the continuing resolution, and there is the Budget Committee. Everybody is going to get confused because everybody is getting it commingled. All of it is getting press and the American peo-

ple don't understand there are three separate solutions to three separate problems.

Let me go to the Budget Committee, which will be on the floor next week, and Senator MURRAY is vociferously and persistently working on that bill. That is for fiscal year 2014. That is the framework on how we are going to approach our overall budget: What are we going to spend, what revenues we are going to have to raise, if any, and also a review of mandatory spending. That is going on over there. That is for fiscal year 2014.

The Mikulski-Shelby continuing resolution is the appropriations bill—not a personality bill—that will fund the government through 2013. The American people might say: Didn't you do that in October? Isn't our fiscal New Year's Eve October 1? Well, not really. What happened is we were going into the heat and passion and prickliness of an election year, so the wise heads thought it best to extend it where cooler heads would prevail in March. So here we are. We are the cooler heads, and we are ready to prevail. What we have here now is that legislation.

Everybody needs to understand this: On March 27, that continuing resolution expires. If we do not pass our bill and then have an agreement between the House and the Senate that is signed by the President, we could face a government showdown. There is no will on either side of this institution that wants to do that. We are absolutely committed to no shutdown, no showdown, no lockdown, no slamdown. We want to do the job, and that is why we have been working very carefully to do that.

What we will offer today is funding through the fiscal year, which will take us to October 1, and that meets the mandatory cap assigned to us by the Budget Committee of \$1.4 trillion. That is a lot of money, but it is a big government with big responsibilities. It includes everything from defense—defending us over there—to the border control—defending us here—to meeting compelling human need and making investments in science and technology while ensuring we do what we need to do.

Our legislation is quite simple and straightforward. It includes five appropriations bills. Two are already in it from the House—defense, military construction, and veterans. It will also include agriculture, homeland security, and a subcommittee that Senator SHELBY and I are chair and vice chair of that funds the entire Justice Department. That means FBI, Federal law enforcement, and science and commerce. So we have Ag, CJS, homeland security and defense. Defense and military construction are identical to the House. Agriculture, CJS and homeland security are consistent with bipartisan and bicameral agreements negotiated last fall.

Remember, we are reaching across the aisle, we are reaching across the

dome. That is how we are trying to do it. However, there are seven remaining bills in the continuing resolution, and they are energy and water—money for things such as the Corps of Engineers—interior and environment, financial services, transportation, Labor-HHS, state and foreign ops, and the legislative branch. That means they are provided current funding levels and policies with some very limited changes to fix present problems. These are called anomalies.

The Senate version, as I said, totals \$1.43 trillion, which is equal to the House CR. So the top line is the same; the difference is how we achieve national goals. It is equal to the House continuing resolution, and it is the same as required by the Budget Control Act. We are absolutely in compliance with the Budget Control Act.

Sequester mandates another \$86 billion in cuts. That comes over what we do, and that solution is to be negotiated by the President and the leadership with the concurrence of both bodies. That is part of the charm offensive that is going on now. OK. Sequester needs a balanced solution, and we will be listening and awaiting their ideas, but right now we are looking at our bill that includes bipartisan amendments, minimizing the problems of operating and returning to a regular order for fiscal year 2014.

The amendment we offer is much better than an extension of the current continuing resolution. Why don't we take a date and just change 2012 to 2013? We don't do that because our bill makes reforms. We actually get more value for the dollar. If we just extended it, we would sometimes be spending money on unneeded programs, one of which would be—in our bill, CJS—\$500 million for a space shuttle that doesn't exist. We want to change that and put it where it belongs, into the proper defending of our Nation and investing in science and technology. So a date change in a continuing resolution is not workable.

The Senate amendment improves the House CR by adding those three domestic bills and, as I said, includes a number of changes. I could go through each and every one of those changes, such as in agriculture, but what I wish to do is explain the process now. I do want to explain the content of my bill; however, I am going to take 1 minute now and yield to Senator SHELBY for his opening statement and then I will come back and explain the details of our actual funding.

I must say again, I have appreciated not only the civility and the collegiality but the candor. We had to look at not what we would like to do and not even what we should do but what we must do to keep government operating, to achieve the national goals America wants: our national security, both those who wear the uniform of the U.S. military as well as others who defend the Nation, such as border control, Federal law enforcement, law enforcement at the local

level, food safety and drug safety inspectors, to make sure we meet compelling human need in the fields of education, biomedical research. This is what we are trying to do—weather satellites that predict future natural disasters.

Again, we don't have a bill that is what we would like to do, what we have is a bill that is what we must do. If we all work together—and we ask those who have amendments to be working with our leadership—we believe we can move this bill by the middle of this week; that by the week's end, the certainty of government funding will have been established and we will have shown we can govern.

I yield the floor so my vice chairman can say what he wishes to say to add to the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, first of all this morning I would like to thank Chairwoman MIKULSKI for her willingness to work together in good faith and to introduce the bill that keeps the government running for the rest of the fiscal year. The chair and I have had what I would characterize as a long and productive working relationship. I think this bill is a very clear signal that we intend to continue that relationship for the good of the legislative process and the American people.

I believe Congress must learn to deal with the spending constraints that have become a necessary reality for all of us. Much more work remains to be done to secure our fiscal future, including fixing entitlement programs and reforming our Tax Code. However, today we have taken the first step to show the American people Congress can come together on important issues. My hope is we will continue to do so.

I am pleased to say Chairwoman MIKULSKI and I have accomplished three shared goals in this proposed legislation. First, this bill will prevent a government shutdown. Nobody in America wants that. Moving from one continuing resolution to the next only delays our problems and creates added uncertainty. I hope we can return to the regular order of producing budgets and appropriations bills to avoid the threat of a shutdown in the future.

Second, this bill will provide more flexibility for the remainder of the year so that government agencies can deal with the reality of the sequester which remains fully in place here.

Third, I believe this bill is a product both parties in both Houses can support. It prioritizes spending and aims to steer clear of divisive issues.

In addition, discretionary spending is subject to the caps put in place by the Budget Control Act, and this bill complies with those levels. As noted, spending cuts made by the sequester will come on top of these constraints.

I support moving forward with this bill, and encourage my colleagues to join together to do the same. Many Americans have lost faith that Repub-

licans and Democrats can work together on anything. I believe this bill demonstrates it is possible, and I hope it will pave the way for a more productive relationship in the future. And while we are sure to disagree on many issues, I remain positive we can restore regular order in the Congress and deal with pressing fiscal matters in a timely bipartisan manner.

I think I speak for both of us when I say we are committed—yes, we are committed—to putting the budget and appropriations process back on track. We look forward to working with our colleagues who share that goal and are willing to join us in this effort. This is a new beginning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, you can see our tone. We need everybody's cooperation, if they have amendments, to bring them to us and also to the leadership which is helping us negotiate which ones will come up, and I think we can get this bill done this week.

But I wish to say why getting it done is worthwhile. I want to speak about agriculture, and I wish to speak about some of the content we have, and do it in alphabetical order because it is easier for folks to follow.

In agriculture, our amendment makes sure we fund the Food Safety Modernization Act which is not included in the House bill. This is the first major reform of food safety laws in 70 years and is much needed. CDC says 48 million Americans suffer from food-borne illness each year.

This morning before I came to the floor, I attended a hearing on the Select Committee on Intelligence that I am a member of. General James Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence, along with key people from the military, civilian agencies such as FBI Director Mueller, gave us a 30-page report on threats to the United States. One of the things they talked about was the safety of our food supply. We need to make sure we have inspectors on the ground for what might occur through bacteria or what might also be induced. So food safety is a big issue.

This amendment is also better at improving clean water to rural communities, and provides 165 rural communities with clean water and waste disposal, creating construction jobs today, and improving community health. I am very well versed in that because, along with Senator CARDIN, we represent 2,000 miles of the Chesapeake Bay. We have older communities. We have issues related to wastewater treatment that are not only polluting the Bay but are very difficult to repair because of the very nature of our population—wonderful, patriotic people who don't have a lot of cash to pay a lot of taxes for wastewater. But in helping them, we improve public health and we save the Chesapeake Bay with all its seafood industry. That is just me. But we could go everywhere.

Commerce, Justice, Science, that is a subcommittee I chair. Boy, do I like it. Why do I like it? Because it goes to everything we are talking about: about justice, about jobs today and jobs tomorrow. When we look at our Department of Commerce, which should be the point place for American business really promoting private sector initiatives and, most of all, promoting exports—not sending jobs overseas but sending products and services—that is where the trade negotiation goes. This is part of our economic vitality. This is where we have bipartisan agreement. Let's engage in free and open and fair trade. That negotiation staff and so on is funded through our subcommittee.

We also want to protect our borders. That is going to be in homeland security. In our justice funding, we fund Federal law enforcement and provide funds to local communities on a competitive basis to put cops on the beat and to give them the appropriate things they need to protect themselves.

Let's look at the Byrne grants, the main Federal tool that helps State and local law enforcement. We provide more money. That means more money for body armor, more money for them to learn the latest tips and so on, and stopping the gang threat. It also provides COPS on the Beat grants. Both of those are modest increases over the House funding. When I say modest, do you know what I am talking about? For all that local law enforcement does, we are going to provide \$15 million. That is not a lot of money by Washington's terms, but to the local police departments it will be a help.

Commerce-Justice also supports innovation. It is in this subcommittee that we fund the National Science Foundation \$220 million more than the House. That means we will be able to provide more help to 7,000 scientists and teachers making new discoveries for new products that will lead to new companies and new jobs. This is what we do.

We are better than the House also in homeland security. This amendment does more to protect the Nation from cyber warfare. Cyber warfare is one of the greatest threats facing America. Again, in this 30-page report we have on threats, the first five pages were devoted to all of the cyber problems. What kind of cyber problems? Cyber attacks, cyber espionage, and the growing nexus between organized crime and nation states, preventing hacking, stealing our state secrets, our trade secrets and also the human trafficking of children and women, weapons of mass destruction. Where you sell women and children as a commodity across the borders of the world through organized crime and corrupt government officials, you will also sell other kinds of things, including weapons of mass destruction. So this is where we need to fund homeland security, the Department of Defense, the FBI, our contribution to Interpol. All of that is in the bill, and we do better—not a lot better

because we are frugal; again, not what we would like to do, but what we must do.

Also under homeland security, we make sure we look at that which puts people in harm's way. In my own State, and others, there is the issue of fires. Most fire departments in big cities are run by professionals, but in most rural communities they are run by the great volunteer fire departments. We have a fire grant program that I helped start that trains and equips local firefighters. What we do here is provide more money—\$33 million above the House—to help provide those grants, and we also provide additional funds to help State and local fire departments.

In the area of compelling human need, I want to talk about the Subcommittee on Education, Labor, and Human Services. This is the subcommittee that funds compelling human need. And what do we do here? We look after childcare development block grants, we support care for 9,000 more children, and we also make sure we adequately fund Head Start by providing modest sums there.

In addition, we also provide more money to the National Institutes of Health, \$71 billion. But put that into the context that they are going to take a \$1.5 billion hit in sequester.

I know the Presiding Officer represents a great State, Hawaii. Who wouldn't love Hawaii? But I wish the Presiding Officer would look at Maryland. Not only do we have the wonderful Chesapeake Bay, a Super Bowl championship, but we have other "super bowl" winners. They are called the National Institutes of Health, the National Security Agency, the National Weather Agency.

Just the other day when I was over at NIH, they told me—and told America through their communications—that NIH's work, working with clinicians and the private-led science sector, has reduced cancer rates in the United States of America by 15 percent in breast cancer, prostate cancer, lung cancer. And it is all those wonderful researchers at the Bethesda campus and in academic centers of excellence all over America. But instead of pinning medals on those people and encouraging young people to come into science, we could end up giving them a pink slip. What are we doing?

I not only want to lower cancer rates, but I want to improve and raise the discovery rate. This is what we do in this CR. We are working with them on a bipartisan basis. This is helping American people and giving us products that are approved by FDA that we can sell and ship around the world, particularly to countries that could never do it.

So I am all about jobs—jobs today and jobs tomorrow. That is why what we do in transportation, housing, and urban development is also a big step forward. In addition to looking out for the homeless, we provide an additional amount of money for highway and road

safety programs, where people actually working with funds going to Governors at the local level—not some shovel-ready gimmick—can identify projects in the pipeline we could generate in construction. We can improve public safety by smart highways. And, literally, we can help get America rolling again; we have a fragile economy.

I could go on about this bill, but this is a general outline, and I will talk more about it. I feel very passionate about it because we have squeezed every nickel, we have looked at it very fastidiously to make sure that we are right within our mandated spending cap to assess our national priorities: national security, compelling human needs, how we can help create jobs, look out for the middle class, and make those investments that improve the lives of the American people and generate jobs tomorrow.

I think we have a very good bill. I ask everyone's cooperation to get it passed.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

THE SEQUESTER

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise in support of the work Chairwoman MIKULSKI and Ranking Member SHELBY and the Appropriations Committee have done and the place they will bring us to on the floor of the Senate this week as we take an important step forward to fix the fiscal year 2013 budget. I will be meeting tomorrow—as many legislators do during the course of the year—with my Governor. All of the Virginia delegation will be sitting down with Governor McDonnell, who will be visiting, and he and the State will view this as very good news as we can talk about this work product.

I made my first speech on the floor about 2 weeks ago, and it was a speech that was kind of a plea. It was a plea to avoid the economic self-inflicted wound of sequester. As we all know, we were not able to do that at the time. There were two bills, and neither of them was able to get sufficient votes to move forward. The negative consequences from that sequester have been felt in the Commonwealth, as I traveled around, whether it is warn notices to ship repairers in the Hampton Roads area, planned furloughs of DOD civilian employees, or a delay in a carrier deployment that could potentially leave us more vulnerable in the Middle East.

The good news is that we can fix it and improve it. The Appropriations Committee's work discussed today is a way to begin to do that. We have a chance to get it right and to reduce the negative effects of sequester by dealing effectively with the expiring CR for fiscal year 2013 and then producing a progrowth 2014 budget. This is the work before this body in the next few weeks, and we need to do our very best work.

On the continuing resolution, it has been made clear in the comments be-

fore, we do not have a fiscal year 2013 budget or appropriations bills at the current time, so since October, we have been operating out of 2012 appropriations bills, pushed forward for a few months at a time. This leads us to a situation where we are not forward-focused, but we are operating out of an old playbook. We need to align our spending around this year's priorities and not be locked into funding the priorities of the past.

The Department of Defense—just to focus on this for a minute because defense is critical to the Commonwealth, as it is to all States—is very constrained by the continuing resolution that is currently in place. There is a \$11 billion operations and maintenance shortfall that is difficult for DOD to manage in a way that will keep us safe. There is a lack of flexibility to adjust to new needs. There are no new starts on important projects, including on the shipbuilding and naval side, which is so important to the Commonwealth. That has already led to a delay in the construction of one of the new Ford class aircraft carriers, the USS *John F. Kennedy*, with a consequent potential loss in jobs. Other agencies throughout the Federal Government have been similarly affected.

The good news is that there is a solution. Chairwoman MIKULSKI and Senator SHELBY, the ranking member, have worked together to lay that out today. This week we will work together on a true appropriations bill for the remainder of fiscal year 2013 for critical government functions: Department of Defense, military construction, the VA, but also homeland security, agriculture, commerce-justice-science. There are other governmental functions that will continue to operate under the fiscal year 2013 CR, but in many areas we will not be working off a backward-looking document. For the remainder of the year at least, because of the work of this committee, we can look at a forward-looking document.

Again, I congratulate Chairwoman MIKULSKI and Ranking Member SHELBY and the Appropriations Committee for working so hard together with House colleagues to put us in this posture. A true appropriations approach to the remainder of fiscal year 2013 fixes many of the DOD problems I outlined earlier. For example, it will allow us to go forward on the shipbuilding contract to construct a second Ford class carrier, the USS *John F. Kennedy*. That will be wonderful news for our defense and wonderful news for the shipyard that is the largest private employer in Virginia. It will allow us to move forward on significant ship refurbishment and repair contracts. The repair and refueling of the USS *Roosevelt* and the USS *Lincoln* were delayed as a result of the uncertainty about the budget, but the work this committee is doing will enable us to move forward.

We will be able to not completely eliminate the operations and maintenance deficits but at least make moves

among those accounts to mitigate the effects of the O&M deficit, and that will be across service branches.

Just last Friday, as I left the Senate and drove back to my home in Richmond, I stopped and did an economic development tour with a contractor in the Fredericksburg area working on robotics projects for all of the service branches. They talked about the fact that the CR was really putting a crimp in their planned expansions, their ability to hire students who are graduating from engineering programs around Virginia and around the Nation this fall. The CR fix going forward will give this company and so many others some certainty that will enable them to do the work we need to do and also help expand employment.

Other agencies have a similar upside from the fix of this fiscal year 2013 CR, as Chairwoman MIKULSKI was just outlining—improvements in domestic nutrition; improvements in international food aid, which is not only good for the most vulnerable people in the world but also good for the American farmer; improvements in State and local law enforcement support, immigration enforcement, workforce training, early childhood education. There are many aspects of this fix going forward that are far preferable to the CR and certainly preferable to flirting around the possibility of any kind of a shutdown after March 27. That is why I strongly support the approach the Appropriations Committee, under its leadership, has worked on. It is good for the United States and good for Virginia, and it represents a move to forward-looking budgeting rather than plays out of last year's playbook.

Make no mistake, the sequester is still in place, and the sequester is still having significant effects. The fiscal year 2013 appropriations bill we are discussing will mitigate the effects, but there will still be an operations and maintenance shortfall within DOD. Every service is still facing potential cuts in training and other readiness functions that should cause us concern.

Last Monday, a week ago yesterday, I went to the Pentagon and visited with Secretary Hagel, Deputy Secretary Carter, General Odierno, spent time with General Welsh last week, and not just with the brass but then went down into the cafeteria and heard the real deal from folks who were having lunch, and these were Active Duty assigned to the Pentagon, DOD civilian, Guard men and women who were back just coincidentally to do training-related meetings that day, and veterans who were back having lunch with their friends. As I went table to table and talked about sequester, I heard about continuing effects and concerns regarding the furlough of defense civilians and potential cuts to contractors. So those are still out there, but the good news is that this bill will address and improve, and then we have a second chance to do so as well as we begin in short order to deal with a proposed fiscal year 2013 budget.

There is a strong budget process already underway that will bear fruit in the committee within the next couple of days. The Budget Committee, under the leadership of Chairman MURRAY, has worked very hard, and it started the process that will lead to committee discussion and voting and then amendment and debate later this week. The basic goal of what we are trying to do is pretty simple, under the chairman's direction: Let's grow the economy and create jobs while reducing our deficit and debt in an economically credible way.

If we do this right, together with the appropriations approach discussed today, we can help reduce and then shape the negative effect that sequester has had on the Commonwealth and the country by replacing a blunt, non-strategic, across-the-board set of cuts with more strategic and targeted approaches.

We have a long way to go, obviously, whether it is on finding the path forward just on this bill—and it looks as if there is very strong bipartisan support, and that is positive—but certainly on moving forward with the budget and the possibility of finding some compromise with the House. There are going to be vast differences in the approaches, and we cannot sugarcoat that. But I think it is maybe important at least to stop and acknowledge some positive steps.

At year end, before I joined the body, the two Houses did come together and they found a compromise on the Bush tax cuts, which was positive. There were things not to like about it, but the fact of compromise was a positive. The House agreed earlier in calendar year 2013 that they would not use the debt ceiling as leverage over the American economy or leverage over these discussions. That, in an earlier instance, led to America's credit being downgraded, so stepping away from that is positive. In the Senate, we are returning to normal budgetary order under normal timing, and that is a positive step. Both sides have agreed to avoid brinkmanship surrounding government shutdown on March 27 and have worked assiduously to avoid it. This compromise to the fiscal year 2013 CR and the willingness to move forward in a true appropriations approach for the rest of the year in these key government functions is so positive. And the prospects, which I think are very good, of both Houses actually producing budgets on time for the first time in a number of years is also positive.

So while there are real and significant differences, and we will lay those on the table and debate them with vigor over the next few days and weeks, the American public will see this process unfold. They expect us to debate, listen, and find reasonable compromises. We have seen some, just in the last few days—I guess I will conclude and say this: We have seen some recent positive economic news—the

jobs report Friday, some of the news about housing, the stock market. There are some positive economic trends that are starting to develop. Congress can accelerate these trends. Congress can accelerate the improvement of the American economy if we keep taking these reasonable steps forward to find a responsible budgetary path. This work on the CR bill to find an appropriations path for the remainder of the year is one of those positive steps, and I applaud the committee leadership for doing so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Virginia for his comments. He and Senator WARNER are on the other side of the Potomac, and sometimes we are friends, sometimes we are rivals. But it is such a dynamic State. The junior Senator from Virginia knows his State has some of the greatest Federal assets there—the Pentagon, the Central Intelligence Agency. It is a home of vibrant technology. That is why we sometimes come as rivals.

But I want to ask a question of the Senator from Virginia, if the Senator will yield?

Mr. KAINE. I yield.

Ms. MIKULSKI. When we are moving the continuing resolution and he talks about being in the cafeteria and going table to table, which is something I do myself, and I know he enjoys it,—is it his point that we protect the men and women in uniform but the civilian employees, many of whom are veterans, would be at risk?

Mr. KAINE. Absolutely. I am just coming from an armed services hearing, I say to Senator MIKULSKI, where we were talking about that very same thing. The armed services mission, of course, requires that we protect the men and women in uniform. But so many of the DOD civilians are absolutely critical in doing their appropriate jobs. Sixty percent of the staff, for example, our strategic men, STRATCOM, are civilian employees. They are doing some of the most important work that we need done in the country right now around cyber security. The nurses who care for the wounded warriors I visited at Fort Belvoir Hospital, for example, are DOD civilians. So the furloughs that affect, more broadly, the civilian employees should be reason for significant concern.

Again, we are taking a positive step toward addressing some of these issues by embracing the appropriations approach that the Senator has worked on, and we will have an additional ability to take a positive step with respect to the fiscal year 2014 budget.

Ms. MIKULSKI. So just to prove our policy goal here, we cannot have government funding expire. The consequences of a government shutdown would be horrendous. What would it be on the Virginia economy?

Mr. KAINÉ. I say to the Senator, it is impossible—

Ms. MIKULSKI. Speaking from the old days as a Governor.

Mr. KAINÉ. It is like the old commercial about the price of various things but some things are priceless. There is no way to estimate it. Just off the top of my head, there have been analyses of the degree to which the Federal budget impacts the economy in each State, and the most recent, done by Bloomberg about 16 months ago, had Virginia as the State most affected by the Federal budget. So the prospect of more brinkmanship around shutdown, which has happened in the past, even if it does not occur, creates great anxiety. But if it were to occur, whether it is the nurses caring for our wounded warriors, whether it is the researchers helping us to figure out how to stay ahead of the cyber attacks that are frankly happening to our Nation every day, or whether it is the shipyard repairers at Newport News Shipyard who manufacture the largest in manufactured items in the world, nuclear aircraft carriers, which should be a story of American pride, who would find their jobs at risk—a shutdown and even the negative consequences of playing out of last year's CR, which is backward-looking rather than forward-looking, are significant. And that is why turning and facing forward is the approach we should take.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Senator for his insightful and cogent comments. He is a great fighter from Virginia. I look forward to working with the Senator from Virginia—just as I have worked with Senator SHELBY—where there is no brinkmanship, no ultimatums. We just want to get the job done. We need to do our job so other people get to do their job so America keeps rolling.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I would like to speak for 15 minutes on the topic of revenue sharing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I did not come to the floor today to speak on the appropriations and CR, but I want to thank the chairwoman and ranking member for working in a bipartisan way. They are working on finding a solution and an ability to ensure that at the end of the day we can keep this government operating and moving forward, and I thank them for that.

REVENUE SHARING

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I rise to take exception with some of my colleagues—and I hate to say this—on my side of the aisle. This subject is very frustrating. I am talking about a letter I reviewed from March 8. It is a letter from the Senate Energy Committee. The letter talks about revenue sharing and offshore oil and gas development

and how that Federal revenue should be shared.

When I read this letter, it sounds as if there is some evil monster lurking in the deep, which is far from the truth. It is very frustrating—and I hate to say this—to see some of my fellow Democrats trying to make energy policy without talking to folks who are in the energy-producing States.

Let me make this very clear. I am here to talk about revenue sharing. The letter is laid out as if it is about revenue sharing. After reading the letter, I found out that it is really about opposing offshore oil and gas development of any kind. I come from a State that is heavily invested in this endeavor, and to say revenue sharing is inherently inequitable is somewhat comical. What is inequitable is to drain resources from our energy-producing States without compensating them for the impacts of this needed development.

I introduced legislation 6 weeks ago to make sure Alaskans get their fair share of the resources developed along our coastlines. Our communities are greatly impacted by development. My goal is to share Federal energy resources generated off Alaska's coast with the State and local governments as well as Alaska's Native people. It is just common sense.

My bill not only encourages increased and responsible development of Alaska's energy resource, but it also makes sure our communities benefit directly from oil and gas being produced in our State. The idea is to help State, local, and tribal governments pay for the public sector infrastructure required to develop these resources.

My bill also requires oil produced in the Federal waters of the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas—for those who may not always know where Alaska is, it is not near the coast of California, which every map seems to show. It is up north near Canada and has an enormous amount of resources in the Arctic area, and it is called the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas.

My bill also requires oil produced in the Federal waters of the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas to be brought ashore by pipeline. This is safer than tanker transport and secures a future throughput for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline that feeds this country.

The bill provides Alaska with 37.5 percent of Federal bonus bids and royalty shares from any energy development—fossil or renewable. Let me make this clear: Again, when I first read this letter, they seemed to be outraged by revenue sharing. As I look at it closer, it is really about how they don't like offshore development. As I read it, it says they don't like oil and gas.

Before I got here, this Congress passed revenue sharing for the Gulf States, but they excluded Alaska. Even though Alaska is the farthest away from the lower 48, and it is one of this country's fuel sources, there is no rev-

enue stream at all—period. We have a huge impact with the development of our housing, transportation, water, and sewer. We need to have the capacity so these communities can support this large development.

My bill provides just what the Gulf States get—37.5 percent of the Federal revenues. We are not adding new taxes. We are taking what is collected—or in the future what would be collected. The 37.5 percent of Federal revenues would be delivered in the following way: 25 percent will go to the local governments; 25 percent will go to the Alaska Native village and regional corporations. In some ways they are similar to the Indian Country in the lower 48 States but different in how they operate. In any event, it will provide services to Alaska Native communities. Ten percent will go directly to tribal governments, and the remaining 40 percent will go to the State of Alaska to deal with the impacts of this.

This bill also requires 15 percent of the Federal share of royalties be directed to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Why is that important? It is important because that not only touches coastal States, it touches every State. Almost \$900 million annually would be directed for the purpose of land and water conservation throughout this country.

Finally, a percentage of the 37.5 percent of the Federal share would be dedicated directly to deficit reduction.

Again, as I read the letter, they make it sound very evil. They make it sound like it is some monster lurking in the waters. This doesn't sound so evil. This is about fairness to our State and any coastal State that develops oil and gas off their shores.

Again, as I read the letter, it is clear that friends and colleagues on my side of the aisle don't get what it means when we have this type of development and what type of infrastructure we have to provide to balance that infrastructure and ensure the people of that State get the resources and the development they need—especially when we extract from our State. People come and extract from our State and use it elsewhere. Our State should be left with some stream of revenue.

They make a point in the letter, which this bill does address, as far as having 37.5 percent of these resources go to the States. The answer to that is simply, yes. Yes, it does. Relying on the Federal Government to determine what is best for these States doesn't always work out so well. We are now finally doing a CR with some modifications, and I am glad we are.

After 4 years of seeing how this place operates, I will put my bet on State, local, and tribal governments to deliver the services we need. If it means that we take money from the Federal Government and give it to these local communities to do the job, I am all for it.

As a former mayor, I know what we can do when we are given the resources

and how we will spend it efficiently and do what is right for the communities we represent.

I appreciate the moment to talk on this issue. It is frustrating to see these letters. The Presiding Officer is from an energy State and knows what it is like when people propose their ideas for their States—and never talk to us about it—or propose what we should be working on. We should have communication.

It is frustrating to have people from my own side of the aisle say we are not sharing our resources with the rest of the country when we do share. It is also frustrating that some of those on my side of the aisle oppose something which makes so much sense. We need to give more control to the local people who are extracting resources from the coastline.

I thank the Presiding Officer for allowing me to speak.

At this time I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, shortly we will go to our respective party caucuses. I understand that we are going to be joined by the President of the United States so he may share with us his insights and recommendations to deal with our economy so we can get it going.

I know one of the issues that often comes up is the so-called entitlement reform. This is not the subject we are dealing with on the Appropriations Committee, but I would like to talk briefly about how we do impact the funding of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

I would like to take a minute to talk about Medicaid. I want to talk about what Medicaid funds. Remember, Medicaid, by and large, is not in our Appropriations Committee. Medicaid is not in our Appropriations Committee, but the people who work for Medicaid are. And that is a different topic.

I want everybody to understand Medicaid because it is a subject of great debate—and often a prickly debate. Eighty percent of the beneficiaries on Medicaid are children. Usually they are children of the working poor. It helps them to get the health care they need for the early detection of hearing problems. It may also be for a child with diabetes the family is concerned about.

Although 80 percent of the beneficiaries are children, 80 percent of the money goes to seniors or people in nursing homes or assisted-living homes

due to some form of neurological or cognitive impediment.

Now, I don't want to sound like an MD, I don't even have a Ph.D, but from talking to my constituents, I do know 80 percent of those in long-term care facilities are often there due to something related to dementia, such as Alzheimer's or a neurological impediment such as Parkinson's.

Let's talk about NIH—and, remember, NIH does funding at the Bethesda campus in Maryland, and it also gives grants to brilliant researchers who are usually working in academic centers of excellence. Those centers could be Johns Hopkins or the University of Maryland or the University of Alabama or Kentucky. Those grants are competitive and peer-reviewed.

Let me get to the point I am trying to make. By funding NIH and the National Institutes of Aging, we are on a breakthrough trajectory for finding the cognitive stretch-out for Alzheimer's.

I have been on this for more than 20 years because my dear father, who ensured my education and looked out for me all the way through raising me as a young lady, died of the consequences of Alzheimer's. Alzheimer's is an equal opportunity catastrophe for the high and mighty and for the ordinary. Our own endearing President Ronald Reagan died of the consequences of Alzheimer's, as did my father, ordinary people, men and women who helped build America.

So we need to make public investments in research to find the cure for Alzheimer's and, if not a cure, cognitive stretchout. What do I mean by cognitive stretchout? It means if we have early detection, new tools, new MRI technology, new ways of identifying it early on, what could we do to prevent memory loss? If we could do it in 3 to 5 years, we would reduce the cost of Medicaid spending. If we find a cure for Alzheimer's alone—and I am not even talking about Lou Gehrig's disease or Parkinson's—we could reduce the Medicaid budget by 50 percent—5-0.

Nancy Reagan has spoken about it. Sandra Day O'Connor has spoken about it. BARB MIKULSKI is speaking about it. Most of all, America speaks, through the Alzheimer's Association and other groups. They march for the cure. They march for the stretchout. In that one area alone, we could have a dramatic impact on the lives of American families and on the future of Federal spending in Medicaid. It would meet a compelling human need. When a person has Alzheimer's, the whole family has Alzheimer's. I remember my dear mother, as my father became more and more lost in his memory, had to work a 36-hour day, as the family did as well, looking out for him. We were more than willing to do it.

I was born in the 1930s. I was a school girl in the 1940s and 1950s. There wasn't much talk about educating girls. But not from my father. I have two wonderful sisters. My father wanted his girls

to have an education. He felt that by giving us an education, he could give us something nobody would ever take away from us so we would be ready for whatever life sent us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority time has expired.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have no objection but—

Ms. MIKULSKI. Oh, I am sorry. I didn't realize—

Mr. GRAHAM. No objection, I just need about 7 or 8 minutes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Let me just finish this, if I might. I need just 2 minutes. I didn't realize the Senator from South Carolina was on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I just want to make this point. My mother and father saw to my education. My father's business burned down when I was a senior in high school. My mother moved Heaven and Earth for me to go to college. When my father was stricken with the consequences of Alzheimer's, I was determined to move Heaven and Earth to help him. There was little help available.

It is not just about my father. It is about mothers and fathers everywhere. Let's spend the money where the people want us to spend it. Let's meet a compelling human need now and do the research we need to do to help those families and help the Federal budget in the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

ENEMY COMBATANTS

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I wish to bring the body's attention to a recent decision by the Obama administration to place the son-in-law of Osama bin Laden, Mr. Abu Ghaith—I think I am pronouncing the name correctly—into Federal district court in New York charged with conspiracy to kill American citizens. He has been presented to our criminal justice system. He is, in my view, the classic example of an enemy combatant.

I will be, along with Senator AYOTTE, writing the Attorney General asking for a rundown of how long he was interrogated before he was read his Miranda rights. I believe this is a classic example of a person of great intelligence value who should have been held as an enemy combatant at Guantanamo Bay for intelligence-gathering purposes as long as it took to get good intelligence. He, in my view, is a treasure trove of information about not only al-Qaida but maybe things going on in Iran. There is an allegation of his being held in Iran for a very long time as their houseguest, for lack of a better word.

I fear greatly we are beginning to go back to the criminal justice model that

preceded 9/11. The first time the World Trade Center was attacked, we had the Blind Sheik case and the prosecutors did a wonderful job of prosecuting the Blind Sheik and his conspirators in Federal court. But everybody at that time treated al-Qaida and terrorism as a criminal threat.

After 9/11, we changed our model. The attacks of 9/11 were viewed as an act of war and we authorized military force to go after al-Qaida and affiliates by allowing us to use the law of war model regarding al-Qaida operatives. From 9/11 forward, we can now hold them as enemy combatants.

Under the law of war—I have been a military lawyer for 30 years—there is no Miranda right component. If a person is captured as an enemy prisoner, he or she is not read their rights or provided a lawyer. When a commander hears we have a highly valued member of the enemy in our custody, the first thing the commander wants to know is what intelligence we have gathered. The last thing on the commander's mind is where we are going to prosecute them.

So when we are fighting a war, the purpose of interrogating an enemy prisoner is to find out information about enemy activity so we can win the war and protect our troops. In criminal law, the purpose is to convict somebody for a crime. Under criminal law—domestic criminal law—we cannot hold someone for interrogation purposes. We can't ask them about what they have been up to, what they know, and I don't suggest we should. They are entitled to a lawyer and Miranda rights and that is the way it should be.

But we are fighting a war, at least in my view we are fighting a war. I wish to remind the Nation—I doubt if we need a whole lot of reminding but every now and then apparently we do—this is the Twin Towers on fire, beginning to crumble from an attack on 9/11. This is the Pentagon, the damage done to the Pentagon, and 300 people lost their lives there, and this is the Shanksville, PA, site of Flight 93.

To those who suggest we are not in a war, I could not disagree more. I would say the single biggest loss of life in the war on terror was the first day; the very first day the war began, September 11, 2001. Do my colleagues remember where they were? Do they remember their reaction? The first three battles in this war cost us the most lives of any day in the war. We have lost a lot of soldiers, and our hearts go out to them, but there has never been a day when Americans bled more than 9/11 itself.

There are three battlefields in this war: New York, over 2,000 people killed; the Pentagon, around 300 killed; Shanksville, PA, the entire membership of that airplane was killed. To the people of flight 93: You fought back. You weren't fighting against a bunch of criminals. You fought back against a bunch of terrorists who were trying to take the last airplane and crash it into

this building or some other building in Washington. To those who died on that flight, you are the first line of defense. You, above all others, were the first ones to fight back. I will not let your fight go unnoticed. You were not fighting a bunch of criminals. You were fighting people who are at war with us.

I wish we had understood in 1998 we were at war and not used a criminal model. If we had kept the Blind Sheik in military custody, interrogated him for a very long time, lawfully and humanely—because I believe that as a military lawyer—maybe we could have gotten information that would have prevented 9/11.

Here is why I am so upset. The person in custody in New York is the son-in-law of Osama bin Laden. Again, I remind my colleagues, this is the bloodiest day in the war on terror. These are three battlefields that cost us 2,900 lives. Over 2,900 American citizens died on the first day of the war.

Now, years later, we are still capturing people. The person we captured—and I congratulate all those who were involved in bringing this man into our custody. This person over here to the left sitting by Osama bin Laden is his son-in-law. He left Kuwait in 2000 and went to Afghanistan. He pledged allegiance to bin Laden. He was the spokesperson for al-Qaida. He was one of the key guys trying to get other people to pledge allegiance to al-Qaida and bin Laden.

So in 2000 he went to Afghanistan and he joined with bin Laden and became his son-in-law. He founded a charity that was used to support terrorist organizations.

On 9/11, after the attacks, he was one of the first people to speak and to glorify the attacks about how they attacked our homeland. I will get that quote later; I don't have it with me. He said: My brothers, we finally hit the homeland. We finally hit them in the heart of where they live.

On October 10 in a video he said: Americans should know the storm of planes will not stop. There are thousands of the Islamic nation's youth who are eager to die, just as the Americans are eager to live.

All I can say is if this man was interrogated by our intelligence officials and the FBI for hours, not days, before he was read his Miranda rights—under the law of war, we have the opportunity available to us to hold them indefinitely as a prisoner, an enemy combatant, a member of the enemy force, and to lawfully interrogate him without a lawyer, without reading him his Miranda rights because we are trying to gather intelligence and make sure we can prevent future attacks and to find out what this vicious enemy is up to. We did not take that opportunity.

This administration is refusing to use Guantanamo Bay, one of the best military jails in the history of the world—very transparent, well run, and it is the place he should be today, not in New York City awaiting trial in Federal court.

It is not about Federal court not being available in the war on terror. Article III courts have done a good job in many cases of prosecuting terrorists but so have military commission tribunals at Guantanamo Bay, where KSM, the architect of 9/11, is being prosecuted under the Military Commissions Act.

My complaint is that this man was, within hours, read his Miranda rights and given a lawyer and cut off the ability of our government to find out what he knew about the war on terror, current operations, and future operations. He should have been at Guantanamo Bay, interrogated by our military for as long as it took to find out what he knew. If the administration is telling me we got all we needed from this man in 1 day, they are offending my intelligence. I have been a military lawyer for 30 years. I understand what is going on at Guantanamo Bay, the information we have received over years. In some cases, it took months, if not years, to get the total picture of what a detainee knew. So if the administration is telling me and the American public the time they had with this man before they read him his Miranda rights was enough, then they are offending my intelligence.

They are making a huge mistake. The decision not to treat him as an enemy combatant and putting him at Guantanamo Bay for interrogation purposes under the law of the war is one of the most serious mistakes we have made since 9/11. We are beginning to criminalize the war.

This was not an intelligence decision or a military decision; it was a political decision, because they will never convince me or almost anybody else in America that interrogating him for hours was enough. The reason he was interrogated for hours and not days is that they did not want to take him to Guantanamo Bay. The reason he was read his Miranda rights is they are pushing everybody back into the criminal justice system.

All I can say is that Guantanamo Bay has been reformed. It should be the place we take people such as he, as an enemy combatant, to be interrogated under the law of war, and we are using the criminal justice model in a way that will come back to haunt our Nation. We are beginning to criminalize the war. I want my colleagues to know we are going down a very dangerous path, and I will do everything in my power to get this administration and future administrations back in the game when it comes to fighting a war because I believe very much, I say to my colleagues, that we are in a state of war with an enemy who does not wear a uniform, who has no capital to conquer, no Air Force to shoot down, and no Navy to sink. The only thing between them and us is our brave men and women in the military and good information. This man was interrogated for hours when he should have been interrogated for months.

We are beginning to do what got us into this mess to begin with, looking at al-Qaida as a group of common criminal thugs rather than the warriors they are. These people right here mean to kill us all. They are at war with us. I intend to be at war with them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

POULTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. COONS. Madam President, seeing the press of business here, I will be brief. I wanted to take the opportunity to rise and simply speak to the importance of the poultry industry, something that spreads across the Delmarva Peninsula and is central to the State of Maryland, State of Delaware, and many other States in our country.

With the sequester having kicked in, many of us who are from States that have livestock or poultry processing are aware of the impending and significant negative impact on our home States and our economies, on people's employment, and on their opportunity to continue to support their families. So I wanted to briefly speak in support of what I know are Senator MIKULSKI's tireless efforts to ensure that the 6,200 meat and poultry processing plants in this country do not get needlessly shut down.

In the last quarter of the last calendar year alone, 2.2 billion chickens and turkeys were inspected by the meat inspectors of the Food Safety and Inspection Service. This poultry industry, which is nationwide, provides vital employment to the people of Delaware, Maryland, and many other States.

Secretary Vilsack of the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that furloughs, if implemented, of these safety inspectors could cost \$10 billion a year in losses and \$400 million a year in lost wages just for those directly employed.

The private sector grows and the private sector has opportunity when Federal inspectors are a part of the total ecosystem of poultry in this country. We raise great turkeys, we raise great chickens in this country. We have the world's leading poultry industry, but the Food Safety and Inspection Service is a vital part of it.

I commend Senator MIKULSKI for her tireless effort to make sure we find some responsible way through the sequester to ensure it does not needlessly harm and put out of work the tens of thousands of Delawareans and Marylanders who rely on this vital industry for their opportunities going forward.

Madam President, 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. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 21, H.R. 933.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 21, H.R. 933, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Madam President, we expect to adopt the motion to proceed to this bill this afternoon and start on the amendment process. I have spoken to the Chair and the ranking member of this committee, and we are anxious to move forward and start doing some legislating.

As I said this morning when I opened the Senate, this is exemplary, the work done with the two managers of this bill, and we need to make sure we move forward on it. It would be good if we would have amendments that would be in some way germane and relevant to what we are doing, but we are going to take all amendments and try to work through them as quickly as we can. I hope people would agree to very short time agreements. I would hope we do not need to table the amendments. I hope we can move forward and set up votes on every one of them.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate shall stand in recess until 2:30 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:33 p.m., recessed until 2:30 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, as we begin our work this afternoon, I wished to come to the floor to make a few comments about the Homeland Security appropriations bill which is now going to be included in the amendment offered by Senator MIKULSKI and Senator SHELBY as part of an appropriations bill coming over from the House. This is such an important step forward, not just for the government but for the private sector jobs which depend on reliable, transparent, and appropriate government spending, for the whole country. We have been in gridlock and stopped on our funding bills for months

now. We have not been talking about what makes Americans happy and prosperous—smart investments in their future and their interests.

We have been fighting about appropriations bills. That fight, hopefully, is coming to an end because of the extraordinary leadership of the Senator from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI, the senior Senator from Maryland, and the newly minted—not new to the committee, a true veteran of the Appropriations Committee—chairwoman of our committee. She is in an able partnership with Senator SHELBY of Alabama, a longstanding appropriator who understands practical politics and compromise is necessary to move anything of importance through this body. I can't thank them and their staffs enough for salvaging several of these important bills.

They weren't able to come to an agreement on everything. I and others are still troubled we will not see much progress in the areas of education and health, as much as we would like, but that is for another day. We are going to move forward on the sections we may move forward together. One of those areas is funding for homeland security, which is a pretty big bill by Federal Government standards. It is not the largest, it is not the smallest, it is \$42 billion. That is not chump change. It is a significant amount of money the taxpayers provide to us to make decisions about their security. It funds everything from Border Patrol and protection to Customs and Immigration.

It funds the Coast Guard, which is a very important part of our operations. We feel that directly as a coastal State in Louisiana and are very familiar with the needs of coastal communities. The Coast Guard is always there.

It funds a number of other entities. I do not want to fail to mention cyber security, which is one of the newest, most frightening threats to our country. This threat didn't even exist 20 years ago. You may see the ever-evolving capacity of people who would do us harm: not just governments that don't like the United States, not just groups that don't like the United States, but individuals who have some bone, some beef, some anger, and may actually act out in unbelievable ways through the Internet by attacking sensitive material and data.

This is not just an attack to the government functions of our country, but we have seen any number of attacks on our private infrastructure. This is so critical to our existence, whether it is our water systems, our financial systems, our utility systems, our electricity systems. I could go on and on.

This is a very important responsibility for the Federal Government to step up and figure out, working with the Department of Defense, Department of Commerce, and the Department of Homeland Security, which I chair. This is no insignificant matter.

On the contrary, it is not only important for us to have the right money but

invest it in the right places. We are trying very hard to do that. This is why it would have been very dangerous, in my view, to have this bill stuck. We would be funding last year's priorities, not being able to account for all the new intelligence which has come in over the last 12 months. This is an evolving, ever-growing, ever-changing threat. We would have been spending taxpayer money funding last year's threats, not tomorrow's threats.

This is why BARBARA MIKULSKI, the chair of our committee, fought so hard to say we must move some of these appropriations bills forward to ensure appropriate funding and not wasting the taxpayer money. She was right. She was able to negotiate with Senator SHELBY a yes—not a no, not a maybe but a yes—for the homeland security bill, and I could not be a happier chairman.

I also want to thank Senator COATS, who is my able ranking member from Indiana. He worked hand-in-glove with me to put this bill together. Our staffs worked very closely together. We had a few minor disagreements and views. We were able to work them out and work through it, obviously. This bill is here with his signature and mine on it. We were able to negotiate in very good faith with our House counterparts, and I want to thank them.

Chairman MIKULSKI says the four corners have signed off on our appropriations bill, both in the House and the Senate, the Republicans and the Democrats. It took some give and take, but that is what we need to do.

I want to highlight a few areas in the bill people have been very interested in. First, the bill includes total discretionary spending of \$39.6 billion. As I said, \$42 billion was what it was a few years ago. Like every committee, we have taken a cut, we have taken a reduction. Contrary to what you might hear, we are tightening our belts and we are cutting into some muscle. We are cutting into some bone. It is not easy, but it is necessary.

However, there is a point where you can't keep cutting or you won't be able to provide the security in the phrase homeland security. It will just be homeland. There won't be a big security piece around us because we have chopped it up. When people who want to harm this country discover this, they will find the weakness.

I am not trying to scare up additional funding, but I am speaking the truth. Do you want to secure a border? You may talk about it or you may actually build one. If you want a strong Customs agency, which moves people through quickly but ensures no bad things come into our country, you need to fund it. This does not happen on a wish and a prayer.

We have a flat budget. We have reorganized to accommodate what Senator COATS and I believe are the priorities for the Members here representing the people. The Coast Guard, cyber security, border security, travel facilitation I will return to in a moment.

For the Coast Guard, the bill includes \$9 billion in discretionary spending, which is \$400 million above the President's request. We have cut out some other things, but those of us on the committee believe the Coast Guard is important. The Coast Guard is on the front line for drug interdiction, which I don't have to explain to people. It is not classified information that now we have drug kingpins owning submarines which bring drugs into the United States. People read about this. It is true. It is not science fiction. We need to make certain the Coast Guard has access to stop drugs from coming into our country in smart, aggressive ways, working in partnership with other governments.

I don't have to remind everyone about the oilspill, the terrible accident. That trial is still going on in New Orleans as I speak, with hundreds of lawyers still debating the worst oilspill in the history of the country. Who showed up? The Coast Guard. They have to have all sorts of equipment to be able to respond for drug interdiction, which is different than an oilspill cleanup; and, of course, people are rescued literally every day by the brave men and women of the Coast Guard who risk their lives to keep our commerce and our recreational boating moving throughout this Nation.

We have \$557 million for production of the sixth national security cutter. Let me say something about this that people don't understand. I see my good friend DICK SHELBY, and he most certainly understands this as a Senator from Alabama, but I want people who are not on our Appropriations Committee to understand something. When most people in America buy a big item, such as a house or even when they send their kids to college, they finance that. They take that big hit, such as a \$40,000 loan to send their child to college for 1 year or \$120,000 or \$160,000 for 4 years, if they are going to a very fancy, expensive school. Happily, for some of us, at LSU we get a great bargain and a great education for \$10,000. But for some families even \$10,000 for 4 years is a lot of money. They do not pay cash for that. They finance that. The Senator from Alabama knows this.

Under the rules in Washington, we cannot finance most things. People don't understand this. We have to pay cash. So because we need that national security cutter, I had to find \$557 million in our budget to pay for it this year, even though it takes a long time to build it.

I think this should be changed. Senator Snowe, who was the chair of this Committee on Defense, Navy, for many years, thought it needed to be changed, but it has not changed as yet. I want people to know the pressures we are under in this bill, because sometimes when we have to fund these big items in one year, basically, we have to pay cash.

Now, yes, ultimately this money is being borrowed through the general

fund—and I don't want to get into a technical argument—but as far as we are concerned, we are paying cash for it in our budget—\$557 million this year for the national security cutter.

We are also funding \$77 million for long lead time, \$335 million for six new fast response cutters, \$90 million for a new C-130 J aircraft, and I have invested, at my priority, \$10 million for military housing for the Coast Guard.

The Army, the Navy, the Air Force have been upgrading their housing. The poor Coast Guard, because they are smaller and they are more isolated, is not in areas where we can take advantage of that public-private partnership that is working so well. I think our Coast Guard families need some support, and I was able to find some funding there for them.

I don't need to take much more time. I don't know if the Senator from Alabama is here to speak, but I will take 5 more minutes, and if he needs me to cease, I will.

But I want to also point out that we put some investments in the bill to address the cyber threat, which the President has described, and I agree with him, as one of the most serious economic and national security challenges we face as a nation. This bill includes \$757 million, which is \$313 million above last year, and I was happy to do that. I think this is a priority. We have moved other items around in the budget because this is a real threat, it is evolving every day, and we have to have the research and technology to address it and work with the private sector to see what we can do to keep their network safe and our government strong.

The bill includes \$7 billion for the Disaster Relief Fund. This was also a battle we fought. The money is in there for Sandy, for Isaac, for Irene, for Ike, for Gustav, for Rita and Katrina and there are a few other storms that are, even after 6 or 7 years, still open. So this is money there for them to finish their recovery.

In science and technology, the bill includes \$835 million, a 25-percent increase. I want to say one other thing, and I think Senator SHELBY will agree with me, that people don't understand how important it is that the Federal Government invests in research and development. Yes, private companies do invest in research and development, but some of the investment we do is truly so farfetched that no one in their right mind would invest in it because there is no immediate return. Yet we have seen, time and time again, when the Federal Government steps up and makes those long-term investments in research, what happens—something is discovered. The Internet was a good example of research through the Department of Defense, and I could give other examples. But soon enough, the private sector realizes, oh my gosh, this research is breakthrough—such as that which came from our research in health on our DNA and all the new and exciting technologies in health.

I can tell you our State is benefiting a great deal from the research done 20 years ago on fracking. That wasn't done by Exxon or Mobil, it was done by the Federal labs out West because of research money in one of our bills. I am not sure which bill it was, but potentially in energy, and that is what is leading to the revolution in natural gas. As to this baloney that the Federal Government doesn't have to invest in research and technology, we do it in partnership with the private sector, and it is the best system in the world. We would be shortchanging ourselves and our future economic growth if we didn't continue it.

Finally, just one more word about another priority. I have put some additional funding by moving some things around for Customs and Immigration and for TSA. I am not the only Senator who represents a State that depends, in large part, on the hospitality tourism and trade. I could list many States in our country that do as well, but let me tell you about Louisiana. We believe in hospitality. We believe it is a good business. We enjoy having people come to our State. They come, and we all have a great deal of fun and excitement with our festivals and our fairs. But at the end of the day, we make money and we create jobs and it is an important industry. I am alarmed at the fallout of international travel to the United States since 9/11. It has only increased by about 1 percent.

To put that into perspective—and I believe this number is correct, but I will check it for the record—as the Senator from Alabama knows, international travel in the world has increased by something like 400 percent. So people are going to China, they are going to Korea. There is a growing middle class, and what middle-class people do, besides buy homes and send their kids to school, is travel. It is a middle-class thing. We now have more middle-class people in the world than ever, but they are not coming to the United States because we are not investing in the kinds of infrastructure in our airports and ports that provide a safe but pleasant environment. So I am working very closely with the International Travel Association—and I want to thank them publicly for the work they are doing—because I am one Senator who believes in this. I think the President has also said that international travel means jobs for Americans right here at home. It is something they cannot transport.

For border security, the bill maintains the legislatively mandated staffing floor of 21,370 border patrol agents and provides \$76 million above the request for Border Patrol staffing within customs and border protection.

Similarly, the bill provides \$240 million above the request for maintaining current staffing levels of frontline CBP officers at our land, air, and sea ports of entry. The fiscal year 2013 budget request for CBP submitted to Congress over 1 year ago resulted in an overall

funding shortfall of more than \$320 million. This bill fills the vast majority of that shortfall through internal savings and reductions in other, lower priority areas. CBP will continue to face challenges in meeting its staffing requirements and I am committed to helping this important agency fulfill its critical missions.

The bill includes \$1.46 billion for first responders grants, an increase of \$200 million above fiscal year 2012. These grants ensure our frontline responders are trained and equipped for catastrophic disasters. Recent examples of grant investments that supported disaster response are: communications assets, search and rescue units, generators, and medical equipment used during the 2011 tornadoes in Arkansas, Alabama, and Missouri; joint operations centers, rescue boats, and hazardous materials equipment used during Hurricane Sandy in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut; and cutting-edge mobile vehicle radios and an upgraded 911 call center used during Hurricane Sandy in Maryland.

While the response to more frequent severe disasters has improved, the funding in this bill will help address remaining gaps in preparedness. For instance, the recent National Preparedness Report found that State and local governments are less than halfway to achieving needed recovery capabilities and defending against the growing cybersecurity threat.

Finally, in an effort to maximize resources for frontline missions, the bill approves the request to eliminate \$800 million in administrative costs and rescinds \$307 million in unobligated balances associated with low-priority programs. The bill also requires 30 expenditure plans to ensure oversight of taxpayer dollars.

I would like to conclude by emphasizing my concern with the impact sequester will have on the Department of Homeland Security. Despite the smart investments that are made in this bill, the problem of sequester remains.

The Secretary of Homeland Security has testified before the Appropriations Committee that these automatic budget reductions will be disruptive and destructive to our Nation's security and economy.

At our busiest airports, peak wait times could grow to over 4 hours or more during the summer travel season. Such delays would affect air travel significantly, potentially causing thousands of passengers to miss flights with economic consequences at the local, national, and international levels. New flights that bring in hundreds of millions of dollars to the U.S. economy would be delayed or potentially denied due to reduced staffing.

Sequestration will also impact our Nation's land borders. For example, daily peak wait times at the El Paso Bridge of the Americas could increase from 1 hour to over 3 hours.

The Coast Guard will have to reduce operations by up to 25 percent impact-

ing drug and migrant interdiction efforts.

The sequester will impact our ability to detect and analyze emerging cyber threats and protect civilian federal computer networks, and

FEMA will delay implementing critical reforms to improve disaster response and recovery.

The Border Patrol workforce could be reduced by 5,000.

I urge Senators to work together on a bipartisan basis to repeal this ill-conceived sequester and approve legislation that includes balanced deficit reduction.

I again want to thank the chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator MIKULSKI; the vice chair, Senator SHELBY; and the ranking member on the Homeland Security Subcommittee, Senator COATS for their hard work in including the Homeland Security Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2013 in this essential legislation to fund the Federal Government.

I am very happy to speak about this bill, but I do see the leaders are on the floor—the chairman and the ranking member—and I want to personally thank them both for bringing our appropriations bills to the floor. I have spoken about homeland security, but there are other bills that need to be talked about this afternoon. I am happy we could work out this agreement with my Republican counterparts, and, again, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their extraordinary leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, I just want to follow up on some of the comments the Senator from Louisiana has made—very positive comments about research and the role of the Federal Government in all aspects of research. She is a very hard-working member of the Appropriations Committee and she has been involved in a lot of this.

Whether it is research on health issues—the National Institutes of Health on cancer or you name it—information technology, energy, which the Senator from Louisiana referenced—there are so many good things that come out of this, and I believe, overall, the Senate and the House, on both sides of the aisle, realized this. But with all the breakthroughs in information technology we have had, we have only to go back to the research and development the Federal Government did that basically brought us our Internet to realize that didn't just happen. It was built over many years, with many ideas and research. Look at it today. We have all benefited from this overall.

There are threats to this information technology, in everything we use today dealing with energy; for example, our power grid, because a lot of that, as we all know, is computer driven and operated, our banking system's information technology, our military, our traffic

control systems we rely on every day, and I am sure our trains and other vehicles we run. There are threats to this today. A lot of us know it as cyber security threats, and they are real.

So as we do research in this area, as we continue our research, we cannot forget that. That is a job we all have to work together on, and I believe, on the Appropriations Committee, this is a good start today for challenges in our future to the security of our information systems—our grid, our banking system, our Federal Reserve, and I can go on and on because it affects everything in our everyday life, and we shouldn't forget it.

I think we are off to a good start today. Senator MIKULSKI, the chair of the committee, and I believe this is the first time in a few years we have come to the floor trying to work together on appropriations, and we are determined to make this regular order work. I believe the majority of the Senators on my side of the aisle—the Republicans—and those on the Democratic side of the aisle will, in a few days, bring this to a head and we will do something good for the American people and bring forth some certainty and some good legislation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, other Senators on the Appropriations Committee—and all are welcome to come and comment, but those on the Appropriations Committee actually assigned to do the work will be coming throughout the afternoon to actually describe the content of the bill. I would like to talk about the content.

We on Appropriations have 12 subcommittees. Of those 12 subcommittees, each has a chair and a ranking member from the other party. The reason I am telling you this is to describe what it takes to do a bill.

So through all of last week, after we got the guidance of our caucus, the guidance of the authorizing committee, the guidance from the leadership, we began to put a bill together. It is not easy. My own staff and Senator SHELBY's staff worked through that first snowstorm we had, took computers home and worked all day and through the evening. I was back and forth. We wanted to make sure there was no fog in our bill. And then out of that the subcommittees gave recommendations.

The reason I say that is that took us to Thursday. We didn't complete, from our end, the framework and substance of the bill until Saturday. That means me, the Democratic majority—the majority party has the responsibility of

putting the bill together, but this is not a one-woman show here. So after we did, we gave it to our counterparts, who have been in consultation on broad principles, negotiations between the subcommittees, consultation with the authorizing committees on policy, where we are heading.

Then when we got it to Senator SHELBY and his staff, they had to exercise their due diligence. We wanted them to do the due diligence. We wanted them to look through every aspect of that bill to make sure with our word of honor, which we have had together for more than 25 years, that there were no hidden agreements, that there were no surprises parachuted in that if we woke up, neither would be happy about.

I must compliment Senator SHELBY and his staff. They worked through the weekend doing every line item to make sure, when they gave Senator MCCONNELL and the Republican caucus their best assessment, they had a chance to look at every single line item, and they sure did it, and they worked hard.

So there are those who would say: We would have liked to have had the bill sooner. We would have liked to have been able to get the bill sooner. But we are talking about the funding for the entire United States of America. That is a lot of lines and that is a lot of items that had to be gone through methodically, diligently, and meticulously, and we moved as expeditiously as we could.

So we then had our bill, and I really wanted to share it with the House. I think we have been working with the House in a very constructive way, communicating, but it took until very late yesterday afternoon for us to complete our process as members of the Appropriations Committee.

I would have really loved getting this bill to the floor and filing this bill sooner, but in order to do it right, and not only the right content but the right way, to make sure the appropriate committees were able to exercise their due diligence, their vigilance, their scrutiny, we now present a bill to the entire Senate.

So I hope we can move forward on our legislation. We want Members to take a look at it. We hope we can work on amendments this afternoon. I hope we have permission to go to our bill. We have two great amendments lined up—different philosophies, but that is what it is.

I talked to Senator AYOTTE on the floor a couple of weeks ago during sequester. Bring up the amendments. We have an amendment by Senator HARKIN on the Labor-HHS content, and we have an amendment to be offered on President Obama's health care bill. There is a Senator who would like to have the full Senate decide whether we should defund it. This is an important national debate. Let it come on out. The only way we can get to that is by letting us go to the bill.

We have an arcane procedure in the Senate called a motion to proceed. In

order to be able to vote, we have to get permission to proceed. I want to get to amendments. I want to have a real debate on real issues. Where are we on Labor-HHS? What is the Senate's full view on the funding of ObamaCare? Let's get out there, and instead of fussing over procedure, let's get to real content. Let's talk about the real issues around funding and what we should be doing to pass the continuing resolution to keep America's funding going but where the majority rules and we have our bill.

So let's get to the situation where we can move through the bill, where we can offer amendments. Regardless of how you feel about amendments, we all feel Senators have the right to offer amendments. Let's get to it. Let's get the job done. Let's show we can function as the greatest parliamentary body in the world.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am somewhat amazed and stunned. You would think that someone who is given an answer to the question—yes—should pretty much be satisfied.

We have been trying to keep the government from shutting down. I appreciate the work done by the Speaker. I didn't agree with his bill, but I appreciate what he did, and he did it in a timely fashion.

The chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator MIKULSKI, has been negotiating with her Republican counterpart, RICHARD SHELBY, for days now. They worked all weekend, late into Sunday night, and they worked out a bipartisan agreement. They offered the amendment here. Now we hear from a couple of Senators: Let's not take up the bill. They need more time.

I thought people wanted to have an open amendment process on this bill. Offer amendments. Now it appears that the day is gone. I guess we won't be able to offer amendments today. I have said all along that we would turn to it as soon as possible. Our Republican colleagues said they want to see the first amendment that was to be offered. They saw that. They were originally given to certain people in the leadership office on Saturday about noon, and there has been every effort to work together on this matter. They wanted to see the first amendment that will be offered. I have indicated that was done; they saw it. There were negotiations to get to where that is. But now Senators want to prevent us from going to the bill. Remember, if I file cloture today, the earliest we can have the vote is Thursday.

We are going to finish this CR, and we are going to finish the budget before there will be an Easter recess. That is a fact. So everyone should understand that delaying on this—because they want to read the bill more deeply, I guess—doesn't really make a lot of sense.

We are going to do the budget resolution. I have made that clear, and I emphasize that now. And the Republicans have been talking about—even though it is basically without foundation—that we haven't had a budget resolution. We haven't needed one. We had one that was not a resolution, it was a law that set the standards for what we would do with our budget. It set ceilings on how much we would spend. As a result of that, we were able to get the funding for our subcommittees and appropriations. But they want a budget resolution, which isn't as good as law, and we are going to do everything we can to get that done.

So if Republicans object to allowing the Senate to be in consideration of a bill negotiated with Republicans, then the only people who will be disadvantaged are other Republicans who want to be able to offer amendments.

So I regret that again we have come to this. Just when you think it can't get worse, it gets worse. There are things we have to do. The CR is one of those. If it means cutting into the April recess—we have 2 weeks to do a lot of things people have planned for some time—then that is what we will need to do. But I am stunned.

I learned about this when we had the President at our caucus. I really am flabbergasted that here we are on the eve of doing something together, regular order, but regular order around here is stopping every bill from going on the floor. That is what the regular order is here. I thought we had some kind of an agreement at the beginning of this Congress that this wasn't going to go on anymore. We had that 2 years ago. We changed the rules here a little bit.

There is going to be tremendous angst within my caucus and I think the country to continue trying to legislate with the burdens that we bear, that just one or two people do everything they can to throw a monkey wrench into everything we do. As a country, we are being looked at as being inoperable. It is too bad. It is not good for this institution, and it is really not good for the country.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, if people are watching us on C-SPAN—and they do, in our own country and around the world—they will say: Well, it is Tuesday afternoon, 3:30. What is happening in the Senate? We see two Senators—able, seasoned, experienced. Where is the debate? Where are the amendments? Where is the clash of ideas in an open and public forum on what is best?

We are not doing that because we have arcane rules that Senators can put what they call a hold on a bill so we cannot proceed. In the old days that was a good idea; you placed a hold. This goes back to stagecoach days. You are an Indiana man, you understand that, I say to the Chair respectfully. But it was so you could get back. You would put a hold on a bill if you believed I offered legislation that could hurt Indiana, and in your stagecoach you could dash back here.

We don't have stagecoaches anymore. In fact, we are all right here. I would like to be able to move this bill. There are those Senators who want more time. They could actually be looking at the bill if they would let us go this afternoon, because we have two amendments that would take us to 5 or 6—well, gosh now—until this evening. But we would get two amendments done on two pretty big topics, one of which should be, are we or are we not going to fund the President's health care initiative?

We need to move this bill. What is it that Senator SHELBY and I are trying to do? We are trying to pass a continuing resolution to fully fund the Federal Government with the scrutiny and oversight of the Congress by October 1. Right now we have the CR, as it is called, the funding. The continued funding expires March 27. Some people might say that is 15 days from now. Not really because we have to pass our bill, we have to go to the House, and then we have to have a bill signed by the President. We would like to do that before the Easter-Passover recess, for which we break next week. We would really like to do it.

I know one of my colleagues is on the Senate floor. I recognize the right for Senators to review and scrutinize a bill. I have done it myself. I respect that.

In the days when we were skeptical and even suspicious of one another, you wanted to look at it to make sure there were no cheap gimmicks, no little fast hand motions, no earmarks parachuted in. But I can say this: After the Democrats finished the bill, we gave it to Senator SHELBY and his staff. This bill has been very much scrutinized so that any of those tricks of the old days are not here.

I really need everybody's attention. There is a lot of conversation going on.

What I want to say is this: If anyone spots something they think is a cute gimmick, I would sure like to know about it. I recognize the Senators' rights, but I ask them if we could at least proceed to the bill where, while we debate these two big amendments, we would do it.

Would I have liked to have made it available 72 hours ago? The answer is, yes. But given the magnitude of what we did and the due diligence necessary by the Republicans, it was physically and intellectually impossible, not with the scrutiny and oversight not done until yesterday. When we get back to

regular order it will be better. But I feel like I have multiple decks I have been dealt: a real deck, a pinochle deck, a poker deck, and so on.

I am making a plea that we go to our bill, recognizing the Senators should scrutinize the bills and recognizing Senators' rights to offer amendments. That is simply my plea. Some of my colleagues are on the Senate floor, and I will be happy to engage in a conversation with them, two of whom I have enormous respect for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, first, I want to tell the chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee that I actually very much appreciate her work. I actually trust her to do the right thing. But we got this bill last night at 9 o'clock. It is a 500-page bill. It has multiple levels of authorizations in it that we found so far—authorization on an appropriations bill. It has what I would consider—and we haven't been completely through it—some things that are totally counterintuitive to where we find ourselves today in terms of spending money.

Before I could grant a unanimous consent—and I will; as soon as we get through with the bill I plan on granting unanimous consent. But I want to know, we just heard the majority leader say he can't understand why somebody wants to read this bill. We are talking about in excess of \$1 trillion. That is one of the problems, one of the reasons we are \$17 trillion in debt. It is because people don't read the bills.

I also want to say to my friend from Alabama, I have the greatest praise for him. He knows some of the heartburn we have on this, but we knew that was coming from the House. But to not allow us the time to assess what you have produced by being able to read and study the bill is going against the best traditions of the Senate. It is also going against common sense.

How do we know whether we want to offer amendments unless we have been able to read the bill? Are we just to blindly say: Whatever you want to do we are going to approve it because we have a deadline at the end of this month?

I am willing to do whatever is necessary to make sure we get a continuing resolution, but I am not willing to do that blindly. I am going to study this bill. We have three Members' staff working on this full time. They have been working since last night. They are investigating and looking at this bill. I will not go into the details of the things we have seen so far, but we ought to at least have the opportunity before we rush into granting unanimous consent to go forward.

I plan to allow unanimous consent, but I will not do so until I know what the agreement is going to be in terms of amendments. Even if we read the bill and have some good ideas, we don't know whether we are going to be able to offer any. This is an appropriations

bill. We ought to be able to offer amendments with our ideas on ways to save this country money, increase its efficiency, increase its effectiveness, and still meet the deadline that the chairwoman outlined.

I hope the Senator understands why we are not in a mood to grant it until we actually know what we are talking about. To ask anything less of us would be asking us to deny the very oath we took when we came here.

With that, I yield the floor and thank my colleague JOHN MCCAIN for being here.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, along with the Senator from Oklahoma, I intend to object. I think the Senator made the case. I will remind my colleagues that 1 week ago Senator COBURN and I sent a letter to Senator REID and Senator MCCONNELL with copies to Senator MIKULSKI and Senator SHELBY.

We stated in one sentence:

We write to inform you of our intention to object to entering into a time agreement before consideration of a continuing resolution until we have had at least 72 hours to review its contents.

That is what we wrote. That is what we asked for.

I will remind my colleagues again, it is a 587-page bill of over \$1 trillion that we got at 9 p.m. last night. Is there anyone who has had time to read this entire bill that is 587 pages long? We are talking about \$1 trillion, and we are holding up the Senate? We have had since 9 p.m. last night until 3:30 p.m. this afternoon to examine a 587-page bill of over \$1 trillion.

What we have already found—and we have not finished, but we hope to be finished with examining this legislation within a few hours—is the most egregious pork-barrel spending during a time of sequestration. I find it mind-boggling. We spent 3 weeks in December on the floor of this Senate doing the fiscal year 2013 Defense authorization bill. There are provisions in this CR that were directly prohibited in the Defense authorization bill.

I respect the knowledge of the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Maryland on defense issues, but we spent 3 weeks and hundreds of hours in hearings including amendments and markup. For example, we said there would be no money for Guam until we have a coherent strategy laid out by the administration as to how we were going to implement the base realignment. The fiscal year 2013 National Defense Authorization Act prohibited expending that money.

What have they crammed into this 587-page bill? There is \$120 million for a public regional health laboratory and civilian wastewater improvements in Guam. Why? I ask my friend from Alabama: Why does this directly contradict the authorization bill which was just passed that said no money would be given to Guam for these pur-

poses until such time as we had developed the strategy for the base realignment in Guam? Is it because the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Maryland know something more than the Defense authorization bill authorizers did? We had debate, discussion, and authorization of this, and we specifically prohibited it.

So here we are. We have not been able to deploy an aircraft carrier because of sequestration. We have had to cut down on flying hours. We have had to reduce maintenance. We have had to make all kinds of tough decisions as to the men and women who are serving, not to mention the equipment, operations, and maintenance.

What have we already found out in this bill? I want to assure my colleagues I am not making this up. There is an additional \$5 million for the National Guard Youth Challenge program. I think the National Guard Youth Challenge Program is a pretty worthwhile project, but is it worthwhile when we are having to keep a carrier from deployment? There is \$5 million for the National Guard STARBASE Youth Program; another \$154 million for the Army, Navy, and Air Force “alternative energy research initiatives.” This type of research has developed such shining examples as the Department of Navy’s purchase of 450,000 gallons of alternative fuel for \$12 million, which is over \$26 per gallon.

There is \$18 million for unspecified “industrial preparedness,” \$16 million for Parkinson’s disease research. That part is out of Defense, my friends. That is not out of Health and Human Services; it is out of Defense. There is \$16 million for neurofibromatosis research, \$16 million for HIV-AIDS research, which is a worthy cause, but it is taken out of Defense. There is \$9 million for unspecified radar research, \$567 million for unrequested medical research, \$20 million for university research initiatives, and \$7 million for the Civil Air Patrol program increase.

The list goes on and on, and we have not finished. How in the world do we have a provision “for an incentive program that directs the Department of Defense to overpay on contracts by an additional 5 percent if the contractor is a Native Hawaiian-owned company,” how in the world is this justified during this time of sequestration?

I note the presence of our leader on the floor, and I want to assure the leader, with all due respect, that this is a 587-page bill of over \$1 trillion. We got it at 9 p.m. last night. I hope that in a few hours we will be able to finish examining this bill. What we have found so far is so egregious it is hard to imagine that anybody—in light of the sequestration and the damage it does to the lives of the men and women who are serving the military—could have added these kinds of provisions and, frankly, is beyond anything I think I have ever seen in the years I have served in the Senate.

I yield to the distinguished majority leader, but before I do, I object.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Object to what?

Mr. President, through the Chair to my friend from Arizona, this is a 587-page bill that has been available to the public because the vast majority of this bill is identical to what the House already passed—identical. He, along with his staff and the Senator from Oklahoma, have had days and days to look this over.

I want to make sure everyone understands I can only do so much. I try not to be too sensitive, but the Senator from Oklahoma seems to have a problem—I assume he was referring to me or perhaps he was referring to Senators DURBIN, SCHUMER, and MURRAY. Here is what he said on one of the Sunday shows:

“The Senate’s not nearly as dysfunctional as it is made out to be . . .” said Coburn. “Our problem in the Senate is the leadership in the Senate.”

I don’t know if he is referring to Senator MCCONNELL, I don’t know whom he is referring to, but one day he should look in the mirror.

I want to try and get along here. The vast majority of the stuff that is in this bill came from the House of Representatives. It has been available for days. I cannot remember what day we received this. I think it was last Wednesday or thereabouts, so it has been many days.

I know Senator MCCAIN very well. He and I came to the House and the Senate together. I understand how he feels about these issues. I don’t blame him for being upset about some of the things in this bill, but it is not our fault. We are trying to get a bill to fund the government, and what we need to do is get on the bill.

I am criticized for not allowing amendments to be offered. We cannot have amendments offered until we get on the bill. I think it would be much better if we could get on the bill. If people want to offer amendments, it is kind of jump ball here. We have 100 Senators, and a few of them want to offer amendments. We cannot dictate what amendments will be offered before we even get on the bill.

I hope my friend from Arizona will take some time with the staff and look the bill over—it has been around since last Wednesday or thereabouts—so we can get on the bill. The time is being wasted. We have to finish this and the budget before we leave for Easter vacation.

We can do the bill this week, next week or the week after that. We have to get this done. I am not trying to fight with anybody, but as I said, I do have some sensitivities about my friend from Oklahoma continually berating the leadership in the Senate. I have come to the rationalization that maybe he is talking about his own leadership. I don’t know.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask through the Chair if my friend would yield for a question.

Mr. REID. Of course.

Mr. MCCAIN. First of all, I appreciate very much the majority leader's responsibility to make sure we take up and pass legislation. There are many times when I have to say that the majority leader has been frustrated by some events and individuals which arouses my sympathy for the responsibility he has and his inability to carry out his duties.

I point out to my friend from Nevada that we just got this bill last night, so to rely on the fact that a House bill should be our guide when we know there were many provisions added—at least some provisions that were added that we already found in the Senate version of the bill—I would hope he would understand we need a little more time to try to get through the entire bill, which I hope will be sooner rather than later. Once that is done, then we can—as the majority leader said—be open for amendments.

I hope the majority leader understands our point of view, that this is bill over \$1 trillion with 587 pages. For us to take sort of an act of faith that this is the bill that came from the House is obviously not the case.

Mr. REID. If my friend would yield—Mr. MCCAIN. I appreciate the majority leader's responsibilities, and I appreciate his frustration. I hope he will understand ours and we will try to move this as quickly as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. For many years and decades Senator MCCAIN has been a watchdog of what goes on with spending in this country. I expect that from him, so I don't say that in a negative fashion. I don't have a problem with Senator MCCAIN looking over this legislation so he feels comfortable with moving on to it, and then if he has amendments to offer, we can move on amendments. I have no complaint about JOHN MCCAIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me thank the Senators from Maryland and Alabama for their leadership on this bill. I might say to my friend, the Senator from Arizona, that I have a new assignment in the Appropriations Committee following the departure and passing of our great friend Senator Danny Inouye. I am trying my best to make sure we are doing our best on national defense, which I know is near and dear to the Senator from Arizona.

There was an extraordinary effort made in the House to accommodate the Department of Defense in the continuing resolution as well as accommodating military construction and veterans. I think it is a good bill. It comes over to us with provisions that will be helpful with some of the problems and challenges they will face.

What these Senators have tried to do is to add several other areas of agreement in the appropriations process. If I am not mistaken, most everything

they have added has been subject to debate within the subcommittee and full committee. So there is no attempt here to conceal anything, and we knew full well that the watchful eye of the Senator from Arizona and his friends would be applied to this bill.

I think what we were trying to achieve today is to start the amendment process—not to close it down but start the amendment process. That would give Members who want to come forward with an amendment the time to offer those amendments and others the time to review this legislation closely. I think that was our goal, only to have this shut down now, where no amendments can be taken up or considered. Without foreclosing the Senator from Arizona or the Senator from Oklahoma, wouldn't it be a healthier situation for us to be actively considering amendments of Members who know what they wish to offer at this point?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. The point of the Senator from Illinois is very well made, but unless we know the entirety of the bill, we don't know what our priorities are as far as amendments are concerned. I am sure the Senator knows that even though amendments are going to be allowed, there is going to be a limited number of amendments. We know how things work around this place come Thursday afternoon.

All we are asking is to give us a little more time. It was 9 o'clock last night when we received the final version of the bill.

I would say to my friend from Illinois, unless we know what is in the bill in its entirety, it is hard for us to know what the priority amendments we intend on proposing are. I think we are nearly through the examination of the bill. I do not wish to impede the progress of the Senate on this legislation. I know how important it is.

I also hope my friend will understand that we asked a week ago to have 72 hours, which is the normal Senate procedure, to examine the bill before we consider it. I understand the exigencies of the moment—all the back and forth between both sides of the Capitol—but I don't believe, for a \$1 trillion bill, 587 pages, it is too much to ask for about 12 hours, or 14 hours, 15 hours—we have our staff working full time, and I wish to assure the Senator we will have it done soon.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if I might engage further in this dialogue, I see the Chair is seeking recognition. But there are Senators on both sides who have amendments ready to go. They have ideas they wish to present to the Senate for consideration. Without foreclosing the Senator from Arizona and his colleagues of the possibilities to offer amendments tomorrow or

whenever they are prepared to, I don't know why we want to shut down this deliberation today. We can consider some of these amendments and still not in any way prejudice the rights of Senators to review the bill and offer amendments of their choice.

Mr. MCCAIN. Look, my dear friend, every Senator has their responsibilities in this body. I have a responsibility particularly where defense is concerned. We spent 3 weeks on this legislation, including hundreds of amendments, hours and hours of debate, markup in the committee of hours and hours, hundreds of hours of hearings by the leaders of our military and the administration. I haven't finished examining the defense part of this bill.

Now, why am I so worried about the provisions of this bill? Because there are provisions in this bill that directly contradict the Defense authorization we spent weeks on. We prohibited money for Guam, OK? We prohibited it. Now there is \$120 million in the bill for it. So that makes me curious as to what else is in this bill.

So I think for me to go back and tell my constituents in Arizona, who are heavily dependent on our national defense and our bases, to say, Yes, I went ahead without even reading the whole bill, without even my staff going through the entire bill; we were in such a hurry with our over \$1 trillion legislation that they didn't want me to hold up the Senate so people could propose amendments—that is not my duty to the citizens of Arizona.

So I say with respect to my friend, I respect the rights of all other Senators. I hope the rights of the Senator from Oklahoma and my rights would be respected and that includes reading a piece of legislation that is 587 pages long.

Mr. DURBIN. If I might respond to the Senator, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for 2013 provides \$604.9 billion, including \$87.2 billion for overseas contingency operations. That is a reduction from the 2012 level of \$633.2 billion.

There are no changes in the defense section of this bill. There are no changes in the bill that was passed by the House of Representatives last week. The bill fully complies with the spending caps in the Budget Control Act. It contains no Member-requested earmarks, in compliance with the earmark moratorium. There are cuts in the defense budget to define programs with excess funding, scheduled delays, and the like.

The bill includes 671 cuts as it came out of the House to programs in the budget request of funds that are not needed for the remaining 6½ months of the year.

I might say to my friend from Arizona, this is what the House passed. We have not added anything to it that I think would be of Senate authorship that changes it in substance.

So I understand. It is the Senator's right. I respect his right and I will

fight for his right as a Senator. But I would hope that at least for those Senators prepared to offer amendments, without in any way prejudicing the right of the Senator from Arizona to do so, we could proceed with the amendment process.

Mr. MCCAIN. Well, again, I thank my friend from Illinois and I thank him for his point of view. I understand it. I understand the frustration of our two leaders on the Appropriations Committee and their desire to get this done. I understand the time clock is running out. We are talking about a very short period of time. But I have to repeat to the Senator from Illinois one more time: I am not going to go back to my State and say, By the way, I started the amendment process and debating on a bill that I hadn't read. I don't do that, and I hope the Senator from Illinois respects it. I hope in a very short period of time we can agree to proceed and have vigorous debate and amendments.

I also have to say this is remarkable. Here we are, I say to my friend from Illinois, in a period of sequestration, and there is a provision in here for \$15 million for an incentive program that directs the Department of Defense to overpay contracts by an additional 5 percent if the contractor is a Native Hawaiian-owned company. That boggles the mind. It is unbelievable. While we are keeping ships tied up at the pier because we can't deploy them, we are now going to tell Native Hawaiian companies they are going to be overpaid by an additional 5 percent if they are based in Hawaii. What is that all about? That is why the Senator from Oklahoma and I have to read the bill. I thank my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Would the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. MCCAIN. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. MIKULSKI. We acknowledge the validity of the concerns of the Senator from Arizona. We also acknowledge that we would have liked very much for people to have seen this 72 hours in advance. There was no intent to stiff-arm. Please understand that. We weren't trying to be cute and come in late and all that. It was just the sheer physicality of moving the bill, not getting it from the House until Thursday. So there was no intent to not honor the request of the Senator from Arizona, in which he was very plain, and he has been consistent in every bill. The Senator's request was not unusual and it was no surprise. So that is essentially where we are.

Mr. MCCAIN. I would say to the Senator, the distinguished chairperson, I respect that and I would never impugn her motives. I said I thought I understood the time constraints the Senator from Maryland is under, given the House and the Senate and all that. I certainly did not intend to believe that there was anything—

Ms. MIKULSKI. I just wanted to assure the Senator from Arizona of that

and I have respect for the Senator and his regard for the purse.

Does the Senator from Arizona have a sense of when he will be finished reviewing the bill?

Mr. MCCAIN. I think in a very short time. I have to coordinate with the Senator from Oklahoma, but I think within a couple of hours.

Ms. MIKULSKI. We would appreciate it in any way the Senator feels he can exercise his traditional due diligence. We are not going to engage in arguments, but we would like to go ahead if we could get something going even later on this evening.

Mr. MCCAIN. Could I say to the distinguished chairwoman, I will go back to my office right now, get together with Senator COBURN, and see if we can't come up with a definite time, and I assure the Senator from Maryland it will be a short period of time.

Ms. MIKULSKI. And if perhaps there are amendments the Senator from Arizona could share with Senator SHELBY. I expect there to be amendments from Senators MCCAIN and COBURN. It wouldn't have been a real bill if they did not offer amendments. It somehow or another wouldn't have counted in the process. So we look forward to it. If we can move it in an expeditious way, and courteously understanding the Senator's right to offer amendments, I think we can get going.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I will try to carry out my mission as assigned by the distinguished chairperson. I thank her for her leadership and her excellent work. I thank both leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will not engage the Senator from Arizona with questions. I don't want to delay his reading time.

I appreciate the work the distinguished chair of the Appropriations Committee has done, and the distinguished ranking member, the senior Senator from Alabama. I worked with both of them for decades on the Appropriations Committee. I know they are diligent. They are hard working. In fact, I recall a discussion with the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland when she agreed to take this assignment. I told her I couldn't think of anybody better on our side of the aisle to be the chair of this committee because I know how hard she works and how well she works with the ranking member.

I spoke also with the distinguished Senator from Alabama at the time—again, somebody who knows how to get things done on appropriations. He and I have negotiated things over the years. We have always kept our word to each other, just as the Senator from Maryland has. Now it is time to debate the bill on the floor and it pains me that having got this far, two senators are preventing anyone else from offering amendments.

It is unfortunate we are discussing a continuing resolution because if left to

the three Senators who are currently on the floor—the Senator from Alabama, the Senator from Maryland, and myself—we know we would be fully capable of completing action on individual appropriations bills. In fact, they were painstakingly negotiated by the Senate and the House as part of an omnibus legislative package last December. But then, for reasons we don't have to go into here, a year's work of seven appropriations subcommittees was dumped in the wastebasket, not because of the two leaders but because of others.

Unfortunately, that means we have been funding the government on autopilot. None of us who have spent time on the Appropriations Committee wants this because we know it wastes money and sequestration will make a bad situation even worse.

Having said that, I think what Chairwoman MIKULSKI and Ranking Member SHELBY have done in negotiating this continuing resolution is far better than putting the government on autopilot as we did last December.

I wish to talk about title 7 of this resolution, which concerns the Department of State and Foreign Operations. The House continuing resolution included several changes in the fiscal year 2012 appropriations act. The Senate incorporated those changes with minor modifications. Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM and I included other changes we believe are critical to our national security. Top officials at the State Department and the Pentagon agree with us.

We did our best to avoid spending money on things that may have made sense in fiscal year 2012 but are a waste today. I will give an example. The House continuing resolution includes another \$250 million for the Iraq police training program, the same amount as in fiscal year 2012. Yet the State Department plans to spend zero in fiscal year 2013. That is just an example of why we should go, if we could, by the regular order, because nobody wants this money.

There have been a lot of changes in the world since December 2011 when the 2012 bill was signed by the President. There is the catastrophe in Syria, with millions of people fleeing their homes, which threatens to engulf the entire region. Benghazi and Mali are other examples. Conditions are changing in Egypt, Afghanistan, and in our own hemisphere. We face growing challenges in East Asia and the Pacific.

Now, we should not say, as these challenges come up—sometimes overnight—that well, two or three years ago we passed a bill, so there is no need to do one this year. The world does not stand still.

I think the chairwoman is doing a superb job, and Ranking Member SHELBY is showing, as usual, his many years of experience and hard work. I thank Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM and his staff, who have provided very constructive input.

In the past, appropriations bills were always a bipartisan effort. We worked together. I think of Senator Byrd and Senator Stevens on this floor working things out; my predecessor as President pro tempore, Senator Inouye, and Senator COCHRAN working things out.

Title VII of this resolution is a grand total of 11½ pages. Out of over 500 pages, it is 11½ pages. It should not take long to read. We do not expect amendments, but if we get them, I hope we can act on them quickly.

Mr. President, if nobody is seeking the floor, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to continue for 5 minutes as though in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ARREST AND PROSECUTION OF SULAIMAN ABU
GHAITH

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last week the Obama administration announced that Osama bin Laden's son-in-law, Sulaiman Abu Ghaith, had been brought to the United States to be prosecuted. Several of us who have oversight in particular committees were notified a week before this became public. We were briefed on what was happening as he was being flown here to this country to be prosecuted.

I commend the work of our Nation's dedicated law enforcement and intelligence officials who are helping bring him to justice. I was briefed on exactly what they did and how they did it, and there was a superb combination of work by the Justice Department and intelligence communities, at the CIA, FBI, and other agencies. And I applaud the Obama administration for their unanimous decision within the National Security Council to prosecute him in a Federal court.

We have reason to be proud of our courts. Our Federal courts are an example of impartiality, competence, and integrity seen the world over. We, as Americans, are not afraid to take somebody who has acted against us and prosecute them in our courts. We should not act as though we are afraid and simply say that we can't have them in our Federal court, and that we should just lock them up in Guantanamo.

As a practical matter, our Federal prosecutors have established a tremendous record of convictions of terrorism defendants. They have convicted over 450 terrorism-related defendants since September 11, 2001.

The military commissions at Guantanamo Bay—where some said they wanted to send Abu Ghaith—are largely untested. There have only been 8 convictions there—not the 450 we have seen in Federal courts but 8—and on average the sentences handed down in military commissions are shorter than those given in the Federal court. In fact, two of these military commission convictions were overturned just last year. Indeed, based on the recent decisions of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, it is unclear whether a con-

spiracy case against this defendant could even be legally sustained in a military commission at Guantanamo Bay.

Why do we act as though we are afraid to bring this terrorist before our Federal courts where we bring mass murderers and everybody else, and instead argue that we should send him off somewhere where he may never be convicted? In fact, regardless of the outcome of a military commission proceeding against Abu Ghaith, it is possible that he could have been stuck there without the possibility of a Federal prosecution, given the short-sighted limitations on detainee transfers imposed by Congress. When you look at how well the Federal courts have done, I am surprised to hear people criticize the decision to bring him before an Article III Federal court.

I would say that using our justice system is not mutually exclusive from gathering intelligence. In fact, from public accounts—and I refer to what has been in the press—it appears the FBI gathered information and intelligence from him for about a week before he was formally even arraigned in court last week. In fact, according to one of the prosecutors, law enforcement officials were able to obtain detailed, extensive audio recordings and roughly 22 pages of post-arrest statements from Abu Ghaith. And the fact is, also, as we have seen in some of these other cases, once you present the defendant in court, oftentimes they continue to cooperate and talk.

It is clear to me that President Obama's national security team did the right thing. But we also show the rest of the world that we are not afraid, that as Americans we are not cowering and afraid to use our courts, and that we are not afraid to use the law and procedures that have made us free and strong.

We have had several hearings in the Judiciary Committee on how best to handle terrorism suspects. I am convinced that the Attorney General and the administration must have all options available. For example, the case of the Fort Hood shooter went to a military trial, as it should have. That case involved a military officer committing a crime on a military base against other military personnel, even though influenced by somebody from al-Qaida overseas. But in the Abu Ghaith case we have somebody that we can and should prosecute on conspiracy charges in Federal court. As a former prosecutor, I have looked at that, and I have absolute faith in the abilities of our Federal courts and our prosecutors and law enforcement officials to bring terrorists to justice. They have a tremendous record.

Let's not be afraid of these people. Let's not say: Oh, we have to hide them down there in Cuba at Guantanamo Bay. No, we are Americans. We are America. We are not afraid of terrorists. Bring them before our courts, and let them face American justice. Let

them face our prosecutors and our courts. Let's do it in a way that we can show the rest of the world how justice truly works. When we tell them, why aren't you running your courts in an open way, or when we criticize other countries, as we often do, let us not give them an opportunity to come back and say, well, you don't do it that way yourselves. No—we can and must say that we do. We have captured the son-in-law of Osama bin Laden, who conspired with him to commit a horrible crime against our Nation. It took us years to find him, but we got him. We brought him back here. And now we are taking him to court, and we are going to let a jury decide his guilt or innocence. That is the way it should be done. That is the American way. And that shows that we do not have to hide. We Americans are willing to stand up and face those who would attack us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, before the distinguished Senator from Vermont leaves the floor, I really wish to compliment him not only in the way he has moved legislation but really the values, the American values, behind it. I think he has worked steadfastly on a bipartisan basis with Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM on our foreign operations. This is what has been called soft power, but there is nothing soft about it. It is part of our smart power strategy.

And what has it meant? It has meant healing the sick, feeding the hungry, making sure children whose legs have been blown off with land mines have an opportunity for rehabilitation or for the children of Haiti who lost their limbs because of the horrific nature of the earthquake—taking lessons learned from other places in the world, that they have a chance to do it.

Baltimore is the home of the Catholic relief organization. These are people who serve the world without religious creed. They serve whomever is in need. The way they extol the virtues of what they have been able to do has been amazing. What they say to me is that because of the work Senator LEAHY has done, they are able to leverage philanthropic dollars. Rather than being in lieu of government, they can leverage it because we are coming in to help the children, to help the children learn to walk, and they then come in with community development so that they learn a trade, so that we are literally rebuilding the lives of children in Haiti but also giving them a future where they are going to earn a livelihood. It is pretty terrific.

We have President Clinton, who does his global initiative like in Haiti, but we all have to be in it together, whether it is Bill Gates—the women of the Senate on a bipartisan basis last week met with Melinda Gates in terms of the great Gates Foundation, and they talked about their health care initiatives.

We said: Well, what does all this mean in terms of us?

They said: If you do the job only government can do, we can then do what we need to do.

This is unique. I do not know of other countries in the world that quite work with this synergy, letting our private philanthropic community do splendid, inspirational work. But they need a government.

The other thing we are able to do in this bill is provide something very near and dear, which is embassy security. We know we wanted to do more. We know that over the last couple of years the House has denied \$400 million in embassy security. So we are heartsick at the way our Ambassador died. And while there is all that back-and-forth over talking points, which we are not getting into, the fact is that we need to protect our American men and women working in embassies because they are at a duty station, and now that duty station has become a battle station. We need to make sure we provide embassy security in the best way possible. We can debate policy, management, and so on, but at the end of the day we need to put money in the Federal checkbook to do that.

We lost an Ambassador in Benghazi. I lost an Ambassador, and America lost many others a few years ago at Khobar Towers. One was our Consul General. His name was Bartley. He was the highest ranking African American in the Foreign Service. His son was interning with him. They blew up the Embassy. He and his son died. We need to look out for these people. There was also a young lady who was there from the community, from CDC, working to make sure we were doing the right health initiatives, teaching, educating the leadership there. She died. Again, they were at their duty station, which has now become a battle station.

So I compliment the Senator for the children, his work on land mines, and his work on feeding the hungry. And do you know what. We make wise use because of the strong oversight. I know the Senator from Vermont listens to the inspector general, scrutinizes those GAO reports. We get a dollar's worth of assistance, and at the end of the day America is stronger because of what we do in this bill.

I wish to salute the Senator for his sense of bipartisanship, his leadership and stewardship not only in this bill but over the years. The Senator should be saluted, and I want to make sure this bill moves forward so we can get on to next year and even do a better, smarter job.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Maryland for her kind comments. We do a lot. It is interesting. In the foreign aid part, it is less than 1 percent of our budget. But what we do is show the face of America—the best of the face of America throughout the world. The distinguished Senator has been, throughout her career, both in the other body and

here, a strong supporter of those programs and made life better for an awful lot of people who never know who Senator MIKULSKI is or Senator LEAHY or anybody else. All they know is that life is better because of the things we have done.

I was in Haiti just a couple of weeks ago. I have been there several times since the earthquake. I have seen how our programs have helped, including the Leahy War Victims Fund, which helps land mine victims around the world. The Senator from Alabama knows, as he was there with me a year ago.

I saw youngsters with prosthetics learning to walk again. I saw people from other parts of the world who were inspired by what the United States was doing.

I remember a physician from Brussels who had gone to Haiti. When I asked him why he spent so much time volunteering there, we were speaking French with each other, but I remember the emotion in his voice as he grabbed my arm and said, “pour les enfants,” for the children. Those children are not rich. They are not powerful. They will never vote for us. But we are human beings, and we have a responsibility.

The Senator from Maryland has spoken about security at our embassies. We tell people to go to some of the most dangerous parts of the world and show the best face of America. We have a responsibility to protect them. We have tried to get that money passed only to have had it held up in the other body. Let's continue our work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, the bill Chairwoman MIKULSKI and Senator SHELBY have compiled is an excellent example of how hard work, cooperation, and good-faith negotiating can produce results in a body which is too often paralyzed by gridlock. The combined omnibus and CR, while not all I would wish for, is a balanced approach to keeping the government functioning through the remainder of the fiscal year while avoiding the specter of a government shutdown.

The Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill is one of five bills in this package, and it reflects the agreement reached between the Senate and the House last fall. The Senate bill is identical to the House-passed MILCON-VA bill, and it sends a strong message of support to our Nation's vets and military families, including previously appropriated advances for vets' medical care. The fiscal year 2013 bill provides a total of \$144.8 billion for military construction, family housing, the VA, and four related agencies, including Arlington National Cemetery. Of that amount, \$71.9 billion is discretionary funding. This includes \$10.6 billion for military construction, \$61 billion for the VA, and \$347 million for related agencies.

This bill deserves the full support of the Senate. The alternative is a continuing resolution which is out of step with current requirements or a crippling government shutdown. A CR would be disastrous for military construction. The CR prohibits new starts, which would block execution of 97 percent of the fiscal year 2013 military construction program. As a result, more than 250 MILCON projects in 42 States, the District of Columbia, and overseas which are funded in the bill before us would be put on indefinite hold in the CR.

For the VA, a CR would not provide advance funding for fiscal year 2014 for vets' health care. Advance funding is an important tool to protect funding for vets' health care from the very predicament we find ourselves in today.

Another small but important program in this bill which would be scuttled by a CR is funding for needed cemetery expansion at Arlington National Cemetery. All of these problems are solved in this omnibus package.

Our Nation's vets, our military troops and their families, have made and are continuing to make great sacrifices in defense of this Nation. The bill before us recognizes and honors that commitment by funding a wide array of programs essential to the health and well-being of both vets and military families.

I urge the Senate to support this bill.

I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I would like to compliment the Senator from South Dakota, who does an excellent job as assistant chairman on the Subcommittee on Military Construction, VA. He has worked steadfastly to bring up this bill. We are in agreement with the House. I wish to share a sense of urgency why this needs to happen.

In this bill, thanks to the leadership provided here, it increases funding to improve and accelerate claims processing to increase staff, business processes, and infotech enhancements. This kind of sounds bloodless and technocratic, but I stand before you today to tell you we have a claims processing crisis for our veterans, particularly in the area of applying for disability benefits.

I hate to tell you, Baltimore has one of the worst records. There are many reasons for this situation. It wasn't my fault. We let the infrastructure deteriorate, there are staffing issues, and there are an incredible number of our men and women coming back from the longest war we have fought with incredible injuries, with some bearing the permanent impact of the war, and

they are eligible. Many have multiple problems. This is not your World War II benefit claim.

So we have a backlog. We need to deal with that backlog; otherwise, shame on us. Those men and women fought hard. They gave it everything they had. Thanks to the skill and dedication of military medicine, we saved more lives in combat than in any other war.

I don't want to sound like an epidemiologist; I am a Senator. The fact is we have reduced what doctors call morbidity and mortality. That is the good news back to the hospital from the battlefields, from training medics, all the way to Germany, all the way now to Walter Reed National Military Medical Center in Bethesda.

What is the issue when they come back home? Because we have saved their lives, they have injuries. It means they have some level of disability. They may not be totally disabled, but they are eligible. If they have a permanent injury, they should have a permanent benefit from their government. While they were on the frontline, they should not need to stand in line to have their claims processed.

We have some claims which take as many as 3 or 4 years to complete. We need to pick it up. We need to up our game.

These are improvements. We have spoken to General Shinseki. I know the gentleman. The chairman of the committee has talked to him and was quite vigorous and insistent in his advocacy. I had General Shinseki come to Baltimore. I was ballistic about the claims situation in Baltimore. What did we need? We needed increased staff.

Did you know we do most of our disability claims by paper? We might as well be doing it by papyrus.

When you look at it—I am rarely brief, but I am short—the average disability claim, which I know you have gone to look at, sir, is sometimes 6, 8, and 12 inches tall. That is just the VA. In order to be certified you need to have the military give you information, you need to have Social Security give you information, and you need to have doctor information. In the meantime, somebody who lost a leg, somebody who has lost an arm, somebody who has lost so much time fighting a war, we ask too much from too few for so long who are there waiting for their benefit.

We need to go digital. If we are going to run government like a business, let's give them the standard business tools. That means more technology.

I really want to thank the Senator from South Dakota and his Republican vice chair for much of what they have done in this bill. What is nearest and dearest for me are two things: increased funding to deal with the claims process to receive what they deserve and also advance funding for VA medical to enable the veterans to receive the health care they were promised, they need, and they deserve. If you

ever want to talk about an earned benefit, it is the men and women who need VA medical care and the men and women who need their claims processed to receive what they deserve and what they are entitled to.

This in and of itself is a reason to ensure we don't have a government shut-down and blow this program out of the window. I want to thank the Senator for his advocacy and also for taking good intentions and putting them in the Federal checkbook.

Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I rise today to speak about an amendment to the pending matter, an amendment I intend to file when it becomes procedurally appropriate to do so.

The amendment I intend to file is about foreign aid to the nation of Egypt. But let me start by talking about foreign aid in general because there is a lot of debate about that and a lot of concern around the country about foreign aid. In fact, a lot of places I go people ask me: With things so tough here in the United States, why do we give money to other countries? Why are we giving money to other countries?

That is a very good question to ask. First, I would say, and I would caution people, that foreign aid is not 20 percent of our budget. It is not 30 percent of our budget. It is actually, on some days, less than 1 to 3 percent of our total budget.

Secondly, I would say that foreign aid has a very useful role. Just to set the table, I think people need to understand that our foreign aid has accomplished a tremendous amount of good around the world. For example, the USAID programs to fight HIV/AIDS in Africa has helped save millions of people. Millions of people are alive today because of the generosity of the American taxpayer.

It has helped to alleviate poverty. I think you should look at some of the great examples of foreign aid like the Marshall Plan or the work we undertook to rebuild Japan and the alliances we have today as a result.

One of the great stories of foreign aid is South Korea, a nation that was long a beneficiary of foreign aid—and not just from the United States but from the world—and today it is a donor in many of these forums.

So that is the good news about foreign aid—and foreign aid is important because it increases our influence. It is part of how we can influence what is increasingly a global economy. I think it is important to understand when

people talk about the American economy, we don't just live in a national economy anymore. We live in a world where, increasingly, things that happen to you on a daily basis—the price of things that you are buying—some of these things are set halfway around the world not just halfway down the street or halfway across the city. So foreign aid is important because it deals with America's influence around the world and, in particular, our ability to influence things toward our national interests.

Foreign aid is not charity. Although it may be charitable, and although it may be motivated by us and our efforts to advance our principles and the things we think are right, foreign aid is not charity. Foreign aid is designed to further our national interests. That means every single dime we give in foreign aid should be conditioned toward our national interests, should be about furthering our national interests. And I think that is true all over the world, everywhere we give it, whether it is military aid or economic aid.

I think today we have one example of a place where we should start to examine how we give our foreign aid and examine it in a way that allows us to maximize our national interests. That country I want to talk about today is Egypt, and there is a lot of concerning things happening in Egypt.

We have all been witness to the amazing Arab spring and all the changes that it brought about to the region, potentially democracy, et cetera. And Egypt, obviously, has been a prime example of that, a country where all this has been occurring. It has brought to power a government that largely is governed today by the Muslim Brotherhood.

Here is the good news. The good news is these changes have occurred, and, theoretically, there is a more open society. The bad news is some of the people who have been brought to power bring with them an ideology that at times is troubling and, in fact, in practice has been deeply troubling.

For example, we have seen efforts in Egypt to undermine democratic institutions. We have seen efforts in Egypt to undermine the judiciary. We have seen open examples in Egypt of the freedom of religion being undermined. We have seen women and women's rights regress. We have seen irresponsible economic behavior in Egypt. And we can talk about the causes of all this, but this is the reality of what is going on in Egypt.

In addition to that, we should be deeply concerned about Egypt's ability or willingness to live up to their security arrangements with their neighbors, particularly our strong allies in Israel. They have a commitment they made years ago to securing the Sinai, to preventing weapons and terrorists and others from crossing through the Sinai and into the Gaza Strip and into Israel. This is a commitment and an obligation they have, and we should be

concerned about their unwillingness or inability, or both, to live up to these commitments.

So what I am asking for in this amendment is for us to reexamine the way we give foreign aid to Egypt, not to get rid of it because there is a real danger that we can start to lose some of these foreign aid programs. The American people are fed up with story after story of countries that are benefiting from our generosity, and then they open the newspaper and they read inflammatory comments that are made about us. They open the newspaper or turn on cable television, and they see reports from these countries where democracy is being undermined, where the rights of women are being trampled, where religious minorities are being persecuted, and they have a right to ask: Why are we giving so much money to these countries?

We actually have a record in Egypt of working very closely with their military organizations, and we hope that can continue. But we also want to ensure that Egypt continues to move toward a direction of true democracy.

Democracy is not just having elections. Having elections is one part of democracy. You have to govern like a democrat. You have to govern in an open process where you allow people to speak out, opposition parties to organize, have a court system that doesn't skew things in your favor and against the opposition. You don't just have to have elections to have a democracy; you need a lot more than that.

We saw last week where former Senator Kerry, now Secretary of State, awarded a sum—by the way, we have given over \$70 billion of aid to Egypt since the 1940s. That is not an insignificant sum. But we look now at the \$250 million in aid they received last week, and I believe that was unfortunate.

We have significant interests in ensuring that Egypt remains at peace with Israel, that the Morsi government does not undermine the democratic process, and that human and political rights of all Egyptians—including that of religious minorities and women—are respected, and our foreign aid should reflect that.

So what this amendment which I intend to propose does is a few things. Let me begin by saying this is not about canceling foreign aid to Egypt per se. This is about restructuring it in a way that lines up with the national interests of the taxpayers of the United States of America. I will have more to say about this amendment when the appropriate time to file it comes up, but let me just briefly describe it, and I hope to gain support from my colleagues and the public at large.

First, it would block the disbursement of additional economic support funds and new—not the existing but new—foreign military financing contracts until Egypt begins to enact economic reforms and the administration certifies that Egypt has done a few of the following:

It has adopted and implemented legal reforms which protect the political, the economic, and religious freedoms; it is not acting to restrict the political, economic, and religious freedoms and human rights of the citizens and residents of Egypt; it is continuing to demonstrate a commitment to free and fair elections and is not taking any steps to interfere with or undermine the credibility of such elections.

Another condition is that it has lifted restrictions in law and practice on the work and the funding of Egyptian and international NGOs—nongovernmental organizations—comprising those in human rights and democracy fields. Those include the International Republican Institute, the National Democratic Institute, and Freedom House; that it is fully implementing the Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty; that it is taking all the necessary actions to eliminate smuggling networks and to detect and destroy tunnels between Egypt and the Gaza Strip—tunnels that are used to smuggle weapons and terrorists into the Gaza Strip—and is taking all other necessary actions to combat terrorism in an increasingly ungovernable space of the Sinai.

The second thing it does is it begins to recalibrate the U.S.-Egyptian security relationship toward Egypt's actual security needs.

Now, let me say this: It does not appear—and I don't know of anyone who would disagree with this—that Egypt has any imminent threat of being invaded by any one of their neighbors. It is not going to happen. Egypt's real security needs are its ability, No. 1, to live up to its obligations to stamp out terrorism within its borders and, in particular, to secure the Sinai, to close those tunnels that lead to Gaza. But the second security need it has is internal—in particular, street crime.

One of the ways Egypt is going to be able to rebuild its economy is through tourism, and I am not a tourism expert, but I think muggings, murder, and kidnappings are not good for tourism. People don't usually visit countries where these things are happening. This is the actual aid that Egypt needs in terms of its security.

It doesn't need tanks, it doesn't need jet fighters. It is not going to be invaded by a foreign country. That is not its real threat. I understand their desire to have those things—and, by the way, there are existing contracts to give them those things. But their real security needs are largely internal, and we want to recalibrate our military aid in the future to Egypt to meet their actual needs.

To that end, the amendment would require an analysis of Egypt's security requirements, produced by the Department of Defense in consultation with the Egyptian Government, and to be shared with the relevant congressional committees both in the House and the Senate. We also want the administration to certify that the Department of Defense has allocated a portion of

Egypt's foreign military financing—no less than \$100 million—toward counterterrorism tools, including the equipment and training related to border security, and to address the instability in the Sinai.

We also want a report on all FMF contracts the Department of Defense has carried out over the last 10 years, as well as the Department's plans for contracting over the next decade. I think it is wise to look at what we have done in the past, to fully understand the contributions the American taxpayer has made to Egypt's security in the past. But we also need to see the contracts that are pending move forward. All of these need to be aligned so we can ensure the aid we are giving them isn't just what they want, but it, in fact, is what they need, within the confines of what is in our national security and in our national interests because, once again, this is our money.

We should begin to shift U.S. assistance away from military programs and increasingly toward civilian assistance. So what this amendment would do is require the administration to begin a dialogue with the Egyptian Government and with the Egyptian civil society about the need to rebalance our system away from its current, almost obsessive focus on military aid by reallocating economic funds not provided to Egypt during periods when certification is not in effect toward democracy and governance programs, including direct support for secular, democratic, nongovernmental organizations, as well as programming and support for rule of law and human rights, good governance, political competition, consensus building, and civil society.

We should look at transferring the interest earned in Egypt's account. They have an account where this aid money sits when we give them this aid. Those accounts have a lot of money and generate a lot of interest. We should be able to take that interest that is generated from these funds and make it available and allocate these funds for democracy and for governance efforts.

Last but not least, we should require the President to submit a report to the Congress describing the specific results of an Egyptian policy review that includes a dialogue with the Government of Egypt and also civil society on how to rebalance the U.S. military and economic assistance.

Now, as most of these bills will have in them, this is going to have a national security waiver. In essence, if the Secretary of State comes to us and says: It is in our national security not to implement or fully implement this amendment at this time, as they do with almost all aid programs, they would have the right to do that. But they are going to have to do it every 180 days, at least twice a year, so we can be sure we are keeping up with the transition that is going on in Egypt.

Let me briefly address a few of the arguments that are going to come

against this potentially. One is that we have this incredibly strong relationship with the Egyptian military, and we don't want to undermine that. This is not intended to do that. We value that relationship. We hope it will continue to grow stronger. But the reality of it is, No. 1, these are hard-earned taxpayer dollars. At a time when the United States of America really doesn't have a lot of money to throw away—in fact, it has no money to throw away—we have to ensure the aid we give is aid that is effective, that is actually doing what it needs to be doing, not simply going to a wish list of some general or military official somewhere. This is not about cutting off the Egyptian military; this is about recalibrating our relationship with them to ensure that what we are making available to them is not just what they want, but it is what they need. That is the first thing I would say in that argument.

The second argument I would have—and we hope this day will never come—but as Egypt continues to transition, we don't know what the Egyptian military is going to look like 2 years from now, 5 years from now, 10 years from now. In fact, many of the top people we have been dealing with in the past aren't in those positions anymore. They have been replaced by the new government. And I would tell you, history is a lesson.

If the Morsi government and the Muslim Brotherhood take Egypt in a direction that is not in our national interests, that is not in the best interests of the region or our allies in the world, they are not going to be able to do that unless they replace the military leadership with people who agree with them on these things. So while we hope that never happens, we hope to do everything we can to prevent that from happening, we hope the Egyptian military will continue to be governed and run by professional men and women. But we can't guarantee that, and we don't know what the Egyptian military will look like 5 years from now or 3 years from now.

That is why it is so important this waiver provision require the Secretary of State to do so twice a year, so we can keep up on the recent events. Who would have predicted 3 years ago that the events that happened in Egypt would have happened in our time? Yet they did. So we can't predict what Egypt is going to look like 3 years from now. We hope it will be better, but we don't know.

The other argument I have heard is, well, this is going to offend their sovereignty. They don't like us to tell them what to do with the aid we give them. The Egyptians are not going to take kindly to the idea of the United States dictating to them.

I, quite frankly, don't understand that argument because this is our money. They don't have to take our foreign aid. They don't have to accept it. But our foreign aid has never been—

or should never have been—a blank check. This idea that somehow the money we are going to make available to people should be unconditional, quite frankly, doesn't make sense to me. This is our money. If they don't want the aid, they don't have to take it. But if they are going to accept our aid, we should have some say in it.

If it is the U.S. dollars of the U.S. taxpayer that are going toward this program, shouldn't the American people, through their elected representatives and their government, have some say—if not a predominant amount of say—over how these dollars are spent and on what these dollars are spent? And shouldn't we ensure those countries are headed in a positive direction, not in a direction that acts against our national interests?

I believe in foreign aid. I think foreign aid is important for the United States. But it needs to be done the right way. I think it needs to be done the right way across the board, in all of our aid programs. But this is one that is pressing, that is right in front of us.

I recently took a trip to the Middle East. I went to Jordan. I went to Israel. In many places where I went, I heard over and over again a lot of concern about the direction Egypt is headed. They are going through a balancing act right now, is what it appears. On the one hand, you have a deeply seated ideology that I think many people would find offensive. We have heard some of the past comments of the President of Egypt. We have heard some of the past comments of some of the leadership in the Muslim Brotherhood. It is down-right offensive, and that is their ideology. We have seen some of that seep through in their public policymaking.

We also understand there is a pragmatic argument going on. They know they cannot survive in government and in power if they don't have an economy. They know—at least, I hope they know—they have to take steps to reform their economy. They have to take steps to increase their security so tourism will return. They know they need to do these things, and right now they are calibrating those two things: the pragmatism of needing to secure their country and needing to provide for economic growth versus their ideology.

In the ideological base of the Muslim Brotherhood that is calling for a rapid expansion of Islamist-type rule, you can see those pressures building within Egyptian society in and of itself. I think U.S. aid has an opportunity to tilt that conversation toward pragmatism. If we are smart about how we use our foreign aid, we can actually help tilt that conversation away from the ideology and toward pragmatism, toward security that is not designed to crack down on internal dissent, that is not designed to one day wage war against their neighbors in Israel or anywhere else, but in fact is designed to provide security against common street crimes, security against terrorism, to seal those tunnels in Gaza,

to live up to their international obligations.

I think if we condition this the right way, we can help encourage them to take on the kind of economic reforms that Egypt needs to have the kind of economy they need. After all, that was the heart of the Arab spring, the heart of the Arab spring where hundreds of thousands of unemployed people—starting in Egypt particularly—were desperate for a better future and didn't think they could find it. Then they looked at a government that they saw as repressive and corrupt, and they wanted to replace it. But not with this.

The reason I feel so strongly about this is that as the Egyptian leaders are undertaking this cost-benefit analysis—should they lean more toward ideology or should they lean more toward pragmatism—through our foreign aid we actually have an opportunity to push them, to nudge them, to encourage them toward pragmatism.

I hope I can achieve bipartisan support for this amendment. I hope people will find it to be thoughtful and insightful. In the days to come, I look forward to addressing more questions that my colleagues may have on it. We are going to put some releases out about this, and I hope my colleagues will become interested in helping us achieve its passage.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, you have heard me speak to the Democratic caucus and to the press that moving the continuing resolution, or I should call it the continued funding resolution—remember, continuing the funding for fiscal year 2013 to our fiscal New Year's Eve, October 1, is our goal. We don't want a government shutdown, we don't want a government slam-down, lockdown. So we have been working very diligently on a bipartisan basis to fashion the bill that would get 60 votes so we would be filibuster-proof.

In the old days, majority ruled. Now it is supermajority. That is not a fight I am going to do here on this bill. My job is to keep the government funded, to work in an open, transparent, bipartisan and hopefully bicameral way.

I said this was like the last helicopter leaving a disaster area. I was trying to get the cargo on it to make sure we protected national security. We honored compelling human need, particularly for women and children in the area of education and health care, and we also looked at how we could generate jobs—not in government but government-generated jobs in the private sector, such as transportation, and make important investments in

science and technology that come up with the new ideas for the new products that will create jobs in our country and hopefully even for export around the world. That is what I have been trying to do.

I also had to give up a lot. I had to give up the funding for ObamaCare. This was not my choice. I know there will be an amendment offered to even defund it further. I happen to believe in what we did with President Obama's health care framework. I liked ending discrimination against women. I liked ending the discrimination against people who have children with preexisting conditions. I liked funding the amendment that provided access for women for mammograms, and for children for early detection and screening. But we could not do it.

One of the other things we could not do was we could not add a very modest pay raise for Federal employees. This bill will continue the existing pay rates. It is necessary to avoid a government shutdown for the entire government. Shutting down the government would make a tough situation worse for Federal employees. It would jeopardize our economic recovery. Shutting down the government would threaten the viability of small and medium-size businesses. It would even threaten the safety of our families, our economy, maybe even our country.

This is not a happy day for me and it is not a happy day for the millions of people who work diligently for the Federal Government. I have the great honor to represent 130,000 Federal employees—I wish you could tour Maryland with me, the way I have been up to your home State—each one doing important work for the Nation. And who are they, these employees? They are people who work at the National Institutes of Health, finding cures or ways to contain diseases—the next vaccine to help the flu endemic or protect us against a pandemic.

They are the civilian employees at the National Security Agency. We employ the largest number of mathematicians in the world. What do they do? They invent the kind of technology that breaks the codes and protects us—now in this whole new cyber domain. They are the people who run the weather satellites. The European model might have done a better job last week than they did, but do you know why? Because we have not had the resources to fund them the way the Europeans have.

I have employees at FDA right this very minute at their jobs, looking at medical devices to see if they are safe. Right at this very minute they are working with the private sector, which is bringing them new pharmaceuticals, new biotech and biologics that they could look at to see if they are safe and effective so they could go into clinical practice to help save lives here and be certified by the FDA, which would give us the ability to sell them around the world. We say to them: We know what

you are doing, but tough luck; we can't give you a pay raise because we say we have out-of-control spending. I don't think we have out-of-control spending. Do we have to be more frugal? Do we have to be smarter? Do we have to get more value for the dollar? Absolutely. We are onto that. But don't attack Federal employees for the mismanagement of the Federal Government. That is right here. That is what we do. Don't blame them and don't make them pay the price. It is like making the middle class pay the price for more domestic cuts while we protect subsidies to corporate jets.

These 130,000 Federal employees help run the Hubbell Space Telescope, more discoveries—the most important telescope since Galileo invented the first one. I can't tell you how bad I feel that we are not at least giving them a .05-percent pay raise. And they are facing sequester, which could mean for many of them a 20-percent pay cut, if they are furloughed.

I visited NIH to see what was the impact of sequester. There was Carol Greider from Hopkins. She won the Nobel Prize 2 years ago. We are proud of her. NIH, within a week of my arrival there to meet with them, as I have done so often—they cut cancer rates 15 percent. Instead of pinning medals on them, we say: You don't get a pay raise. We have more important things to do with the money. You are the problem.

I don't think they are a problem at all. I think they are part of the solution—coming up with ways to help compelling human needs and creating jobs in our country in life sciences and giving us something to sell overseas. I think it is wrong to keep asking them for more when oil and gas companies make record profits and we don't ask them to give up tax breaks. It is wrong when we can't close one tax loophole that sends jobs overseas. When Senator MURRAY brings up her bill, I will talk more about these lavish tax earmarks. This is not the time and place. But it is time to say we have to protect our civil service.

Senator RUBIO just spoke about Egypt and he said they have to be able to govern. It is not enough to just bring down a dictator. That is an excellent point. We have to govern, too. And the hallmark of a democracy is a civil service that has integrity, that is promoted on the basis of meritocracy, that is independent of politics, doing missions that serve the Nation in research, technology, administering programs that help get transportation funding to Governors to build roads, bridges, and fund our pent-up demand for physical infrastructure, and then in human infrastructure—education, health care. That is what a democracy does and you need a civil service that is independent, has integrity and is promoted and hired and so on on the basis of meritocracy. What is the hallmark of a despotic, autocratic government, be they Communist or just plain

despots? They are corrupt. You get ahead by taking a bribe, by doing a party favor, by looking the other way, on so many other things where you cannot even open a business or get a permit or so on unless there is a series of tipping fees. You can't get through an airport unless you bribe your way through it. That is what a corrupt, despotic, autocratic government does.

But when you visit democracies, the first thing you see is they have a civil service. What is the civil service? Integrity, competency, incorruptible. But we say: Yeah, yeah, you know, we know you have a Ph.D, or we know you are the blue-collar worker who manages the facilities at NIH to keep the lights on so the researchers can do their work. It is those people who help us have a great country, and a country we can be proud of.

I hope we resolve this sequester thing, with layoffs and furloughs and potential cuts of 20 percent. I wish we could have at least said one thing to the Federal employees, that we are at least going to give you a .05—a half of 1 percent—pay raise. I didn't like it because I thought it was so skimpy and Spartan.

But I will say this. The helicopter could not take off if it was on it. I think this is a terrible mistake. I hope in next year's regular order we can make this up. But I want to say to my Federal employees this was a Draconian choice. Do we try to give you a pay raise that would be important to you? Every penny and every dollar counts.

You led the Consumer Protection Agency. You certainly have the reputation, Madam President, of being a real fighter for the consumer, and you were the first in America to do a study that showed people were going bankrupt not because they bought too many Volvos, ate out too much, or lived a life of brie and wine and so on. It was because of medical catastrophes that faced them. You were the first to tell us about that, so you know about family incomes and what makes them and what breaks them. But I say this to you: Thank you for your work.

And I want to say to the Federal employees, thank you for your work. I wanted to do it with a modest pay raise, but right now my duty in the situation I find myself in reluctantly is that the way I serve you is to make sure there is no government shutdown. Because you know what. In my heart and in my mind—and as I see how different places function—there is no such thing as a nonessential Federal employee. Everybody at the workplace and who serves the Nation is doing their job with honesty, integrity, meritocracy, and is incorruptible. Let's make sure we honor them. We have to get this bill done. Let's get on the Murray budget and right our economy. Whatever problems we have, don't blame the Federal employees for the decisions made by the Congress to get us in the deficit and debt we are in.

They didn't do it, we did it. We should take the pay cut, not them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, I have been listening to the remarks of my colleague from Maryland, and as we say down South, she is spot on. Before she became chairperson of the Appropriations Committee, she was a member of that committee for many years. We worked together when I was chairman of the subcommittee and she was the ranking member and when she was the chairperson and I was the ranking member. We both came from the House. We were on the same committee in the House. We worked together. We struggled with each other from time to time, but in the end, we knew we had to come up with a product, and that is what we are trying to do here today.

I was hoping we could bring this bill to the floor. As the Senator from Maryland has been saying, there are a lot of Members who want to offer amendments. We could offer some amendments and debate them tonight and perhaps even vote on them tonight. We know we have this deadline. At the end of March the CR expires, along with the funding of the Government of the United States. I don't think any party—Democrat or Republican—is interested in any way of going to the brink again. It serves no purpose. It creates uncertainty in the marketplace; it creates uncertainty with the role we play in the Senate and the House.

As the Senator from Maryland has said, we have worked together. We have a continuing resolution which came from the House, with the Department of Defense and the MILCON-VA—military construction and VA—in it to fund until September 30, which is the fiscal year. It is about 6 months from now. We have added to the legislation which we hope to bring before the Senate the Commerce, Justice, Science Subcommittee, of which she is the subcommittee chair and I am the ranking member. We have worked together on that. Agriculture, which affects everybody in this country one way or the other, and homeland security, which is the essence of the security of this country at home, have been added by the Senate.

We scrubbed these bills all weekend. Both sides scrubbed them. I have given up things I would personally like, and she has given up things, probably including some things from the Democratic leadership. We have done the same over here. We are doing this to show the American people that America comes first. We need to show we can work together. We need to pass these bills. The sooner they get up here, the sooner amendments can be offered by Republicans and Democrats, the sooner we get the process working and we get into the debates. That is what this legislative body is all about.

The CR we are bringing up—or the hybrid CR—is funded at the fiscal year

2012 levels, and it is consistent with the Budget Control Act. It would leave the sequester in effect. It gives some leeway—some but not unbridled—to enable the situation with sequester to maybe work a little better. I think it is good policy and bad procedure.

We are going to have to cut because we cannot sustain deficits of \$1 trillion. We cannot continue to go down the road we are on. We have to change the trajectory of this country. We cannot sustain ourselves if we have a \$20 trillion or \$25 trillion debt. Whether you are a Democrat, Republican, Libertarian, Independent, or whatever you are, you should want a strong monetary policy and a strong economic policy.

We have a few more years left, and this is a good start here in the Senate. If we can get this bill up and pass it, then the House will do something. We will fund the government until September 30, which is what we are supposed to do. If we do that, then we can start on the 2014 budget. From there we can perhaps go to regular order. That is what we wish to do in the appropriations process so we are not going from crisis to crisis.

What we have done in the House and the Senate—and the White House is involved in this too—in recent years is we have been lurching from crisis to crisis, and then we come up to the deadline and people say: Oh, we have to have certainty. So we kick the can down the road a few more yards. That is not the way to do business. This country is too important. The business community needs certainty, people in government need certainty, and I think this is a good first start. I hope we can get this process moving.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, as I rise to talk about the budget that was released in the House of Representatives, I want to first commend our chair Senator MIKULSKI and ranking member Senator SHELBY for working together. I could not agree more with what Senator SHELBY said about getting back to regular order and getting back together. This is an example of what we need to do. I want to commend both Senators.

We obviously have very different points of view. People can come together and listen to each other and be willing to compromise, which is not a bad thing. I don't know any part of life where we don't compromise. I have been trying to figure that one out. When you have children, wouldn't it be nice not to have to compromise? Somehow we always have to. I want to commend both of our leaders on the Appropriations Committee.

I am very hopeful we can return to regular order and hash out our very different perspectives and very different views of the country. I think we have seen that today with Chairman RYAN with the Republican budget. We

will see a different view tomorrow with Chairman MURRAY coming through with a budget as we work through the budget in committee this week and then on the floor. This way reasonable people can sit down and listen to each other and find a path forward.

Most importantly, I think if we listen to the American people we represent—their values and their priorities—we can move forward. I do feel strongly that what has been released today in the House is the wrong set of values; it is the wrong approach. Actually, I am surprised we are seeing the same kind of budget we have seen for the last couple of years come out of the House—particularly one where the public spoke so strongly against the foundations of what is in that budget. It has been called a balanced budget. It is anything but balanced.

Overall, it is my understanding that there is an identification of some \$5 trillion that will be cut in spending, but nobody says where. Then they say: Oh, the budget is balanced. Well, as our leaders on appropriations know, we actually have to get in and say where it is going to be cut so we can balance the budget, which this does not do. It does not balance the budget, and it is certainly unbalanced when it comes to the values represented in the budget.

I have to start with the one issue that is so concerning to me, and that is the whole question of Medicare. Once again we are seeing in the Republican budget of the House the effort to eliminate Medicare. It basically eliminates Medicare as an insurance plan. It basically says: You go out and find private insurance. They changed the names to different things. They tried to make it sound better, but it all comes down to the fact that people will be given a voucher. Good luck trying to find private insurance.

It was the private insurance sector and the lack of affordable insurance for seniors which created Medicare in 1965. As we get older, we lose more health care because we are more expensive to cover. Before Medicare, it was very difficult to find affordable insurance. In fact, it was impossible for many people. As Americans we came together and said: If you are 65 or older or if you are disabled in this country, you have the right to have insurance and health care available and affordable to you. We created a health insurance system called Medicare. By the way, Medicare costs dramatically less to administer than any private sector plan. We are talking 3 percent or 4 percent to administer Medicare as opposed to 15 percent, 20 percent, 25 percent going to administrative costs and profits and so on. So it is very efficient.

There are issues we need to address, and we have been doing that. In fact, we have put in place cost savings over the next 10 years by eliminating overpayment to insurance companies that do what is called Medicare Advantage. It is interesting that while Chairman RYAN and the House Republicans say

they are going to do away with Medicare, they put the \$700 billion we saved by stopping overpayments to insurance companies—as well as doing other things for prevention and cost savings—in their budget. After criticizing it, they want the savings, but they turn around and want to eliminate Medicare. It is a very interesting combination of things here that is a hocus-pocus kind of approach with smoke-and-mirrors as far as how they are coming up with their budget.

The bottom line is very clear: It guts Medicare. It guts Medicare, but not in order to fund or strengthen Medicare services or health care services in some way. The astounding thing is they continue to put forward a budget that guts Medicare in order to continue tax giveaways for the very wealthy and well-connected people in this country. It makes no sense. It makes no sense, and our budget will be very different than this one.

Medicare has been a great American success story. Medicare and Social Security have lifted a generation of Americans out of poverty. It has given them the ability to live longer and healthier lives. It has allowed my mom, who is on her way to 87, to play with her now great-grandchildren. By the way, my three grandchildren are the most beautiful children in the world. My mom is able to play with them and be healthy and active because of something called Medicare which was put in place to give her the opportunity to pay into a system so she could have health care and be able to live a longer life. That is a great American success story.

We know we are living longer. The greatness of Medicare is that people are healthier and living longer, and so we know we have to do some refiguring here and have some savings. We are already doing that. Over the next 10 years we are putting in place \$700 billion in savings by focusing more on prevention. We are focused more on wellness visits and helping people on the front end before they get very sick, as well as cutting overpayments.

We are now hearing that Medicare is going to have a \$500 billion savings as well, and that insurance rates and growth have actually slowed. We are seeing the actuaries reconfigure the savings. CBO, the budget office, reconfigured the cost of Medicare and Medicaid to create more savings because of things we have begun to do. Thanks to health care reform we are able to focus more on prevention and people being able to see a doctor. We are able to do all those things that save money without cutting health care for people.

We are very committed to making sure we have savings in Medicare and that we strengthen Medicare for the future. Whatever decisions we need to make, we need to do that for Social Security and other areas as well. The difference we have is, we think it should exist. We think it should exist as a health insurance plan. I cannot imag-

ine any way in which our Senate majority would ever vote for what is in the budget that was released by the Republican caucus today. So we are looking at very different priorities.

In the area of Medicaid, we are also looking at very different priorities. The majority of Medicaid, in terms of the number of people, are children; the majority of money under Medicaid is actually spent on seniors—on nursing homes, people who are in extended care facilities, and so on. Again, when we think about the budget being released in the House of Representatives by Chairman RYAN and the Republicans, they go right to Medicare, eliminate Medicare as an insurance plan, and then they block grant and cut Medicaid, which goes to the poorest seniors in nursing homes, so they get a double whammy in the budget that has been released by Chairman RYAN and the House of Representatives.

We also know they are slashing investments for middle-class families as well as the vulnerable, as well as public safety, police, and fire. I just left my mayors from Michigan coming in and talking about what has happened to them on the frontlines. We have trickle-down cuts, and they end up with it all in their laps, having to figure out how to provide local services. When we talk about the fact that there would be dramatic disinvestments or cuts in public safety, police, fire, and so on, they are appalled and desperately worried about how they are going to make sure they can respond to the people who live in their communities.

In education, cuts, of course, to Head Start, financial help for people to be able to go to college, all of which are good things.

Roads and bridges.

Another piece that is very concerning to me is our nutrition programs which have been put in place for families who have challenges. People have lost their jobs and they need some help with putting food on the table for their families. We are seeing that program, the SNAP program—Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—gutted with \$160 billion—\$160 billion in cuts that would leave millions of children, millions of families without help. Interestingly, the spending on the nutrition programs, on SNAP, is actually going down. Why? Because it is there when people need it, when they have a crisis, and then the spending is not used when families go back to work. So we are seeing over \$11 billion in decreases in spending because the economy is improving and people are going back to work. That is the way we want to bring spending down.

Interestingly, within my purview as chair of the Agriculture Committee, I am also deeply concerned about the cuts in the Republican budget in the House to crop insurance. Within our farm bill, we have two disaster assistance programs. One is for families, which is nutrition assistance. It goes up and down with the economy. The

other is crop insurance for farmers and ranchers, which goes up and down with the economy.

We have had huge droughts and late freezes on our orchards and others where folks have been decimated, but because of crop insurance this year, rather than doing ad hoc disaster assistance all over the country, we have crop insurance. People buy crop insurance are covered if they need it, and we have been able to see farmers sustain themselves because crop insurance has worked. So crop insurance costs again go up and down based on whether there are disasters. Supplemental nutrition goes up or down whether or not there is a family disaster. Both of those are hit in this budget and make absolutely no sense.

I can assure my colleagues that in the farm bill we will present again to colleagues as we did last year—and we are so grateful for the bipartisan support we had—we will strongly support efforts around crop insurance as well as nutrition.

Finally, let me just say that very different values are presented in the budget presented by Chairman RYAN and the Republicans in the House by going after the middle class, actually raising middle-class taxes in order to fund more tax breaks for the wealthy and the special interests in the country; gutting Medicare and using that money for additional tax cuts for the very wealthy; gutting our investments in science, innovation, and education to grow the economy in order to pay for more tax cuts for the wealthy.

This story seems to go on and on and on. It always comes back to the same place: The wealthy, the well connected, the special interests do very well. Middle-class families get hit, seniors get hit, the vulnerable get hit, children are hit and are asked to pay the tab for trying to bring down a deficit that, frankly, they didn't create. So that is the story in the House.

Our chairwoman of the Budget Committee, Senator MURRAY, will present a very different story tomorrow, one that is focused on growth in the economy, supporting the middle class, protecting Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security for the future, and making investments that grow the economy.

One of the things I know after working on the issue of jobs for a long time is that we will never get out of debt with 12 million people out of work in this country, so we better be focused on jobs and supporting the private sector to create jobs—large businesses, manufacturers, small businesses, partnering on innovation, education, and so on. That has to be part of our long-term strategy to get out of debt as well as making smart cuts and other kinds of smart investments.

Again, I come to the floor to commend colleagues who are on the floor showing the right way to do things—to work together, to listen to each other, to work across the aisle on a bipartisan

basis to get things done. We have a very different picture going on in the budget committees. We have a long way to go when we start with eliminating Medicare as we know it, but the House Republicans are saying, no, we want to strengthen Medicare for the future and keep it intact for seniors. All the other issues we are in a very different place. But I think it is very important that we make a commitment to listen to each other and do our best to find a path forward. We need to find a path. People are counting on us to get things done. They are counting on us to both grow the economy and create jobs and have a strong middle class and they are counting on us to reduce the deficit, all of which we can do if we are willing to work together and listen to each other and find a path forward.

I thank my colleagues for giving me the time. I wish to congratulate them again on the work they are doing. I ask that we work together as we go forward in completing the task on growing the economy and reducing the deficit.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SHELBY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, when I go back to Indiana and meet with Hoosiers, they often ask why Washington seems to experience a crisis every few weeks. It is a debt limit battle. It is a threat of a government shutdown. It is the fiscal cliff on New Year's Eve. It is the sequester. And the list goes on and on, including the funding battle we are in now. Of course, the next round of the debt limit debate is scheduled for May, and on and on it goes. Hoosiers and I think most Americans—and I think most Members of this body—are getting awfully tired of this soap opera drama that occurs every few weeks here.

I think we need to move to the point where we can address the major issues. One of the steps in doing that is to fund this government for the next 6 months. I do not know of anyone here who wants a government shutdown. We do have some urgent things we need to do. We do need to address our funding imbalance that is significantly creating a major problem for us, but in order to get there, we have to do some interim things here to keep the country functioning. We need to commit to go forward and do the big things. In the meantime a 6-month funding resolution has been brought forward here. There are things in this that none of us are going to like. Everybody is going to have problems with parts of this. Everybody is going to think it should have been fashioned just a little bit differently.

The leaders of the Appropriations Committee have put a great effort into constructing a resolution that I think will adequately fund this government going forward, but they do so with the understanding that the commitment to address our spending issues and the commitment to do everything we can to put together a large plan in order to deal with outgoing issues is absolutely necessary. Hopefully, that will be accomplished in the next few months. To start that, you have to have a budget.

I am pleased now that we are going to be taking up a budget debate in terms of the next fiscal year's funding, and we will be taking that up next week. So these two measures together, with the sequester that is already in place and actions that have already been taken, hopefully will be putting us on a path to fiscal health and solvency.

Every family, every business, even local and state governments have to operate on a budget or they cannot maintain and establish the kind of fiscal discipline necessary to get to the point where they are not spending more money than they are taking in. We have seen a cataclysmic plunge into debt that has enormous impact on the future of this country, and we have to address that.

Vice President BIDEN once said: Show me your budget, and I will tell you what you value. Well, for 4 years we have been waiting to see a Senate budget, so we do not know what is valued. Finally, we are getting to the point where we will address that.

I think the responsibility to provide a budget on which to operate is not only lawful, as it is currently enshrined in our statutes, but it is a moral obligation we must fulfill as a body. Without casting blame on one side or the other, it is time that we go through the budget process and establish the direction in which this government will go in terms of spending for the next fiscal year.

Given our soaring national debt and out-of-control spending, eventually we are going to have to make very tough choices that we have been avoiding for years. The more we prolong these challenges we face and the longer we wait to act, the harder it is going to be. We have the responsibility to wisely spend the taxpayers' dollars and not to ask more of them than is absolutely necessary to perform our essential functions.

I am urging my colleagues to go forward in doing what is necessary to keep this government operating but do so with the commitment that we will address these tough questions, that we will address the necessary procedures and make the tough, necessary decisions to put our country on a fiscal path to health. Without that, we are jeopardizing our future, and we are condemning millions of Americans to unemployment or underemployment. We are growing at half the historic rate and have been for the last 4 years.

If this stands the way it is, we will continue to see a country in decline, and, more importantly, we will continue to see people hurting. We will continue to see people without meaningful work. We will continue to see an inability to provide the kinds of opportunities, innovation, and creativity that have made this country so successful in the past.

So with that, Madam President, there does not appear to be anyone ready to speak. I am happy to stop now, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, in the midst of this momentous debate, truly one which will determine the future of the country, I rise on a matter of equal importance, in my view.

Today we welcomed to the Capitol 26 bicyclists, riders who left Saturday morning on this journey. This journey led them to travel the roads from Newtown, CT, to dramatize the importance of actions against gun violence in the United States.

I have said about Newtown that we saw on December 14 of last year enormous evil and depravity in the deaths of 20 beautiful, innocent children and 6 dedicated, courageous educators who literally perished trying to save the lives of those children. We saw evil that day in Connecticut, but we also saw enormous goodness and heroism in the educators who sought to save those children and the first responders who charged into the school. They did so not knowing what would befall them, what they would see, and thereby stopped the massacre.

The community came together in support of the families and all who were affected so deeply by that tragedy. This community has demonstrated enormous strength and courage over these months. It is an example of the quintessential values which make us proud to be an American.

The riders who came to the Capitol, who rode from Newtown on a rough and difficult journey, also showed something profoundly significant and important about Newtown as a community, as well as about themselves. They included as an honorary rider a parent of one of the victims, Chris McDonnell, who was at the departure, and his wife, Lynn, who was also there at the beginning, although she didn't ride.

They carried with them, those 26 riders, the memory of Grace McDonnell. As one of them said—, Monte Frank, who organized and led the effort—Grace was on their wheels. They carried with them the memory of Grace, but they also carried the hopes and

hearts of America. Everywhere they went on that journey, people stopped them, thanked them and honored them, as I seek to do today here on the floor of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two letters, both written to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the ranking member, along with Senators MURPHY and myself, letters written by Lynn and Chris McDonnell and a separate letter written by the families of some of those victims.

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

MARCH 11, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
*Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, Russell
Senate Building, Washington, DC.*

Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
*Senate Judiciary Committee, Hart Senate Office
Building, Washington, DC.*

Hon. CHUCK GRASSLEY,
*Ranking Republican, Senate Judiciary Com-
mittee, Hart Senate Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.*

Hon. CHRIS MURPHY,
*Senate Judiciary Committee, Dirksen Senate Of-
fice Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY AND SENATORS GRASSLEY, BLUMENTHAL, AND MURPHY: We are 32 family members of victims who were killed in the massacre at Sandy Hook Elementary School on December 14, 2012—innocent children and their educators responsibly going about their day.

No one can describe our pain and the brutal day-to-day emotions we suffer. No one can bring our loved ones back and no one from our community of Newtown, Connecticut will ever go back to “normal.”

In the midst of our anguish we have learned about the dangerous loopholes in our nation's gun laws and we are compelled to speak out to save others from suffering what we have endured. We are writing today to express our deep conviction and support for the President's plan to reduce gun violence in America.

Specifically we are asking members of Congress to:

1. Require a criminal background check for every gun sold in America that includes a review of all disqualifying records and meaningful record keeping for all sales—in the same manner that Federally licensed dealers are currently required;

2. Ban military-style assault weapons and high-capacity ammunition magazines; and

3. Make gun trafficking a federal crime, with real penalties for straw purchasers;

The epidemic of injury and death from gun violence is a plague on America, especially since the toll it takes on our families is preventable. Our nation's families deserve to be safe and free in their schools, movie theaters, workplaces and their homes. We ask Congress, in honor and memory of our loved ones, to support the measures that the President has put forward to help stem the epidemic of gun violence.

Our precious children and family members who were so brutally murdered on December 14th deserve nothing less.

Sincerely,

Jackie Barden, Mother of Daniel Barden; Mark Barden, Father of Daniel Barden; Neil Heslin, Father of Jesse Lewis; Veronique Pozner, Mother of Noah Pozner; Len Pozner, Father of Noah Pozner; Gilles Rousseau, Father of Lauren Rousseau; Teresa Rousseau, Mother of Lauren Rousseau; Andrew Rousseau, Brother of Lauren Rousseau; Matthew

Rousseau, Brother of Lauren Rousseau; Suzanne Connors, Sister of Mary Sherlach; Jane Dougherty, Sister of Mary Sherlach; Joseph Greene, Brother of Mary Sherlach; Carlos Soto, Father of Victoria Soto; Donna Soto, Mother of Victoria Soto; Carlee Soto, Sister of Victoria Soto; Carlos M. Soto, Brother of Victoria Soto.

Jillian Soto, Sister of Victoria Soto; Donald Fagan, Grandfather of Victoria Soto; Debra Cronk, Aunt and Godmother of Victoria Soto; Robert Cronk, Uncle of Victoria Soto; Dean Fagan, Uncle and Godfather of Victoria Soto; Denise Fagan, Aunt of Victoria Soto; Don Fagan, Uncle of Victoria Soto; Linda Fagan, Aunt of Victoria Soto; Alex Fagan, cousin of Victoria Soto; Brianne Cronk, cousin of Victoria Soto; Christopher Fagan, cousin of Victoria Soto; Donald Fagan, cousin of Victoria Soto; Douglas Fagan, cousin of Victoria Soto; Heather Cronk, cousin of Victoria Soto; Wesley Cronk, cousin of Victoria Soto; Zachary Fagan, cousin of Victoria Soto.

MARCH 11, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
*Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, Russell
Senate Building, Washington, DC.*

Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
*Senate Judiciary Committee, Hart Senate Office
Building, Washington, DC.*

Hon. CHUCK GRASSLEY,
*Ranking Republican, Senate Judiciary Com-
mittee, Hart Senate Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.*

Hon. CHRIS MURPHY,
*Senate Judiciary Committee, Dirksen Senate Of-
fice Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATORS LEAHY, GRASSLEY, BLUMENTHAL AND MURPHY, On December 14th our family was forever torn apart by gun violence. On that day we lost the love and light of our family, our daughter Grace. Grace and nineteen of her 1st grade classmates and six teachers were senselessly murdered at the Sandy Hook Elementary School. One can not describe the pain and anguish that our family has experienced, a pain that goes beyond just our immediate family, but permeates our entire community.

In the wake of our darkest day, we have become acutely aware that the state of our gun laws in America is at best ineffective. While no one thing led to the devastation that occurred in Sandy Hook on December 14th, it will be a compressive approach that leads us to preventing such loss of life in the future.

We are writing today to express our conviction and support for the President's plan to reduce gun violence in America. Specifically we are appealing to members of Congress to:

Require a comprehensive criminal background check for every gun sold in America that includes a review of all disqualifying records and meaningful record keeping for all sales—in the same manner that Federally licensed gun dealers are required;

Ban all military-style assault weapons and high capacity ammunition magazines;

Establish gun trafficking as a federal crime, with substantial penalties for straw purchasers.

We hope that all of our nation's elected representatives will step forward with the moral courage and commitment needed to tackle the grave issue of gun violence that confronts us. We ask that action is chosen over inaction when it comes to protecting the most vulnerable among us, our children.

We appeal to you as parents to honor the memories of those lives lost at Sandy Hook and support the measures that the President has put forward to reduce the epidemic of gun violence.

That much is owed to our children.

Sincerely,

CHRIS & LYNN McDONNELL.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. These letters summarize the reason for their journey in very specific terms, stating:

In the midst of our anguish we have learned about the dangerous loopholes in the Nation's gun laws, and we are compelled to speak out to save others from suffering what we have endured. We are writing today to express our deep conviction and support for the President's plan to reduce gun violence in America.

Specifically, we are asking Members of Congress to:

1. Require a criminal background check for every gun sold in America that includes a review of all disqualifying records and meaningful recordkeeping for all sales—in the same manner that federally licensed dealers are currently required;

2. Ban military-style assault weapons and high-capacity ammunition magazines; and

3. Make gun trafficking a Federal crime, with real penalties for straw purchasers.

The epidemic of injury and death from gun violence is a plague on America, especially since the toll it takes on our families is preventable.

The letters go on.

As I told them when they arrived, an event which was electric, literally in the shadow of the Capitol, their journey sent a message. Very simply, all of us who believe we must stop a scourge and epidemic of gun violence, all of us must keep on pedaling. We must do as they did. Even though our road, like theirs, may be rough and uphill at times, we need to keep on pedaling and working. Never give up. We need to keep faith with those victims and their families, the 26 victims of that massacre at Sandy Hook. When they rode to Congress, their message to us is we need to keep faith with those victims and assure Newtown never happens again. If it happened in Newtown, it can happen anywhere in America. It is not just a mass shooting which is involved, it is the 2,500 people who have been victims of gun violence since December 14, all around Connecticut, all around the Nation, not only in communities such as Newtown, the quintessential New England town, but on the streets of Bridgeport, New Haven, Hartford, in neighborhoods, in big cities, rural areas, and suburban towns.

Team 26 is really Team Connecticut and Team America. It brings those values, courage, and strength Newtown had shown to Congress. Congress needs to heed and hear the country, just as people on their route honored Team 26. The American people believe we must do something about gun violence in America. They believe overwhelmingly, the polls show 80, 90 percent on all of these issues. They want action from this Congress.

As the President of the United States said to all of us in his State of the Union, the American people want a vote. The victims' families from Tucson, Virginia Tech, and Aurora deserve a vote. This is why Team 26 made this journey, and why they embody the conscience of America. The letters they

have written to Senators here call for action on measures which are common sense and common ground. We can reach a bipartisan compromise if we recognize the carnage, death, and destruction that is the result of gun violence in America.

These measures are law enforcement tools. Background checks enable enforcement of existing laws, the prohibition against criminals, drug addicts, domestic abusers, and the seriously mentally ill from purchasing guns, not just from federally licensed dealers. Background checks are necessary to enforce that law, just as is the prohibition on purchase of ammunition by those same categories of people. Likewise, the Federal ban on illegal trafficking and straw purchases is necessary to enforce existing prohibition. We have work to do.

I want to conclude by thanking those who are all family, who have stood strong and spoken out. Every time they do, it is with grief and pain. Anyone who spent time with them—and I have been privileged to spend hours and hours, days, over these past months with those families, as well as first responders, who still bear the scars, emotional scars, which are deeply felt.

I have great admiration for their courage and strength. I hope this body will take heart from it and will take their leadership as a message we must act, we must vote, we must do something about gun violence in America.

I am proud to welcome Team 26.

I ask unanimous consent the full list of all riders and their support group be printed in the RECORD.

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

Rider #1. Monte Frank, who is here today with his wife Leah, and his daughters Becky and Sarah; Bill Muzzio Rider; Chris Peck, Newtown, Connecticut Rider; John Funk, South Kent, Connecticut Rider; Stephen Badger, Roxbury, Connecticut Rider; Andrea Myers, Danbury, Connecticut Rider; Mike Andrews, Danbury, Connecticut Rider; Tom Officer, Litchfield, Connecticut Rider; Jeremy Brazeal, Manchester, Connecticut Rider; Officer Jeff Silver, Newtown, Connecticut Rider; Matt Baldwin, Redding, Connecticut Rider; Jonathan Lowenstein, North Kingstown, Rhode Island Rider; Lieutenant Gary Lyke, Brookfield, Connecticut Rider; Michael Magur, Newburgh, New York Rider; Andy Officer, Goshen, Connecticut Rider; Fred Thomas, Cape Elizabeth, Maine Rider; Carl Reglar, Mt. Vernon, New York Rider; Wayne Prescott, Litchfield, Connecticut Rider; Kevin Fitzmaurice, Middlebury, Connecticut Rider; Megan Cea, West Harrison, New York Rider; Brian Suto, Oxford, Connecticut Rider; Matt Emeott, Woodbury, Connecticut Rider; John Ford, West Harrison, New York Rider; Aidan Charles, Middletown, Connecticut Rider; Heather Peck, Newtown, Connecticut Honorary Team; and Rider: Chris McDonnell, Sandy Hook, Connecticut.

And their Support Crew: Sean Cavanaugh, Danbury, Connecticut Support Crew; Becky Frank, Sandy Hook, Connecticut Support Crew; Adam Silbert, New York, NY Support Crew; Peter Olson, Bethel, Connecticut Support Crew; Greg Meghani, Bethlehem, Con-

necticut Support Crew; and Mike Conlan, Ridgefield, Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I wish to comment on the remarks by our colleague from Connecticut, Senator BLUMENTHAL.

I say to the Senator, we in Maryland want to once again express our condolences to the people of Newtown. We have lost people in gun violence, nothing like you have, but we have it there. Most recently when a high school opened, a young man who needed mental help came in and one of our young men was shot. Fortunately, he survived. He is an intellectually challenged young man, full of spunk. He has been made an honorary Raven, honorary Oriole. Lady Gaga, who is his favorite, even sent him CDs.

We need to deal with this issue. We need to deal with guns and—I agree with the NRA—we need to deal with mental health. We need to put mental health in the Federal checkbook to train the professionals, do the research and know we are doing the right thing.

One of the fathers from the Newtown tragedy has cycled through Maryland to raise the issue through all of the awful rain in the only way he can to speak up for his daughter.

I want to congratulate the Senator and his colleague from Connecticut, Senator MURPHY, for continuing to be steadfast. I wish to say we support you not only with words but deeds. It is wonderful to express our condolences, to send toys to the children, to do all of that. We need to put money in the Federal checkbook. We must first of all confirm our BATF Administrator. The very person in charge of guns should be confirmed. We need to then look at our own legislation about illegal guns, all of what the Senator is talking about.

On the mental health side, the Senator was a member of the HELP Committee. I know now Senator MURPHY of Connecticut is on the HELP Committee, the Presiding Officer also. We need to look, even now as we look at the CR, how we may do the right research.

I wish to close with one melancholy thing, which is a consequence of the sequester. Senator HARKIN with the HELP Committee held a hearing on mental health. The Director of the Institute on Mental Health was on that committee, and I believe the Presiding Officer was there. I asked him what would be the consequences of sequester on the National Institute of Mental Health, since everyone wants mental health, and that is the research.

This is what he replied: We are not going to fund certain research projects.

Let me tell you one that holds such promise it is going to be a sad day for us not to do it. Here is the test—and, please, I am not a scientist and certainly not a neurological scientist. But there are certain kinds of mental health problems that come on onset,

particularly on young males, who are postpuberty, often after high school or as they go into college. As in Aurora, the young man who shot the people was already a graduate student. These things come on.

The Director of the NIH mental health said they wanted to do research for early detection, biochemical as well as environmental. This is not to earmark, paint them in a corner, or push them in a corner and stigmatize them, but they could receive that help early.

We need to know more. Whether that study is a good idea—I am sure it is, it is peer reviewed—I wish to say to the Senator, the reason we need to get this bill done, the budget done, and go on to regular order is to actually put money in the Federal checkbook to do what the American people want. We can do great gun control legislation on the this floor, but I want to support that mental health component.

I call upon the NRA and all of its members to support us to move the Federal budget, look at the mental health aspects. I believe we would have bipartisan support. I believe we would have grassroots support. At the end of the day not only would we prevent gun violence, but along the way, the President's brain initiative. We could learn a lot more and we could help our people. This is what I mean when I say we need to fund compelling human need and do the research. But I salute the Senator for his advocacy. And my condolences to the people of Newtown, but not with words, let's get to the deeds and let's get the deeds done.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I wish to briefly thank my great colleague and friend for those remarks stated so eloquently. I could not agree more. Mental health has to be part of a comprehensive strategy, as does school safety. No single measure for gun violence control can do it alone.

That is why I began by referring to the momentous debate we are having today about the future of initiatives such as mental health. And I join in challenging the NRA—for all its opposition, staunch and steadfast, against any measure trying to stem or stop gun violence in America—to join in seeking common ground on mental health initiatives and other measures that are common sense. I urge gun owners—responsible people who enjoy recreation and hunting—as well as others who are intent on stopping violence in America to support these mental health services for diagnosis and treatment. That is why I have joined in those measures as well for the Judiciary Committee and the HELP Committee.

But I really wish to thank the Senator from Maryland for her incomparable and invaluable leadership on this issue.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, I think today has been an interesting day here in the Senate. We have been trying—the Senator from Maryland and I—to get the bill we have been talking about to the floor so people will have an opportunity to offer their amendments, to debate their amendments, and we in the Senate will be able to vote them up or down. That is what this process is about.

Although I know it is getting late in the evening, I am hoping we can lock in some time agreement with the leadership. I am sure Senator REID and Senator MCCONNELL are working on that, as well as Senator MCCAIN and Senator COBURN. But if we could get started on this tomorrow and have a healthy debate, there are some issues that ought to be brought up.

I wish to take a few minutes to review a few of the outlines of what we hope to accomplish this week—what is in this bill and what is not.

What this bill would do is allow agencies the additional ability to address priorities in light of sequester cuts. We all know they were Draconian—good policy, as I said, but bad process. The proposed legislation the Senator from Maryland and I are bringing to the floor, hopefully, is in full compliance with the spending caps required by the Budget Control Act, and it brings, with the sequester, the total to under \$1 trillion. So we are doing some serious cutting, but we ought to do it wisely by what we do.

Both sides have given in to get to where we are. There is no new funding for ObamaCare, no new funding for Dodd-Frank, no State-specific earmarks.

The bill enables the Department of Defense—and we all care about security—to better implement sequester, and it increases the DOD transfer authority for reprogramming, thus mitigating a portion of the national security impact of the sequester and other across-the-board cuts.

The bill also ensures that veterans programs receive adequate funding—\$2.5 billion above the fiscal year 2012 levels—for VA discretionary spending. So that is a good increase.

The bill requires greater accountability of government employees attending conferences, including associated expenses, so that we don't read these horror stories of people going to conventions and living high off the hog while people are struggling to make ends meet.

The bill also prohibits the transfer of Guantanamo prisoners to the United States, among other things.

The legislation would provide additional funding for worldwide diplomatic and facility security in the post-Benghazi environment. When we send somebody overseas, we want to make sure, whether it is an Ambassador, an employee, or somebody going temporarily, that they are as safe as we can keep them. We know we live in a dangerous world, and some parts of the world are more dangerous than others.

This bill provides over a \$3.1 billion increase over fiscal year 2012 in assistance to Israel. Israel is the only democracy—I believe a real one—in that area and is a great friend of ours.

The legislation keeps in place the pay freeze for Federal employees for the remainder of this year, the fiscal year ending September 2013.

The bill prohibits distribution of any funds to ACORN, its subsidiaries, or successors.

It rescinds \$50 million from the EPA to restrict its ability to implement certain environmental regulations.

It rescinds \$10 million from the ObamaCare, as we call it, Independent Payment Advisory Board, which is the rationing board, some people call it.

The bill continues a provision to clarify the prohibition of Federal funds being used to lobby State and local legislative and executive authorities.

These are just some of the provisions in here, but I think tomorrow we will talk about more. Overall, I think we have put together a worthy and credible package, and I hope the Senate will soon get a chance to start debating it seriously.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I would like to compliment the Senator from Alabama, my vice chairman. He outlined how we tried to look at this bill and scrub it for nonsense or no sense, OK?

I know we are waiting for the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. COBURN, to lift his hold. I know he is looking closely at the bill. A few years ago, when I was moving the Commerce-Justice bill, he found that one of the agencies was hosting a conference and they were paying \$4 a meatball, so we called it the lavish meatball amendment. Often, the Senator from Oklahoma has great ideas. You know, Madam President, that people from Oklahoma have great ideas, and so we would like him, as quickly as he can, to lift the hold so we can move our bill and he can offer amendments. And I hope he is scrubbing it. I am sure somewhere he will find a rogue meatball. I don't want to minimize what he is doing. He really does scrub for foolishness and folly, and if he has a foolishness-and-folly amendment, I probably will support it. I can't tolerate it either. My constituents really work hard for their money, and they want the money they pay in taxes to work hard for them.

So, Madam President, I see the distinguished majority leader here on the floor. I am hoping that we are going to have a solution to some of that dead-lock here.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, it used to be, before the last Congress, the Senate had two speeds: one for deliberation and one for getting things done. Senators saved the deliberation

speed for truly great issues of the day, and when we needed to get the country's business done, we came together to work things out. It used to be that all appropriations legislation was business the Senate came together to work on and to finish. Sometimes it was 1 day, sometimes it took 4 or 5 days, but we got it done.

These days—for the last 3 years—the Senate has one speed: slow—real slow. And we haven't had appropriations bills for a number of years because we haven't been able to do them because of the speed—slow. Even when we are talking about preventing a government shutdown, even when there is broad agreement across party lines that we want to prevent a government shutdown, even then we are stuck in slow.

Madam President, when we got the bill from the House, I didn't like it especially, but, as I said earlier—and I still feel this way—the Speaker at least got it to us at a decent hour, not at the last minute. These two good Senators, Shelby and Mikulski, worked very hard for days to get this done. Now, frankly, I didn't like some of the things Senator MIKULSKI agreed to, but I was with her, and we agreed to do the things together because we wanted to get a bill done. We swallowed a lot of pride. She gave up things in her bill she has worked on for decades and gave in to others so that they would feel better about this bill.

So then we come here today and are blindsided. This bill has been in the public for days. It passed the House last week, and 85 to 90 percent of the bill that is the so-called amendment was in the House bill.

We are going to finish this bill or not finish it before the recess. If we can't get 60 votes, then it will fail and the government will shut down but not for anything we have done—not for anything we have done. We have a few Senators who are doing everything they can—and have been doing it for years—to throw a monkey wrench into everything we do here. We should have been legislating today.

I came to the floor last week and said we are going to have a CR, we are going to have amendments. I said that when we opened the Senate yesterday. I have tried my best to move to this bill.

The Senate cannot continue like this. I took everyone at good faith at the beginning of this Congress when we made a few changes. I thought those changes would be helpful. To this point, they have done zero because we have had no cooperation from the Republicans.

The Senate has changed, Madam President. I am sorry the Presiding Officer, who has a wonderful background, has not seen the Senate and how it really should work. A small group of Senators has kept the Senate in slow, slow gear. They have prevented us from even starting debate on this important bill. We can't even start the debate on it. People want to offer amendments.

We had Senator HARKIN waiting to offer an amendment, and we had Senator CRUZ here waiting to offer amendments. They can't. We are through for the night, so we have wasted basically 2 days when we could have been considering amendments to this bill, and that is a shame.

We have a limited number of Senate days. In our lives, we have a limited number of days. The time of the Senate is too precious to spend it this way, so I am filing cloture on this bill. We will have a vote on proceeding to it on Thursday. How about that? Isn't that great? We are going to vote to proceed to it. So we will be on the bill Thursday, and we can start offering amendments on Thursday.

CLOTURE MOTION

I have a cloture motion at the desk, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill 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. 21, H.R. 933, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Barbara A. Mikulski, Benjamin L. Cardin, Sherrod Brown, Richard J. Durbin, Tom Harkin, Patrick J. Leahy, Angus S. King, Jr., Tim Johnson, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Patty Murray, Mary L. Landrieu, Jack Reed, Jeanne Shaheen, Richard Blumenthal

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I hope the record is very clear that I do not criticize Senator SHELBY. He has done his best. He was a tremendous advocate for what he thought should be in this bill. But we are going to have Senators stand up and talk about what is wrong with this place when, after all the work that goes into a bipartisan bill, we are stymied from going to that bill and offering amendments.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, a question for the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. This is tough, but the leader has to govern the Senate and move the bill. But a question for the people who watch us and don't know what all these parliamentary ma-

neuvers mean. If there is an agreement to move forward with amendments, is it possible that tomorrow we could vintiate it?

Mr. REID. With the tremendous work Senator COBURN has to put into this so he can finish it in the next 12 hours, maybe we can move to the bill tomorrow. But I know he has a lot of work to do on the bill, so we will have to see how he feels about it tomorrow.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I really want to thank my vice chairman, Senator SHELBY, for being on the floor all day today in anticipation that we would have already voted on two amendments. I think he and I both regret the present situation.

I would hope the Senator who has grave concerns and waited to read the bill could really finish it overnight. We worked every night, I must say, not only my staff, but in talking to the Senator, and we were available to each other by phone. I was talking to Congressman ROGERS, our House counterpart, and we were working. I know that Saturday night we didn't close out until 9 o'clock at night; Sunday, not until 11 o'clock at night. That is why we wanted to get this over, so they could look at it.

So I say to those holding up the bill, I would like you to work through the evening the way we worked through the evening. If you want to see if there are other issues—and we acknowledge the Senator's right to do that, but, really, we do not want to face a shutdown, and there is this other issue of the Budget Committee that we would like to get on the floor. What a great message to the American people that with good will and sensibility and give-and-take—and there was a lot of give-and-take—we can govern.

My hope is that by the time we get to the end of next week—actually, the end of this week—we will have passed the continuing funding resolution and we will have passed a budget, with ample debate.

The Senator and I, House Members, Senate Members—we welcome amendments. We welcome debate. But what is frustrating to me is that we have had a very interesting day, but we had two amendments pending, two different viewpoints on health care and human services. We could have debated and been able to dispose of them in a way that would have brought honor to the institution and moved our legislation forward.

So let's show we can govern. Let's really show we can govern. And I hope we can get to our bill tomorrow and not necessarily go through the whole usual filibuster rules.

Again, I thank the vice chairman, Senator SHELBY. I thank Senator MCCONNELL for the way he helped and conferred on many issues.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I want everyone to hear what I am saying now. If somebody comes to me and says: You can get on the bill if you give

me these amendments, I won't agree. We will have cloture on it on Thursday.

We are through the dealmaking stage. We have been dealmaking on this bill—an important piece of legislation—for more than a week, and if a Senator comes to me and says: You can go to the bill tomorrow, but I want to make sure I have all these amendments, the answer is no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, had we been able to move to this bill, we could have probably debated already and voted on a number of amendments because this is very essential legislation. There is a lot in this bill, a lot of good in this proposed legislation.

I hope that reason will prevail and that people, even if they have some amendments, will come to the floor, as I said earlier, and offer them. Let's debate them, and let's get to regular order, up or down. That is what it is about. But I think the essentials of this bill are solid and good. We have gone into this, and we will go into it more and more. We want the process to work, but the process is not going to work if we don't get the bill up so we can go to the regular order.

So I hope tonight that things will work out and we will get going. This is important legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I came to the floor to speak on an entirely different issue, but before I do that, I would like to commend Appropriations Chair MIKULSKI—and I do like saying that, Appropriations Chair MIKULSKI—and Ranking Member SHELBY for all of the work they and their staffs and the other Senators on the Appropriations Committee have done to try to put together a continuing resolution that is going to keep this government open.

I share the frustration and the concern we have heard expressed on the floor tonight about the hold-up when we thought there was agreement to get this done.

So I appreciate all the work that has been done, and hopefully we can get past this and get this bill done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. The Senator from New Hampshire is a member of the Appropriations Committee; is that correct?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. That is correct.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Is this her first year on the committee?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. It is.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Does the Senator from New Hampshire know what regular order is? This is not a quiz.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I was hoping to learn that this session because unfortunately we have not had a lot of regular order in terms of moving appropriations bills and the budget through the Senate. As I talk to my constituents,

they really want to see us do that. They want to see us work together to move the agenda forward for this country, just as the chairwoman and Senator SHELBY have done in the last week.

Ms. MIKULSKI. The Senator is exactly right. What we are trying to do is to run a rescue operation to keep the continuing funding going on—really, the President will submit his budget next week, and the Budget Committee will be off and running. We will actually hold hearings on every subcommittee, and it will be an open and transparent process. Members will be able to participate, and we will return to that bill by bill. When you are dealing with a bill that has all 12 subcommittees in it and it is \$1 trillion, they think, wow. But we are going to do that regular order.

I thank the Senator. I am so happy she is on the committee. I look forward to showing her what regular order is.

I know the Senator is going to stand up, as she has done on so many occasions, to champion the cause of women; is that correct?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. That is correct. And I appreciate the leadership the Senator has shown.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Well, in the dignified way of the Senate and the way we talk, go for it.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, the world came together once again last week to celebrate International Women's Day. Today I want to belatedly commemorate that special day here on the floor of the Senate and welcome the passage of this year's International Women's Day resolution, which I am proud to say that I cosponsored on a bipartisan basis with my colleague Senator COLLINS, and we had 14 other cosponsors on that resolution.

International Women's Day is observed all over the world. It honors the economic, political, and social achievements of women past, present, and future. It also highlights just how far women around the world still have to go and the many barriers and closed doors they continue to face in the fight for equal rights and opportunities.

I want to recognize and celebrate this year's nine recipients of the 2013 State Department International Women of Courage Awards. This prestigious annual award recognizes women who have shown exceptional leadership in advocating for women's rights and empowerment around the globe, often at great risk to their own well-being.

One of those recipients I want to talk about is Razan Zeitunah. She is a human rights lawyer in Syria, and she has made it her mission to track the ongoing atrocities that have been committed by the Assad regime. Mrs. Zeitunah was forced into hiding after the government accused her of being a foreign agent when she began reporting on these atrocities. Despite living in

fear for her life, with her husband in prison, Mrs. Zeitunah continues to risk so much to make sure the world knows all about Assad's brutal crackdown on the people of Syria.

She is one of nine remarkable women who are being honored by the State Department this year, each with an equally inspirational story to tell.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the names of all nine honorees.

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

Malalai Bahaduri
Tsering Wooser
Julietta Castellanos
Nirbhaya "Fearless"
Dr. Josephine Obiajulu Odumakin
Elena Milashina
Fartuun Adan
Razan Zeitunah
Ta Phong Tan

Mrs. SHAHEEN. While I am very pleased that the Senate was able to take up and pass the International Women's Day resolution last night, I am also extremely disappointed that this bipartisan resolution was objected to at the eleventh hour over a clause that addressed the impact of our changing climate on women in developing nations, and I just want to read that clause.

Whereas, according to the International Union for Conservation of Nature, women in developing countries are disproportionately affected by changes in climate because of their need to secure water, food, and fuel for their livelihood.

That was the extent of the clause that was objected to. Unfortunately, this clause from the resolution was blocked by a Member of the Senate on the other side of the aisle. It was a clause that was included in the 2011 resolution that unanimously passed in the Senate.

Just this past weekend, Navy Admiral Locklear, the commander of the U.S. Pacific Command, was asked during a 2-day trip to New England what was the biggest long-term security threat facing the Pacific region. His answer was very clear: climate change—this from an admiral who is dealing with a bellicose North Korea and escalating conflict between Japan and China in the East China Sea. His answer to what is the biggest threat to America is climate change. Yet we have one of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who objected to a clause that points out what is very clear in data around the world, and that is the impact changes in our climate are having on women who are so often the food gatherers for their families.

This issue of climate change is not going away anytime soon. We can deny that it exists, but it exists. The data is clear, and I believe we need to come together to address this serious concern to help other countries find ways of mitigating the harmful effects of climate change.

Just as climate change deserves attention, we also need to continue our

effort to promote equal rights and equal opportunities for women everywhere. We know that all of society benefits when women are more fully integrated into their communities and countries, and we need to remain focused on this effort. That is why International Women's Day is so important, and that is why passing a resolution to talk about that in this body is so important.

I am sorry we couldn't agree on everything, but I do think it is important for us to recognize International Women's Day and also to point out areas of disagreement that clearly are going to remain at the forefront in the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I was sitting in my office listening to Senator REID, meeting with my staff on the bill we have on the floor, and I wanted to explain to the American people what this bill is.

This bill was published last night at 9:00. We got it at about 9:45. It spends well over \$1 trillion. And I agree with the majority leader, it is important that we pass this bill, but knowing what is in it before you can decide where you would like to try to amend it is asking something of Senators that they can't give.

So I understand the majority leader's frustration, but I would also make a couple points.

In this bill is \$8 billion taken out of the victims' compensation fund. That is not tax money. That is money which criminals have paid into a fund to give restitution to children and women around this country for the harm that has occurred from the crime that has been committed upon them, and we are stealing \$8 billion from that fund. In this bill, we are taking it away—not tax dollars but fines and penalties—and we are going to spend it somewhere else. You talk about being for women and children? This bill is exactly the opposite of that. Money that is due them we are not going to let them have. We are going to go spend it somewhere else.

So knowing those things are in the bill is one of the reasons we ought to read the bill before we can know whether we are going to offer amendments on it.

I would also make one final point. The vast majority of this bill passed the Appropriations Committee in the Senate last spring and early summer. There is not one of the things that are in this bill that the Appropriations Committee hadn't already done, and we had a deliberate choice to not put these bills on the floor last time. So if we are in a snit over the problems we are having, it is because the bills didn't come in regular order to the floor of the Senate so there could have been a conference.

By the way, the House passed 12 of the 13. Our committees worked 12 of the 13 out. So they came out in regular process. They were not allowed to come to the floor.

We have just about finished studying the bill. We have no problems moving on the bill and giving consent to move on the bill once we have looked at the bill. But for the majority leader to say that Members of the Senate can't have amendments after having their staff work since 9:45 last night to look at the bill and attempt to make amendments to the bill, that doesn't fit on a trillion-dollar bill. And when the American people find out what is in this bill that should not be in it, and the options that we can offer of what should be in it, I think they are going to agree that maybe we ought to make some changes.

I understand the frustration of the majority leader, but I also understand our rights. This is not about filibustering anything. This is about being an informed Senator who knows what you are doing and knows how to make a decision about how to amend the bill. We can call it something other than that, but it is not. It is about doing our job. The fact is, we got this last night.

What I would say to everybody who was fine with us going on it without having read it, I would say there is a problem with their position in the Senate in terms of their oath to do what they were sent here to do, which is to read what you are voting on, know what you are voting, and prepare amendments to what you are voting on.

We have this outburst at 16 hours after we got an almost 600-page bill? That doesn't fit with any common sense. We have instructed our side we are willing to go ahead and allow this to move forward but in a process that recognizes that this bill is not perfect, just as both the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the ranking member said. We do not have any problems with it moving forward. We do have problems spending money we don't have on things we don't need, and we ought to be able to offer amendments that would highlight that whether the body agrees with it or not—that would highlight it so the American people can see it. We may not be allowed, based on what the majority leader said, to offer any amendments. He is the majority leader. But if that is the case, we are probably going to be here all through the weekend because that is a right each Senator has and they ought to be able to offer them—especially on a \$1 trillion appropriations bill.

I hope Senator REID has a good night's sleep. I will try to call him in the morning and work out an accommodation that will allow this bill to move so we do not have to be here on the weekend. I don't want to be here this weekend, but I will if it is the right thing to get the point out and let American people know.

Right now we are having no tours of the White House. I can show you hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars that are under the control of the executive that they could save that are a whole lot less important than tours of the White House. The same goes for us in the operation of our House, in terms of the Senate and the House.

I am sorry I irritated Senator REID. I am sorry he is upset with me, but I am going to do my job. I have been here, I am in my ninth year, and I have always kept my obligation to the people of this country to make sure I am thinking about the long term, I am thinking about priority on how we spend money and the best way, the right way, and offering amendments, whether they pass or not, offering those ideas. That is because that is not only my privilege but it is my obligation.

With that I yield the floor.

REMEMBERING YVONNE RICE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I rise with sadness today to pay my respects and pay tribute to a dedicated public servant and a close friend whom I have known for decades.

For 12 years, when Illinoisans walked into Senator Alan Dixon's office—and then later into Senator Paul Simon's office—there was a pretty good chance that they would be greeted by the friendly, warm smile of Yvonne Rice.

She would work with them to solve whatever problems they may have had or to make sure they got the help they needed.

Thanks to her efforts, more often than not those Illinoisans walked away happy—and with one less thing to worry about.

But her service to her community wasn't limited by the walls of a Senate office. She worked in the Illinois State government for many years before joining the Dixon team and then working with Senator Simon.

She also broke new ground when she became the first African-American nominated by a major party for county-wide office in Sangamon County—the capital county of my home State.

Yvonne truly was a remarkable, wonderful, and spirited woman.

She will be dearly missed by her children, stepchildren, grandkids, great-grandkids and all of those—including my wife Loretta and myself—who were fortunate enough to know her.

RECOGNIZING DR. HANNAH GAY

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, today I rise to recognize the work of Dr. Hannah Gay, a pediatric infectious disease specialist at the University of Mississippi Medical Center's Blair E. Batson Hospital for Children in Jackson, MS. On March 3, the news broke that one of Dr. Gay's patients, a baby born with the human immunodeficiency virus, or HIV, had been "functionally cured" of the infection.

Now 2½ years old, this child is only the second person in history to be cured of the virus. The infant was born to her HIV-infected mother at a rural Mississippi hospital and then transported to the University of Mississippi Medical Center, where she came under the care of Dr. Gay. Only 30 hours after the baby was born, Dr. Gay began an immediate and aggressive approach to treatment that seems to have made all the difference in this child's life.

News of Dr. Gay's work and this baby's apparent cure has been celebrated around the world. This development opens a significant door to advance research and treatment for HIV and AIDS, the acquired immune deficiency syndrome. Millions of children around the globe have been infected at or during birth, and it is my hope that the spread of HIV among newborns will begin to slow and eventually stop with what has taken place in Mississippi what one doctor at Johns Hopkins University Medical School called a "game-changer."

I share the pride of all Mississippians in Dr. Gay, a native of Jackson, for her achievement and her dedication to our State. She not only teaches and practices at the University of Mississippi Medical Center, but received her training there. As a mostly rural State, Mississippi faces many health care challenges, and our hometown health care providers give us the best chance of finding solutions so that Mississippians can live healthy lives. Dr. Gay's work at the University of Mississippi Medical Center is addressing critical needs in our State with the potential to impact other countries and regions that struggle with the scourge of HIV.

Congratulations, again, to Dr. Gay and her colleagues. Thanks to them, one child has the opportunity to lead a normal, healthy life, and we may be one step closer to ending the global HIV/AIDS epidemic. I wish all the best to researchers at the National Institutes of Health and other institutions as they explore the potential for Dr. Gay's method of treatment. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Clarion Ledger article from March 7, 2013, titled: "Congratulations in order for Dr. Hannah Gay, UMC."

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

CONGRATULATIONS IN ORDER FOR DR. HANNAH GAY, UMC

[From ClarionLedger.com, Mar. 7, 2013]

Yes, great things do happen in Mississippi. That's something we've known all along. But the rest of the world seems to see us sometimes as a caricature of the lists we make—high in obesity, low in education and income.

But recent news that a baby born with HIV was likely cured at the University of Mississippi Medical Center by pediatrician Dr. Hannah Gay is something so powerful that the rest of the world could not help but notice.

Globally, it is arguably one of the most important stories to come along in years for the health community—real hope that HIV,

the virus that causes AIDS, can be cured. That's why when the case was presented at the 20th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections in Atlanta last Sunday, the story made headlines in newspapers throughout the world.

The story is: A baby was born to an HIV-positive mother at a rural hospital who was then transported to Jackson's UMC. At 30 hours old, the baby tested HIV positive and Dr. Gay, a pediatric HIV specialist at the hospital, put the baby on an intensive drug therapy that continued until the child was 18 months of age. Tests along the way showed a progressively lower viral presence in the infant's blood until it reached undetectable levels at 29 days of age. The child, a little girl, is now 2½ years old. She is healthy, with a normal immune system—meaning she is considered HIV free.

The child is only the second person in history according to health experts to have been cured of the HIV virus. It is also described as the first "functional cure" of an HIV-infected infant, which could lead to eliminating HIV in children throughout the world altogether.

And, it happened right here in Mississippi. It's not that we are surprised. UMC and its staff, comprising more than 9,000 full and part-time employees, have long been known for excellence. It is Mississippi's only academic health science center, which strives to educate tomorrow's health care professionals and eliminate differences in health status of Mississippians based on race, geography, income or social status.

The stories of success over the years are too many to list here. But it's important at this critical moment, as UMC and Dr. Gay stand at the center of the world health stage for work that could ultimately change the fortunes for so many around the world, that we celebrate this accomplishment.

We congratulate UMC, Dr. Gay and the thousands of others who work for and with Mississippi's outstanding health facility. If there was any doubt before, the world certainly knows now—we do great things in Mississippi.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, committee allocations and budgetary aggregates were previously filed pursuant to section 106 of the Budget Control Act of 2011. On December 18, 2012,

those levels were revised pursuant to the Budget Control Act. Today, I am further adjusting those levels, specifically the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2013 and the budgetary aggregates for fiscal year 2013.

Section 101 of the Budget Control Act allows for various adjustments to the statutory limits on discretionary spending, while section 106(d) allows the Chairman of the Budget Committee to make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments. This adjustment accounts for changes resulting from the following bills:

One, the American Taxpayer Relief Act (ATRA, P.L. 112-240).

Two, the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act of 2013 (P.L. 112-77).

Three, the Senate substitute amendment to the Continuing Resolution (H.R. 933).

ATRA reduced the overall discretionary spending level by \$4 billion and redefined the firewalls. The supporting tables reflect totals that correspond to the revised security/nonsecurity definition included in ATRA. As such, I am reducing the security budget authority allocation by \$2 billion, the nonsecurity budget authority by \$2 billion, and the total outlays by \$2.315.

The Disaster Relief Appropriations Act and the Senate amendment to the Continuing Resolution are eligible for adjustments under the Budget Control Act.

The Disaster Relief Appropriations Act includes \$5.379 billion in budget authority that is designated as disaster relief and \$41.669 billion that is designated as an emergency. That funding is estimated to result in \$3.257 billion in outlays in 2013. The adjustment filed on December 18, 2012 included revisions related to the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act. Removing the adjustment for the Senate bill and including the enacted bill nets to a reduction of \$8.909 billion in budget authority designated as an emergency, a reduction

of \$6.309 billion in outlays designated as an emergency, and an increase of \$592 million in outlays designated as disaster relief. Furthermore, the Disaster Relief Act includes \$3.459 in budget authority and \$344 million in outlays as nonemergency and non-disaster funding, which is not eligible for an adjustment.

The Senate amendment to the Continuing Resolution includes \$98.683 billion in budget authority designated as Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO), \$11.779 billion in budget authority for disaster relief, \$483 million in budget authority for program integrity, and \$41.669 billion for emergencies. This is estimated to result in \$55.766 billion in outlays in 2013.

Consequently, I am revising the budgetary aggregates for 2013 by a total of -\$9.883 billion in budget authority and -\$8.603 billion in outlays. I am also revising the budget authority and outlay allocations to the appropriations committee by -\$3.504 billion in security budget authority, -\$6.381 billion in nonsecurity budget authority, and -\$8.605 billion in total outlays, pursuant to the new security/nonsecurity definition included in ATRA.

I ask unanimous consent that the following tables detailing the changes to the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations and the budgetary aggregates be printed in the RECORD.

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

BUDGETARY AGGREGATES

(Pursuant to section 106(b)(2)(C) of the Budget Control Act of 2011 and section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

	\$s in millions	2012	2013
Current Spending Aggregates:			
Budget Authority		3,075,731	2,986,115
Outlays		3,123,589	3,006,559
Adjustments:*			
Budget Authority		0	-9,883
Outlays		0	-8,603
Revised Spending Aggregates:			
Budget Authority		3,075,731	2,976,232
Outlays		3,123,589	2,997,956

* Excludes \$2 million in off-budget Social Security funds.

REVISIONS TO THE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(Pursuant to section 106 of the Budget Control Act of 2011 and section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

	In millions of dollars	Previous Allocation/Limit Under Old Definition	Previous Allocation/Limit Under New Definition	Adjustment	Revised Allocation/Limit Under New Definition
Fiscal Year 2012:					
Security Discretionary Budget Authority		816,943	0	0	816,943
Nonsecurity Discretionary Budget Authority		363,536	0	0	363,536
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays		1,320,414	0	0	1,320,414
Fiscal Year 2013: *					
Security Discretionary Budget Authority		639,663	805,008	-3,504	801,504
Nonsecurity Discretionary Budget Authority		565,836	400,491	-6,381	394,110
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays		1,284,553	1,284,553	-8,605	1,275,948

* The American Taxpayer Relief Act redefined the discretionary firewalls for fiscal year 2013. Security now includes the Departments of Defense, Homeland Security, and Veterans Affairs, all of budget function 150 (international), the National Nuclear Security Administration, and the Intelligence Community Management Account. Nonsecurity includes all other funding.

DETAIL ON ADJUSTMENTS TO FISCAL YEAR 2013 ALLOCATIONS TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(Pursuant to Section 106 of the Budget Control Act of 2011)

	\$s in billions	Program Integrity	Disaster Relief	Emergency	Overseas Contingency Operations	Other	Total
American Taxpayer Relief Act Cap Adjustment (P.L. 112-240):							
Budget Authority		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-4.000	-4.000
Outlays		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-2.315	-2.315
Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 112-77): *							
Budget Authority		0.000	0.000	-8.909	0.000	0.000	-8.909
Outlays		0.000	0.595	-6.312	0.000	0.000	-5.717
Senate Amendment to the Continuing Resolution (H.R. 933):							
Budget Authority		-0.567	0.752	0.000	2.839	0.000	3.024

DETAIL ON ADJUSTMENTS TO FISCAL YEAR 2013 ALLOCATIONS TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

(Pursuant to Section 106 of the Budget Control Act of 2011)

	\$s in billions	Program Integrity	Disaster Relief	Emergency	Overseas Contingency Operations	Other	Total
Outlays		-0.477	-0.083	0.000	-0.013	0.000	-0.573
Total							
Budget Authority		-0.567	0.752	-8.909	2.839	-4.000	-9.885
Outlays		-0.477	0.512	-6.312	-0.013	-2.315	-8.605
Memorandum 1: Breakdown of Above Adjustments by Newly Revised Categories (Pursuant to ATRA):							
Security Budget Authority		0.000	0.919	-5.262	2.839	-2.000	-3.504
Nonsecurity Budget Authority		-0.567	-0.167	-3.647	0.000	-2.000	-6.381
General Purpose Outlays		-0.477	0.512	-6.312	-0.013	-2.315	-8.605
Memorandum 2: Cumulative Adjustments for FY 2013 (Includes Previously Filed Adjustments):							
Budget Authority		0.483	11.779	41.669	98.683	-4.000	148.614
Outlays		0.430	1.453	2.124	51.759	-2.315	53.451
Memorandum 3: Cumulative Adjustments for FY 2013 by Newly Revised Categories (Includes Previously Filed Adjustments):							
Security Budget Authority		0.000	11.612	7.042	98.683	-2.000	115.337
Nonsecurity Budget Authority		0.483	0.167	34.627	0.000	-2.000	33.277
General Purpose Outlays		0.430	1.453	2.124	51.759	-2.315	53.451

*The American Taxpayer Relief Act (ATRA), signed January 2, 2013, revised the discretionary firewalls from defense (budget function 050)/Nondefense (all other budget functions) to Security/Nonsecurity and reduced the overall discretionary funding level by \$4 billion. The Security category for 2013 includes the Departments of Defense, Homeland Security, and Veterans, all of budget function 150 (international), National Nuclear Security Administration and the Intelligence Community Management Account.

**These totals reflect the difference between the Senate-passed Supplemental (which was included in the previous adjustment) and the enacted supplemental. The Disaster Relief Appropriations Act includes \$3.459 billion in non-emergency and non-disaster spending for Corps of Engineers projects.

USS “THRESHER” 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, on April 10, 1963, the submarine USS *Thresher* sank off the New England coast. The loss of 129 officers, sailors, and civilian technicians was a tragedy for the Navy, our Nation, and especially for the families of that gallant crew.

The USS *Thresher* was built in Kittery, ME, at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. Each year, the people of Kittery and neighboring communities in Maine and New Hampshire gather on the anniversary of the loss of the *Thresher* to pay their solemn respects to those who made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our Nation.

This year is the 50th anniversary of that tragedy. On April 10, 2013, the USS *Thresher* Memorial will be dedicated. Located at Kittery Memorial Circle, this tribute features a flagpole rising from a black granite base. The height of the flagpole—129 feet—is a powerful reminder of those who perished.

The memorial is made possible by contributions from throughout the region—from schoolchildren and civic organizations to such U.S. Navy veterans as President George H.W. Bush. The depth of support for this inspiring project demonstrates the gratitude the American people have for all who serve.

The USS *Thresher* was the first of a new class of submarines for the Navy that was designed to be the world’s most modern, quiet, deep-diving fast-attack submarines. It was during deep-diving trials some 200 miles east of Cape Cod when a crucial system failed.

The loss of life on the USS *Thresher* was the worst submarine disaster in American history. Among the 129 lost were a veteran submariner whose service began during World War II and extended into the Cold War, 2 brothers, and a young husband who had just learned he was to become a father. Each of the 129 men left behind a grieving family and a hometown in sorrow.

They did not die in vain. The *Thresher* disaster directly led to the SUBSAFE program that ensures every submarine in America’s fleet undergoes

rigorous testing to safeguard our submariners. Every safe voyage and every crisis survived since that terrible time is the legacy of the USS *Thresher*.

The courage and sacrifice of those aboard the USS *Thresher* exemplify the devotion of all submariners, past and present, and their commitment to the mission. The “silent service” is a critical component of America’s defenses, and those who step forward to serve willingly take on one of the most challenging assignments in our armed forces. The USS *Thresher* Memorial in Kittery, ME, ensures that we will never forget those who are on eternal patrol.

REMEMBERING LEO SANCHEZ

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, on Sunday, March 10, 2013, Wyoming lost a beloved veteran and citizen, Leo Sanchez. I would like to tell my colleagues about this patriot.

There is a Marine Corps saying, “Marines never die; they regroup at the pearly gates and wait for Saint Peter to issue them orders.” Those who knew Leo are certain he is running through a list with Saint Peter regarding his ideas to improve heaven.

Leo served our great Nation first in the Army National Guard and then in the Marine Corps. He fought in Korea. Following his service, he came home to Wyoming and had a successful career as an educator. His desire to serve his community did not end in the classroom; Leo became an involved member of every veteran organization. His priority was helping fellow veterans from every branch and period, at every opportunity.

It is impossible to measure the loss of a man like Leo Sanchez. His absence will be felt by Wyoming for generations. Leo was one of my State’s great treasures. He always gave more than he himself required. I could always count on seeing Leo in uniform beaming with pride and celebrating fellow veterans and our Nation’s patriotic events.

Leo was not only a veteran but a beloved teacher. Leo’s legacy is in the children of Wyoming, those whom he taught and inspired. Leo recognized a

secret that very few embrace: regardless of the conditions of the day, America will always remain great as long as her children understand patriotism and choose to live their lives to those patriotic standards. Leo wholeheartedly believed that there is always hope as long as the next generation values the cost and necessary sacrifice that accompany freedom.

Regardless of an individual’s race, creed, or handicap, Leo found a way for every man, woman and child to participate in what it means to be an American. He appreciated that what makes the United States great isn’t the flag on a flagpole but rather the hands that hold the flagpole. Leo instilled in everyone the importance of service, sacrifice, duty and love of country through his every action.

Semper Fidelis, Leo Sanchez, you will be missed.

RECOGNIZING RxIMPACT DAY

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, as the cochair of the Senate Community Pharmacy Caucus, I rise to recognize the fifth annual NACDS RxIMPACT Day on Capitol Hill. This is a special day where we recognize pharmacy’s contribution to the American healthcare system. This year’s event, organized by the National Association of Chain Drug Stores, takes place on March 13–14. Hundreds from the pharmacy community—including practicing pharmacists, pharmacy school faculty and students, State pharmacy leaders and pharmacy company executives—will visit Capitol Hill. They will share their views with Congress about the importance of supporting legislation that protects access to community and neighborhood pharmacies and that utilizes pharmacists to improve the quality and reduce the costs of providing health care.

Advocates from 37 States have travelled to Washington to talk about their contributions in over 50,000 community pharmacies nationwide. These important health care providers are here to urge Congress to recognize the value of pharmacists and protect access to these medication experts as a part of

our health care delivery system. And just as these providers travelled to meet with us, over 100 Members of Congress have toured a local pharmacy over the past 5 years.

Patients have always relied on their local pharmacist to meet their health care needs. The local pharmacist is a trusted, highly accessible health care provider deeply committed to providing accurate prescriptions, catching possible drug interactions and helping patients take medications as prescribed.

As demand for health care services continues to grow, pharmacists have expanded their role in health care delivery, partnering with physicians, nurses and other health care providers to meet their patients' needs. Innovative services provided by pharmacists do even more to improve patient health care. Pharmacists are highly valued by those that rely on them most—those in rural and underserved areas, as well as older Americans, and those struggling to manage chronic diseases. Pharmacy services improve patients' quality of life and health care affordability. By helping patients take their medications effectively and providing preventive services, pharmacists help avoid more costly forms of care later. Pharmacists also help patients identify strategies to save money, such as understanding their pharmacy benefits, using generic drugs and obtaining 90-day supplies of prescription drugs from local pharmacies. The importance of medication adherence and the effectiveness of local pharmacists in delivering patient care is resonating with policymakers.

Pharmacists are the Nation's most accessible healthcare providers. In many communities, especially in rural areas, the local pharmacist is a patient's most direct link to health care. Eighty-six percent of rural Americans reside within a 10-mile radius of a sole community pharmacy. Usually these pharmacists are substantially closer than their physicians. Pharmacists are one of the most trusted professionals. Pharmacy has a long history of receiving, filling, billing and dispensing prescriptions in tandem with patient counseling. Utilizing their specialized education, pharmacists also play a major role in medication therapy management, disease-state management, immunizations, health care screenings, and other health care services designed to improve patient health and reduce overall health care costs.

As the face of neighborhood health care, pharmacies across the Nation offer these and other cost saving programs and services to patients. For more than a century, pharmacies and pharmacists have made a difference in the lives of Montanans and all Americans through these important patient care services, and it is critical we work to support their unique contributions.

As we refine health care reform and seek new strategies to improve health and reduce costs, pharmacists will play

a critical role. They help patients adhere to their medications and that improves health outcomes and reduces the risks of adverse events and unnecessary costly hospital readmissions and emergency room visits. Pharmacists as providers with a comprehensive understanding of a patient's medical needs, are uniquely qualified to work with patients to help manage all of their medications and play an essential role in helping them take their medications as prescribed. Unfortunately, only one half of Americans living with chronic diseases adhere to their drug regimens. This patient non-adherence costs the Nation's economy an estimated \$290 billion each year, not to mention the avoidable loss of quality of life for patients and their loved ones. Congress recognized the important role of local pharmacists when it included a Medication Therapy Management, MTM, benefit in Medicare Part D. As we have seen the increasing value of this benefit in improving patient health outcomes, I support community pharmacy's efforts to strengthen the MTM benefit so it is available for seniors and others struggling with chronic conditions and other illnesses.

Today, I celebrate the value of pharmacy and support efforts to protect access to neighborhood pharmacies and utilize pharmacies to improve the quality and reduce the costs of health care. In recognition of the fifth annual NACDS RxIMPACT Day on Capitol Hill, I would like to congratulate pharmacy leaders, pharmacists, students, and executives and the pharmacy community represented by the National Association of Chain Drug Stores for their contributions to the good health of the American people.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THIBODAUX, LOUISIANA

• Mr. VITTER. Madam President, today I recognize the City of Thibodaux. This month, Thibodaux, LA, celebrates its 175th anniversary. First named Thibodauxville to honor Henry Schuyler Thibodaux, the city was both a trading post between New Orleans and Bayou Teche in the late 1700s and also a popular settling place for Acadians, Africans, Italians, and Spaniards coming to Louisiana during that time. However, it wasn't until 1838 that Thibodaux became the official name. In fact, city resident and Louisiana Governor E.D. White, Sr., commissioned the name change.

Thibodaux is also where the Battle of Georgia Landing was fought during the Civil War, and the Battle of Lafourche Crossing happened a few miles east. Affectionately known as the Queen City of Bayou Lafourche, Thibodaux's history can be seen in places such as the Laurel Valley Village, home of the oldest working sugar cane plantation in the United States, and the home of Governor E.D. White. Both are listed

on the National Register of Historic Places.

Along with Governor White, Governor Francis T. Nicholls also was a native of Thibodaux, and Nicholls State University is named in his honor. Governor White's son, E.D. White, Jr., served as U.S. Senator from 1891 to 1894. Later, he was an associate justice and chief justice of the United States Supreme Court from 1894 until his passing in 1921. A statue of Chief Justice White stands in our U.S. Capitol commemorating his service to Louisiana and the Nation. These are just a few of the historically significant residents of Thibodaux.

The City of Thibodaux, its people, and Cajun heritage are at the heart of the culture and traditions that have made Louisiana great. Louisiana and the City of Thibodaux's history are represented through our culture, our traditions, and especially our food. They all symbolize who we are and the devotion we have to preserving our heritage.

Thibodaux's motto is "Where Yesterday Welcomes Tomorrow," and it is my honor to celebrate the City of Thibodaux's 175th anniversary while looking forward to its bright future.●

REPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN THAT WAS DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 12957 ON MARCH 15, 1995—PM 5

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared on March 15, 1995, is to continue in effect beyond March 15, 2013.

The crisis between the United States and Iran resulting from the actions and policies of the Government of Iran has not been resolved. The actions and policies of the Government of Iran are contrary to the interests of the United States in the region and continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue

the national emergency declared with respect to Iran and to maintain in force comprehensive sanctions against Iran to deal with this threat.

BARACK OBAMA,
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 12, 2013.

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-774. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Amendments to the HHS Notice of Benefit and Payment Parameters for 2014" (RIN0938-AR74) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 1, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-775. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Extension of the Payment Adjustment for Low-volume Hospitals and the Medicare-dependent Hospital (MDH) Program Under the Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment Systems (IPPS) for Acute Care Hospitals for Fiscal Year 2013" (RIN0938-AR12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-776. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; HHS Notice of Benefit and Payment Parameters for 2014" (RIN0938-AR51) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 1, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-777. A communication from the Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2012 Agency Financial Report; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-778. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certification regarding the Essential Health Benefits (EHB) requirements of the Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-779. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Health Insurance Market Rules; Rate Review" (RIN0938-AR40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-780. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Health Insurance Market Rules; Rate Review" (RIN0938-AR40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-781. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and

Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Standards Related to Essential Health Benefits, Actuarial Value, and Accreditation" (RIN0938-AR03) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-782. A communication from the Deputy Director for Policy, Legislative and Regulatory Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-783. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Additional Safeguards for Children in Clinical Investigations of Food and Drug Administration-Regulated Products" ((RIN0910-AG71) (Docket No. FDA-2011-N-0009)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-784. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Filings Required of Multiple Employer Welfare Arrangements and Certain Other Related Entities" (RIN1210-AB51) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-785. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Ex Parte Cease and Desist and Summary Seizure Orders—Multiple Employer Welfare Arrangements" (RIN1210-AB48) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-786. A communication from the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Learning from Iraq"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-787. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the status of Data Mining Activities by the Department of State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-788. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to compliance by the United States courts of appeals and district courts with the time limitations established for deciding habeas corpus death penalty petitions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-789. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to the Standards of Identity for Distilled Spirits" (RIN1513-AB33) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-790. A communication from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of

Justice's Office of Justice Programs Annual Report to Congress for fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-791. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; Amendment 17 to the Salmon Fishery Management Plan" (RIN0648-BC28) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-792. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XC493) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-793. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XC465) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-794. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XC466) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-795. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Trip Limit Increase" (RIN0648-XC474) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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. 146. A bill to enhance the safety of America's schools.

S. 374. A bill to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale.

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. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 523. A bill to require that the Federal Government procure from the private sector the goods and services necessary for the operations and management of certain Government agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

S. 524. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for the study of the Pike National Historic Trail; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 525. A bill proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to restore the rights of the American people that were taken away by the Supreme Court's decision in the Citizens United case and related decisions, to protect the integrity of our elections, and to limit the corrosive influence of money in our democratic process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 526. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. COWAN):

S. 527. A bill to provide for the adjustment of status of certain nationals of Liberia to that of lawful permanent residents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HAGAN (for herself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 528. A bill to amend the Higher Education Opportunity Act to restrict institutions of higher education from using revenues derived from Federal educational assistance funds for advertising, marketing, or recruiting purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 529. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the commencement date of the period of service at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, for eligibility for hospital care and medical services in connection with exposure to contaminated water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. JOHANNIS):

S. 530. A bill to make participation in the American Community Survey voluntary, except with respect to certain basic questions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 531. A bill to provide for the publication by the Secretary of Health and Human Services of physical activity guidelines for Americans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 532. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to provide for same day registration; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 533. A bill to correct the boundaries of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Unit L06, Topsail, North Carolina; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. WARNER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. WICKER,

Mr. CARPER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 534. A bill to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ENZI, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. VITTER, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 535. A bill to require a study and report by the Small Business Administration regarding the costs to small business concerns of Federal regulations; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 536. A bill to require a study and report by the Comptroller General of the United States regarding the costs of Federal regulations; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 537. A bill to require the Small Business Administration to make information relating to lenders making covered loans publicly available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 538. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the authorities and responsibilities of convening authorities in taking actions on the findings and sentences of courts-martial; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mrs. HAGAN):

S. 539. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes and diabetes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 540. A bill to designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the "Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 541. A bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 75. A resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 54

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) were added as cosponsors of S. 54, a bill to increase public safety by punishing and deterring firearms trafficking.

S. 146

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 146, a bill to enhance the safety of America's schools.

S. 170

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to recognize the heritage of recreational fishing, hunting, and recreational shooting on Federal public land and ensure continued opportunities for those activities.

S. 177

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 177, a bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 entirely.

S. 183

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for fairness in hospital payments under the Medicare program.

S. 185

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 185, a bill to eliminate the automatic inflation increases for discretionary programs built into the baseline projections and require budget estimates to be compared with the prior year's level.

S. 193

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 193, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for startup businesses to use a portion of the research and development credit to offset payroll taxes.

S. 210

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 210, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraudulent representations about having received military declarations or medals.

S. 218

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 218, a bill to ensure that amounts credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund are used for harbor maintenance.

S. 226

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 226, a bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave because of the death of a son or daughter.

S. 289

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 289, a bill to extend the low-interest refinancing provisions under the Local Development Business Loan Program of the Small Business Administration.

S. 290

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 290, a bill to reduce housing-related health hazards, and for other purposes.

S. 309

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 309, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

S. 323

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 323, 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. 338

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 338, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the land and water conservation fund to maximize the effectiveness of the fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 382

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 382, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 407

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S.

407, a bill to provide funding for construction and major rehabilitation for projects located on inland and intra-coastal waterways of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 461

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 461, a bill to exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas and for other purposes.

S. 462

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 462, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 464

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 464, a bill to declare English as the official language of the United States, to establish a uniform English language rule for naturalization, and to avoid misconstructions of the English language texts of the laws of the United States, pursuant to Congress' powers to provide for the general welfare of the United States and to establish a uniform rule of naturalization under article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

S. 470

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 470, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require that the Purple Heart occupy a position of precedence above the new Distinguished Warfare Medal.

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 470, supra.

S. RES. 65

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 65, a resolution strongly supporting the full implementation of United States and international sanctions on Iran and urging the President to continue to strengthen enforcement of sanctions legislation.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 526. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Rural Heritage Conservation Extension Act of 2013.

As we continue to find ways to tackle the important issues of this nation's long-term future, we begin this new congress with an opportunity to take responsibility. This includes the ways we look to safeguard our land. Today, I am introducing the Rural Heritage Conservation Extension Act as part of our collective mission to ensure a prosperous nation for future generations.

We all know our land has a deeper worth than the goods we have cultivated or extracted from beneath the earth. It is our heritage. And when a piece of our heritage is lost, we do not simply lose its future value in dollars. We also lose the wildlife habitat and the open areas that may be enjoyed by people from around the world, on top of the very personal value it has held for generations of landowners. It is our job in government, as stewards of the land, to safeguard this precious gift for our grandchildren and to provide support to the farmers, ranchers and other hard-working landowners who rely on it to make a living.

For this reason we have decided to provide targeted income tax relief to small farmers and ranchers who donate their land under a qualified conservation easement. The provision increases the deduction amount eligible farmers and ranchers may receive for charitable contributions of qualified conservation easements by raising the adjusted gross income limitation from 50 percent to 100 percent and extending the carryover period from 5 years to 15 years. For all other landowners, the AGI limitation was raised from 30 percent to 50 percent. This provision was included in the fiscal cliff package and will expire at the end of this year. The bill before you, the Rural Heritage Conservation Extension Act of 2013, will make this valuable incentive permanent.

Conservation easements have been established as an effective land preservation method across the country. In Montana, we currently have over 2.1 million acres covered by conservation easements. To some, that may seem like a large amount, but this is Montana, and those easements are only 2.2 percent of the total state land area. But we leverage far more value out of these easements because they are often located within or next to large tracts of public lands. In Montana, we fully recognize the importance of using these easements to protect our lands. Now is the time to help my country and my State to do all they can.

This legislative body, the individual States, and the Nation together should stand up for future generations and declare that the time for land preservation is now. I believe that we should do all we can to help landowners afford to choose conservation and preservation, and this bill is a step in the right direction. Let us get rid of the uncertainty that comes with temporary provisions and build on the success of what we have already begun to do. Let us pass the Rural Heritage Conservation Extension Act.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. COWAN):

S. 527. A bill to provide for the adjustment of status of certain nationals of Liberia to that of lawful permanent residents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I introduce the Liberian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act along with Senators WHITEHOUSE, CARDIN, KLOBUCHAR, FRANKEN, WARREN, and COWAN.

In December 1989, Liberia became engulfed in a devastating 7-year civil war, which killed over 150,000 people, displaced more than half the population, and destroyed the country's infrastructure. Thousands of Liberians who were forced from their homes sought refuge in the United States and in 1991, were granted Temporary Protected Status, TPS. Since that time, the status of many of these refugees, as well as many of those who fled to the United States during Liberia's second civil war, 1999-2003, has been extended through renewals of both TPS and Deferred Enforced Departure, DED.

America is now home to these law-abiding and tax-paying Liberians. They came here to escape violence and are strengthening our communities. Many now have children of their own who are U.S. citizens, some of whom serve in the U.S. military. They are here legally, and they continue to work hard and play by the rules.

We are currently less than 20 days away from the expiration of DED on March 31, 2013. In the short term, I have been joined by several colleagues in urging the Administration to extend DED so Liberians who have lived here legally do not face deportation.

The Liberian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act, which I have introduced every Congress since 1999, offers a more long-term solution. It seeks to provide a path to citizenship for qualifying Liberian refugees. After decades of perennial uncertainty about whether they will be able to stay in their communities or whether their families will be split up, this bill would give eligible Liberians the opportunity to apply for legal permanent residency, and begin the process of finally becoming citizens.

Currently, a bipartisan group of my Senate colleagues is working towards a comprehensive immigration reform

bill. I look forward to working with them and others to include the Liberian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act in immigration reform. I thank Senators WHITEHOUSE, CARDIN, KLOBUCHAR, FRANKEN, WARREN, and COWAN for co-sponsoring this bill and urge our colleagues to join us in taking the next steps to finally provide a path to citizenship for qualifying Liberians.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 537. A bill to require the Small Business Administration to make information relating to lenders making covered loans publicly available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, as Chair of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I remain focused on the needs of small businesses. Much of what we do on the committee involves overseeing the Small Business Administration's contracting, counseling, and capital programs, and we are always looking for ways to improve them. As our country slowly recovers the economic downturn, one of the most pressing issues facing small business owners is access to capital.

In the past two fiscal years alone, the Small Business Administration, SBA, supported over \$30 billion in loans to approximately 60,000 small businesses each year through its 7(a) and 504/CDC lending programs. As of September 2012, there were over 2,400 SBA lenders nationwide. While the SBA currently releases some information publicly about SBA lending activity, it is extremely difficult to find and comprehend if you are not an SBA lending professional. If a small business, mayor, or governor wants to determine SBA lending activity in their area, they lack the ability to do so easily.

I come to the floor today to introduce a bill that would increase accountability at the SBA in its lending reporting activity. The Communicating Lender Activity Reports from the Small Business Administration, CLEAR SBA, Act would require the SBA to establish an online database to provide consumers with more transparent, user-friendly data about their local SBA lenders.

More specifically, the CLEAR SBA Act would require the SBA to post a user friendly Lender Activity Index on the SBA website. Users will be able to access the following data for any given bank: name of bank or Certified Development Company, CDC, number of SBA loans each lender made, total dollar amount of SBA loans of each bank or CDC, zip code of lender activity, not where every single loan was made, but a list of every zip code where the bank has made an SBA loan, industries lent to, hospitality, manufacturing, service, software, etc., stage of business cycle, new, or existing business, and business specific information, i.e. Women Owned Businesses, Minority Owned Busi-

nesses, or Veteran Owned Businesses. Data will be available for the year to date and users will be able to compare to 3 previous fiscal years. Both quarterly and annual data will be included.

I would like to emphasize that this proposal has already received bipartisan support. In the 112th Congress, the SBA Lender Activity Index was included as a provision in Title II of the SUCCESS Act. On July 12, 2012, the Senate voted on the SUCCESS Act. On July 12, 2012, the Senate voted on the SUCCESS Act as part of Senate Amendment 2521 to S. 2237, the Small Business Jobs and Tax Relief Act of 2012. Although the amendment came up short of the 60 votes needed to end debate, the SUCCESS Act received a strong 57 bipartisan votes, including five of my Republican colleagues. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together in support of this common sense proposal to increase transparency and accountability at the SBA.

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. 537

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 "Communicating Lender Activity Reports from the Small Business Administration Act" or the "CLEAR SBA Act".

SEC. 2. SBA LENDER ACTIVITY INDEX.

Section 4 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 633) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) SBA LENDER ACTIVITY INDEX.—

"(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'covered loan' means a loan made or debenture issued under this Act or the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 661 et seq.) by a private individual or entity.

"(2) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator shall make publicly available on the website of the Administration a user-friendly database of information relating to lenders making covered loans (to be known as the 'Lender Activity Index').

"(3) DATA INCLUDED.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The database made available under paragraph (2) shall include, for each lender making a covered loan—

"(i) the name of the lender;

"(ii) the number of covered loans made by the lender;

"(iii) the total dollar amount of covered loans made by the lender;

"(iv) a list of each ZIP Code in which a recipient of a covered loan made by the lender is located;

"(v) a list of the industries of the recipients to which the lender made a covered loan;

"(vi) whether the covered loan is for an existing business or a new business;

"(vii) the number and total dollar amount of covered loans made by the lender to—

"(I) small business concerns owned and controlled by women;

"(II) socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns (as defined in section 8(a)(4)(A)); and

“(III) small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans; and

“(viii) whether the covered loan was made under section 7(a) or under the program to provide financing to small business concerns through guarantees of loans under title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 695 et seq.).

“(B) INCORPORATION OF DATA.—The Administrator shall—

“(i) include in the database made available under paragraph (2) information relating to covered loans made during fiscal years 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013; and

“(ii) incorporate information relating to covered loans on an ongoing basis.

“(C) PERIOD OF DATA AVAILABILITY.—The Administrator shall retain information relating to a covered loan in the database made available under paragraph (2) until not earlier than the end of the third fiscal year beginning after the fiscal year during which the covered loan was made.”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 75—CON-DEMNING THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN FOR ITS STATE-SPONSORED PERSECUTION OF ITS BAHAI MINORITY AND ITS CONTINUED VIOLATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 75

Whereas, in 1982, 1984, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, 2000, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2012, and 2013, Congress declared that it deplored the religious persecution by the Government of Iran of the Baha'i community and would hold the Government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all Iranian nationals, including members of the Baha'i Faith;

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom 2012 Report stated, “The Baha'i community has long been subject to particularly severe religious freedom violations in Iran. Baha'is, who number at least 300,000, are viewed as ‘heretics’ by Iranian authorities and may face repression on the grounds of apostasy.”;

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom 2012 Report stated, “Since 1979, Iranian government authorities have killed more than 200 Baha'i leaders in Iran and dismissed more than 10,000 from government and university jobs.”;

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom 2012 Report stated, “Baha'is may not establish places of worship, schools, or any independent religious associations in Iran.”;

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom 2012 Report stated, “Baha'is are barred from the military and denied government jobs and pensions as well as the right to inherit property. Their marriages and divorces also are not recognized, and they have difficulty obtaining death certificates. Baha'i cemeteries, holy places, and community properties are often seized or desecrated, and many important religious sites have been destroyed.”;

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom 2012 Report stated, “The Baha'i community faces severe economic pressure, including denials of jobs in both the public and private sectors and of

business licenses. Iranian authorities often pressure employers of Baha'is to dismiss them from employment in the private sector.”;

Whereas the Department of State 2011 International Religious Freedom Report stated, “The government prohibits Baha'is from teaching and practicing their faith and subjects them to many forms of discrimination that followers of other religions do not face.”;

Whereas the Department of State 2011 International Religious Freedom Report stated, “According to [Iranian] law, Baha'i blood is considered ‘mobah’, meaning it can be spilled with impunity.”;

Whereas the Department of State 2011 International Religious Freedom Report stated that “members of religious minorities, with the exception of Baha'is, can serve in lower ranks of government employment”, and “Baha'is are barred from all leadership positions in the government and military”;

Whereas the Department of State 2011 International Religious Freedom Report stated, “Baha'is suffered frequent government harassment and persecution, and their property rights generally were disregarded. The government raided Baha'i homes and businesses and confiscated large amounts of private and commercial property, as well as religious materials belonging to Baha'is.”;

Whereas the Department of State 2011 International Religious Freedom Report stated, “Baha'is also are required to register with the police.”;

Whereas the Department of State 2011 International Religious Freedom Report stated that “[p]ublic and private universities continued to deny admittance to and expelled Baha'i students” and “[d]uring the year, at least 30 Baha'is were barred or expelled from universities on political or religious grounds”;

Whereas the Department of State 2011 International Religious Freedom Report stated, “Baha'is are regularly denied compensation for injury or criminal victimization.”;

Whereas, on March 6, 2012, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran issued a report (A/HRC/19/66), which stated that “the Special Rapporteur continues to be alarmed by communications that demonstrate the systemic and systematic persecution of members of unrecognized religious communities, particularly the Baha'i community, in violation of international conventions” and expressed concern regarding “an intensive defamation campaign meant to incite discrimination and hate against Baha'is”;

Whereas, on May 23, 2012, the United Nations Secretary-General issued a report (A/HRC/19/82), which stated that “the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief . . . pointed out that the Islamic Republic of Iran had a policy of systematic persecution of persons belonging to the Baha'i faith, excluding them from the application of freedom of religion or belief by simply denying that their faith had the status of a religion”;

Whereas, on August 22, 2012, the United Nations Secretary-General issued a report (A/67/327), which stated, “The international community continues to express concerns about the very serious discrimination against ethnic and religious minorities in law and in practice, in particular the Baha'i community. The Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran expressed alarm about the systemic and systematic persecution of members of the Baha'i community, including severe socioeconomic pressure and arrests and detention. He also deplored the Government's tolerance of an intensive defamation campaign

aimed at inciting discrimination and hate against Baha'is.”;

Whereas, on September 13, 2012, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran issued a report (A/67/369), which stated, “Reports and interviews submitted to the Special Rapporteur also continue to portray a disturbing trend with regard to religious freedom in the country. Members of both recognized and unrecognized religions have reported various levels of intimidation, arrest, detention and interrogation that focus on their religious beliefs.”, and stated, “At the time of drafting the report, 105 members of the Baha'i community were reported to be in detention.”;

Whereas, on November 27, 2012, the Third Committee of the United Nations General Assembly adopted a draft resolution (A/C.3/67/L.51), which noted, “[I]ncreased persecution and human rights violations against persons belonging to unrecognized religious minorities, particularly members of the Baha'i faith and their defenders, including escalating attacks, an increase in the number of arrests and detentions, the restriction of access to higher education on the basis of religion, the sentencing of twelve Baha'is associated with Baha'i educational institutions to lengthy prison terms, the continued denial of access to employment in the public sector, additional restrictions on participation in the private sector, and the de facto criminalization of membership in the Baha'i faith.”;

Whereas, on December 20, 2012, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution (A/RES/67/182), which called upon the government of Iran “[t]o eliminate discrimination against, and exclusion of . . . members of the Baha'i Faith, regarding access to higher education, and to eliminate the criminalization of efforts to provide higher education to Baha'i youth denied access to Iranian universities,” and “to accord all Baha'is, including those imprisoned because of their beliefs, the due process of law and the rights that they are constitutionally guaranteed”;

Whereas, on February 28, 2013, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran issued a report (A/HRC/22/56), which stated, “110 Baha'is are currently detained in Iran for exercising their faith, including two women, Mrs. Zohreh Nikayin and Mrs. Taraneh Torabi, who are reportedly nursing infants in prison.”;

Whereas, in March and May of 2008, intelligence officials of the Government of Iran in Mashhad and Tehran arrested and imprisoned Mrs. Fariba Kamalabadi, Mr. Jamaloddin Khanjani, Mr. Afif Naeimi, Mr. Saeid Rezaei, Mr. Behrouz Tavakkoli, Mrs. Mahvash Sabet, and Mr. Vahid Tizfahm, the seven members of the ad hoc leadership group for the Baha'i community in Iran;

Whereas, in August 2010, the Revolutionary Court in Tehran sentenced the seven Baha'i leaders to 20-year prison terms on charges of “spying for Israel, insulting religious sanctities, propaganda against the regime and spreading corruption on earth”;

Whereas the lawyer for these seven leaders, Mrs. Shirin Ebadi, the Nobel Laureate, was denied meaningful or timely access to the prisoners and their files, and her successors as defense counsel were provided extremely limited access;

Whereas these seven Baha'i leaders were targeted solely on the basis of their religion;

Whereas, beginning in May 2011, Government of Iran officials in four cities conducted sweeping raids on the homes of dozens of individuals associated with the Baha'i Institute for Higher Education (BIHE) and arrested and detained several educators associated with BIHE;

Whereas, in October 2011, the Revolutionary Court in Tehran sentenced seven of these BIHE instructors and administrators, Mr. Vahid Mahmoudi, Mr. Kamran Mortezaie, Mr. Mahmoud Badavam, Ms. Nooshin Khadem, Mr. Farhad Sedghi, Mr. Riaz Sobhani, and Mr. Ramin Zibaie, to prison terms for the crime of “membership of the deviant sect of Baha’ism, with the goal of taking action against the security of the country, in order to further the aims of the deviant sect and those of organizations outside the country”;

Whereas six of these educators remain imprisoned, with Mr. Mortezaie serving a 5-year prison term and Mr. Badavam, Ms. Khadem, Mr. Sedghi, Mr. Sobhani, and Mr. Zibaie serving 4-year prison terms;

Whereas, since October 2011, four other BIHE educators have been arrested and imprisoned, with Ms. Faran Hessami, Mr. Kamran Rahimian, and Mr. Shahin Negari serving 4-year prison terms, and Mr. Kayvan Rahimian serving a 5-year prison term;

Whereas the efforts of the Government of Iran to collect information on individual Baha’is have recently intensified as evidenced by a letter, dated November 5, 2011, from the Director of the Department of Education in the county of Shahriar in the province of Tehran, instructing the directors of schools in his jurisdiction to “subtly and in a confidential manner” collect information on Baha’i students;

Whereas the Baha’i community continues to undergo intense economic and social pressure, including an ongoing campaign in the town of Semnan, where the Government of Iran has harassed and detained Baha’is, closed 17 Baha’i owned businesses in the last three years, and imprisoned several members of the community, including three mothers along with their infants;

Whereas ordinary Iranian citizens who belong to the Baha’i Faith are disproportionately targeted, interrogated, and detained under the pretext of national security;

Whereas the Government of Iran is party to the International Covenants on Human Rights and is in violation of its obligations under the Covenants; and

Whereas the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-195) authorizes the President and the Secretary of State to impose sanctions on individuals “responsible for or complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses against citizens of Iran or their family members on or after June 12, 2009”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha’i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights;

(2) calls on the Government of Iran to immediately release the seven imprisoned leaders, the ten imprisoned educators, and all other prisoners held solely on account of their religion;

(3) calls on the President and Secretary of State, in cooperation with responsible nations, to immediately condemn the Government of Iran’s continued violation of human rights and demand the immediate release of prisoners held solely on account of their religion; and

(4) urges the President and Secretary of State to utilize all available authorities, including the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, to impose sanctions on officials of the Government of Iran and other individuals directly responsible for serious human rights abuses, including abuses against the Baha’i community of Iran.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 27. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 933, making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 28. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 933, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 29. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 933, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 30. Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. RISCH, Mr. VITTER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. HELLER, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. JOHANNIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 26 submitted by Ms. MKULSKI (for herself and Mr. SHELBY) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 933, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 31. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 933, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 27. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 933, making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 571, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . (a)(1)(A) None of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any prior Act making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for bilateral economic assistance under the heading “ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND” may be made available to the Government of Egypt unless a certification under subsection (c)(2) is in effect.

(B) Except as provided under paragraph (3), none of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any prior Act making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for assistance for Egypt under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763; relating to the Foreign Military Financing program) may be obligated or expended for contracts with the Government of Egypt entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act unless a certification under subsection (c)(1) is in effect.

(2) Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary of State transmits to the appropriate congressional committees an initial certification under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (c), and every 6 months thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees—

(A) a recertification that the requirements contained in such paragraph are continuing to be met; or

(B) a statement that the Secretary is unable to make such a recertification and that the certification is no longer in effect.

(3) The Secretary of State may waive the requirements of subparagraph (B) of para-

graph (1) for one or more 180-periods if, for each such 180-day period, the Secretary determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that it is in the national security interests of the United States to do so and submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report with detailed reasoning for the determination and certification.

(b) During a period in which a certification described in subsection (c)(2) is not in effect, amounts that may not be made available for Economic Support Fund assistance to the Government of Egypt pursuant to the limitation under subsection (a) shall be reallocated for democracy and governance programs for Egypt, including direct support for secular, democratic nongovernmental organizations, as well as programming and support for rule of law and human rights, good governance, political competition and consensus-building, and civil society.

(c)(1) A certification described in this paragraph is a certification submitted by the Secretary of State to the appropriate congressional committees that the following conditions have been met:

(A) The Government of Egypt has adopted and implemented legal reforms to protect the political, economic, and religious freedoms and human rights of all citizens and residents of Egypt.

(B) The Government of Egypt is not acting to restrict the political, economic, or religious freedoms and human rights of the citizens and residents of Egypt.

(C) The Government of Egypt is continuing to demonstrate a commitment to free and fair elections and is not taking any steps to interfere with or undermine the credibility of such elections.

(D) The Government is implementing the Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty.

(E) The Government of Egypt is taking all necessary action to eliminate smuggling networks and to detect and destroy tunnels between Egypt and the Gaza Strip.

(F) The Government of Egypt is taking all necessary action to combat terrorism in the Sinai, and the Department of Defense has allocated a portion of Egypt’s Foreign Military Financing (FMF) assistance, not less than \$100,000,000, toward counterterrorism tools, including equipment and training related to border security, to address this problem.

(G) The Department of Defense has consulted with the Government of Egypt and produced an analysis of Egypt’s current security needs, and the analysis has been shared with the relevant congressional committees.

(H) The Government of Egypt has lifted restrictions in law and practice on the work and funding of Egyptian and international nongovernmental organizations, comprising those in the human rights and democracy field, including the International Republican Institute, the National Democratic Institute, and Freedom House.

(2) A certification described in this paragraph is a certification submitted by the Secretary of State to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(A) the conditions set forth in paragraph (1) have been met; and

(B) the Government of Egypt has signed and submitted to the International Monetary Fund a Letter of Intent and Memorandum of Economic and Financial Policies designed to achieve such actions as reducing and streamlining energy subsidies, improving the government financial management, and increasing taxation revenues through a broadened tax base and reducing tax exemptions and has begun to implement such measures.

(d) Any interest earned from amounts in an interest bearing account for Egypt related to funds made available under section

23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763) shall be—

(1) transferred to and consolidated with amounts available for assistance for the Middle East Partnership Initiative under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.; relating to the Economic Support Fund); and

(2) allocated for democracy and governance programs for Egypt, including direct support for secular, democratic nongovernmental organizations.

(e) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing the results of a policy review on Egypt conducted after a dialogue with the Government of Egypt and civil society on how to rebalance United States military and economic assistance to Egypt.

(f) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report listing all of the Foreign Military Financing contracts for the Government of Egypt carried out over the previous 10 years and describing plans for such contracts over the next 10 years.

(g) In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 28. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 933, making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be made available to the Government of Egypt until the President certifies that the President of Egypt has publicly declared, in English and Arabic, his intent to abide by the Camp David Accords.

SA 29. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 933, making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VII of division C, insert the following:

SEC. 17 ____. No funds made available under this Act shall be used to implement or enforce with respect to any farm (as that term is defined in section 112.2 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations)) the Spill, Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule, including amendments to that rule, promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency under part 112 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

SA 30. Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin,

Mr. RISCH, Mr. VITTER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. HELLER, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. JOHANNES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 26 submitted by Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. SHELBY) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 933, making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ PROHIBITION ON FUNDING.

None of the funds made available in this Act may be used—

(1) to carry out any provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148) or title I or subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152), or the amendments made by such Act, title, or subtitle; or

(2) for rulemaking under such Act, title, or subtitle.

SA 31. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 933, making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle VIII of division C, insert the following:

SEC. 8131. (a) INCREASED AMOUNT FOR OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE, FOR STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL.—The amount appropriated by title III of this division under the heading “OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE” is hereby increased by \$25,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for Strategic Command and Control.

(b) **OFFSET.**—The amount appropriated by title III of this division under the heading “DEFENSE ACT PRODUCTION PURCHASES” is hereby decreased by \$25,000,000.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in open session on Thursday, March 14, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled “Keeping Up With a Changing Economy: Indexing the Minimum Wage.”

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Anna Porto of the committee staff on (202) 224–5363.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 12, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Ms. MIKULSKI. 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 March 12, 2013, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Ms. MIKULSKI. 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 March 12, 2013, at 2:45 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, “Oversight of the Federal Communications Commission.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. 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 “Job Corps Budget Shortfall: Safeguarding Workforce Training for America’s Disconnected Youth” on March 12, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 12, 2013, at 10:15 a.m., in SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to continue its executive business meeting from March 7, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 12, 2013, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Republican leader, pursuant to the provisions of S. Res. 64, adopted March 5, 2013, the appointment of the following Senators as members of the Senate National Security Working Group for the 113th Congress: MITCH MCCONNELL of Kentucky (serving in his capacity as Republican Leader); MARCO RUBIO of Florida (Republican Co-Chairman and designated as Administrative Co-Chairman); THAD COCHRAN of Mississippi (Republican Co-Chairman); LINDSEY

GRAHAM of South Carolina (Republican Co-Chairman); BOB CORKER of Tennessee; JEFF SESSIONS of Alabama; JOHN MCCAIN of Arizona; JAMES RISCH of Idaho; ROY BLUNT of Missouri; and JAMES INHOFE of Oklahoma.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 2013

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, March 13, 2013; that following the pray-

er and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following any leader remarks the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 21, H.R. 933.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mrs. SHAHEEN. This evening cloture was filed on the motion to proceed to

the continuing appropriations bill. If no agreement is reached, the cloture vote will be Thursday morning.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mrs. SHAHEEN. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:49 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 13, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ALEXANDRA NUNEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alexandra Nunez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Alexandra Nunez is a 12th grader at Arvada High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alexandra Nunez 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 Alexandra Nunez 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 of her future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO COURTNEY STRUTT
TODD

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Courtney Strutt Todd for being named a 2013 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2013 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Courtney Strutt Todd is a shareholder attorney at Davis Brown Law Firm where she utilizes her talents to assist private colleges, hospitals and other nonprofit organizations obtain public financing for building projects. In the last three years alone, Courtney worked as bond, underwriter's and issuer's counsel on nearly \$1.4 billion in general government bonds. Mrs. Strutt Todd also volunteers her legal talents pro bono and was recognized in 2008 by the Polk County Bar Association Volunteer Lawyers Project for providing more than 200 hours of volunteered legal services. Outside of work, Courtney is heavily involved

with the American Cancer Society, assists Urbandale High School as a volleyball coach, is a member of the Iowa Advisory Council for the Epilepsy Foundation of North/Central Illinois, Iowa and Nebraska, and is currently serving as treasurer of the Greater Des Moines Leadership Institute board. Courtney has been married to her husband Matthew for six years, and they have two children, Bryson and Brinley. In every facet of her life, Courtney is an example of service and Iowa work ethic that our state can be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Courtney in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mrs. Strutt Todd for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Courtney on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

RECOGNIZING MARY-DIANA POULI

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Mary-Diana Pouli as she is honored by the Amherst Museum's Women's Interclub Council. Few have been so generous with their time and talents as Mary-Diana. Her extraordinary legacy of service began during her adolescence, and has continued to this day.

A resident of Amherst since the 5th grade, Mary-Diana began volunteering with Amherst Youth Engaged in Service (YES), an organization founded to encourage community involvement and civic participation among children in Amherst from age twelve to twenty. It was through Amherst YES that Mary-Diana first became involved with the Amherst Youth Board, now the Amherst Recreation and Youth Department. She is one of the few people to surpass 1,000 hours of time spent volunteering with the organization, working with the department for over thirty years. Presently, she serves as the Recreation and Youth Director for the Town of Amherst.

Mary-Diana's dedication to the young people of Amherst extends to her long involvement with the Amherst Youth Foundation. She currently serves as assistant treasurer and as a member of the board of directors, yet is known to cheerfully help wash dishes, move office equipment, and assist office staff. No task is too large or too small for Mary-Diana.

Mary-Diana's good works have touched nearly every volunteer organization in the Town of Amherst. She is the former vice president and current treasurer of the Zonta Club of Amherst, a group dedicated to advancing the status of women and young people. Each December, the Zonta Club helps clothe 300

children through the Town of Amherst's Warm Clothing Project, of which Mary-Diana is a key part.

Mary-Diana's strong faith inspires her many good works. A lifelong Presbyterian, Mary-Diana is ordained as both a deacon and an elder in the Amherst Presbyterian Church, and has chaired their Mission Committee. Using her special connection to young people, Mary-Diana volunteers with their Youth Group to foster new faith. She has had the great honor of representing her denomination on a national level as a small group leader at various conferences, including serving as conference dean at the Presbyterian Youth Triennial, an event held every three years at Purdue University.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great appreciation that I rise to congratulate Mary-Diana Pouli as she is honored by the Amherst Museum's Women's Interclub Council. I am deeply grateful for her exceptional service, generous heart, and efforts that have bettered the lives of so many in Western New York.

A TRIBUTE TO BOLTON HALL'S
100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special recognition to Bolton Hall in Tujunga, California as it celebrates its one-hundredth anniversary.

Shortly after the turn of the century, the Glorietta Heights area of Rancho Tujunga came to the attention of Marshall Hartranft, a land developer who engaged William E. Smythe to publicize the upper slopes of the area. Mr. Smythe was the founder of the "Little Lands" movement, a utopian movement that believed that families settling on an acre or two of land could support themselves and prosper. Settlement of the lots by Smythe's "Little Landers" began in 1913 and in April of that year, Marshall Hartranft donated land and financed construction of Bolton Hall for the new colony. The edifice was designed by "Nature Builder" George Harris, who used rocks gathered from local hillsides and the Tujunga Wash to create a building that harmonized beautifully with its setting between the Verdugo Hills and the San Gabriel mountains. The structure was first called The Clubhouse, but was later named in honor of Smythe's friend, author Bolton Hall. Dedicated in August 1913, the hall quickly became the center of all community activities, including church services, dances, town meetings, socials, and the San Fernando Valley's second library.

Though the "Little Lands" movement declined by 1920, Bolton Hall continued to serve the community, becoming Tujunga's City Hall and town jail after the town was incorporated in 1925. Following the annexation of the city to Los Angeles in 1932, Bolton Hall housed Los

• 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.

Angeles' Department of Building and Safety as well as its Health Department and local police. The city eventually built a new municipal building, and the old stone structure was boarded up in 1957. For the next twenty years, members of the newly-formed Little Landers Historical Society and others fought to save the historic building from demolition and worked toward restoration. Starr Von Fluss, past president of the Little Landers Historical Society served as campaign chairwoman to raise funds for the restoration. With the acquisition of additional funds by Roberta Stewart and L.A. City Councilman Robert Ronka, the campaign to save and restore the building was a success, with restoration work beginning in February of 1980 and its official re-opening celebration held on June 27, 1981.

Today artifacts, photographs, documents and memorabilia of Sunland, Tujunga and the foothill areas are displayed, ranging historically from the village of the Tongva Indians, through the Mission and Mexican Land Grant periods, to the development of Sunland Tujunga and the rescue of Bolton Hall. The building also serves as the office for the Little Landers Historical Society. Along with John Steven McGroarty's home, now the McGroarty Cultural Art Center, Bolton Hall is one of ten historical monuments in the Sunland Tujunga area and is also included in the National Register of Historic Places.

I ask all Members of Congress to join me today in recognizing Bolton Hall's historical importance and celebrating its one-hundredth anniversary.

AARON ARVELLO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Aaron Arvello for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Aaron Arvello is an 11th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Aaron Arvello 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 Aaron Arvello 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 of his future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING THE MINOIA FIRE DEPARTMENT'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL B. MAFFEI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my congratulations to the Minoia Fire Depart-

ment on the occasion of its Centennial Celebration. I am honored to join the community in celebrating the Department on this historic occasion.

The Minoia Fire Department operates out of 2 stations. Station 1, located at 238 North Main S in the village, and station 2, located at 7036 Manlius Center Rd in Fremont. The Department currently operates two engines, two rescue pumpers, one brush truck, and one squad with a staff of 45 volunteers.

The Minoia Fire Department provides many emergency and non-emergency services including but not limited to, fire prevention, fire suppression, hazardous incident and material management, vehicle and other extrication and rescue, swift water rescue, ice water rescue, residential lock-outs, emergency vehicle lock-outs, commercial fire inspections and basic life support emergency medical services. Some members of the Minoia fire Dept. are specially trained and belong to special operations teams in Onondaga County including, Dive/Rescue, High Angle/Rope Rescue, Wilderness Search and Rescue and Hazardous Materials Response Teams.

So much has changed over the past 100 years. In 1913, Woodrow Wilson was inaugurated as the 28th President of the United States, the 17th amendment calling for the direct election of Senators was adopted, and the first automobile road across the United States, the Lincoln Highway, was dedicated. In 1953, Mack Model 85 was the first green fire truck to come to Minoia, setting the precedence for a full fleet of green fire apparatus. In fact, Mack Model 85 was fully restored in 2009 and is currently used by the Department in ceremonies and parades. Minoia Fire Department's uniquely green fleet continues to this day and continues to be a source of pride for local residents.

Despite the dramatic changes that have taken place over the past 100 years, a few things remain the same. The Minoia Fire Department continues to this day to take great pride in being an all-volunteer department. The Fire Department continues to be a central part of life for residents. Furthermore, for 100 years Minoia's finest have dedicated themselves to protecting their fellow citizens and making the community a safer place to live.

We are grateful for the extraordinary service that the volunteers of Minoia Fire Department have provided to residents of our community over the past century. Once again, congratulations to the members and supporters of the Minoia Fire Department and good luck in the next 100 years!

TRIBUTE TO HOWARD TEMPERO

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Howard Tempero for being named a 2013 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers.

Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2013 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Howard Tempero has been with Spindustry Digital for five years and currently serves as the Experience Design Strategist, in which he works with clients on website design and digital promotional material, among other online messages. After professional stints in Chicago and New York, Howard chose to bring his skill and expertise back to his home state. Since returning to the Des Moines area, Mr. Tempero has generated millions of dollars for Spindustry Digital and remains heavily involved in his community through the Rotary Club of Des Moines AM. Last year, Howard was recognized as a finalist for the NOVA Award from the American Marketing Association for his outstanding professional efforts. Outside of the office, Howard enjoys spending time with his wife, Megan, and their two daughters, Isalucia and Aristella, and two sons, Rezin and Corbet. In all facets of his life, Howard is an example of hard work and service that our state can be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Howard in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mr. Tempero for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Howard on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

IN HONOR OF MR. WILLIAM H. REDD

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. William H. Redd, a retired member of the United States Marine Corps who is receiving a lifetime achievement award for his service in the Montford Point Marines.

Mr. Redd was drafted into the Marine Corps during World War II where he was sent to Camp Montford Point, a segregated training camp in Jacksonville, North Carolina. Upon completion, Private Redd was stationed in Iwo Jima and Sasebo, Japan where he worked in Pacific Theater of Operations with the 66th Supply Platoon. He provided support, guard duty, and engaged in combat. Shortly after the bombing at Pearl Harbor, Corporal Redd was stationed in Hilo, Hawaii.

After four years of enlistment, Corporal Reed was honorably discharged and returned to his wife and children in Camden, New Jersey.

Mr. Reed was one of the nearly 20,000 Montford Point Marines who helped pave the way for African Americans in the United States Armed Forces. On June 27, 2012, Mr. Reed and his fellow Montford Point Marines received the Congressional Medal of Honor for their service.

Mr. Redd will be receiving his Life Time Achievement Award from Each One Teach Consultants at the 10th annual Black History in the Barbershop Program in Camden, NJ. The program is dedicated to preserving the historical contributions that African Americans have made to society.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOSEPH
CALIENDO

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Joseph "Joe" Caliando for his work on behalf of Monmouth County, New Jersey and to congratulate him on his retirement as Chairman of the Middletown Democratic Party.

Joe began his career in politics in the 1960s, first serving as a committeeman and then as Chairman. He has served as Chairman of the Middletown Democratic Party for 25 years. Throughout those 25 years, they had 10 wins and while they lost some elections, many were very close. Joe also currently serves as Sergeant-at-Arms for the Monmouth County Democratic Organization.

Not only is Joe active in the Democratic Party, he has also been a prominent labor leader for many years. He currently serves as a delegate on the Central Labor Council, President of the Retirees of IBEW Local 400 and Vice President of the State RAC. Joe continues to work to ensure the rights and benefits of the labor community.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in congratulating Joe Caliando on his retirement and thanking him for his years of service to the people of Monmouth County. His leadership is truly deserving of this body's recognition.

ALYSSA MILLER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alyssa Miller for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Alyssa Miller is a 12th grader at Arvada High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alyssa Miller 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 Alyssa Miller 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 of her future accomplishments.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GROVER CLEVELAND MEMORIAL BIRTHPLACE ASSOCIATION

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Grover Cleveland Memorial Birthplace Association, located in Caldwell, New Jersey, as they celebrate their Centennial this year.

The Grover Cleveland Birthplace Memorial Association was incorporated in 1913 as a non-profit organization "to honor and perpetuate the memory of Grover Cleveland". Stephen Grover Cleveland rose from humble beginnings as the fifth of nine children to a Presbyterian minister in Caldwell, New Jersey. After serving several years as an apprentice clerk in a local law firm, Grover Cleveland passed the bar and opened his own firm in 1859. He soon became a rather prominent lawyer and Democratic politician, and in 1881, was elected mayor of Buffalo, New York. Grover Cleveland's career continued to ascend, and during his gubernatorial term in New York from 1883 to 1884, interest in preserving his birth site kindled. He then served a presidential term beginning 1885, and again beginning 1892, becoming the only president to serve two non-consecutive terms. The political prestige fueled the interest in the preservation of his Caldwell birthplace.

The site was originally erected as a manse by the First Presbyterian Church at Caldwell on the north side of Newark Turnpike. It housed Reverend Richard Falley Cleveland, his wife, Ann Neal Cleveland, and their ever-expanding family, when their fifth child was born on March 18, 1837. He was named for the church's first minister, Stephen Grover. During the ensuing years, the house and barn were enlarged and "modernized" to accommodate the family. In 1902, the Church began negotiations for the sale of the property at \$18,000, to only be used as a CFO COI memorial to Grover Cleveland, and in 1907, a committee of friends installed a bronze tablet in the room where he was born. The then 70-year-old Grover Cleveland wrote that he was profoundly moved by this event. Finally, in 1913, the Grover Cleveland Birthplace Memorial Association was incorporated with four officers and thirty-nine trustees, all prominent citizens throughout the country. The Association purchased the house and lot, as well as the lot along Arlington Avenue. However, they faced financial difficulties during the depression, and the State of New Jersey assumed ownership. Governor Moore appointed twenty trustees to oversee the property. Fortunately, in 1936 the house was restored to its 1870 appearance under a government Works Progress Administration program, and was placed under the Bureau of Historical Monuments (subsequently under the Department of Environmental Protection and Energy, Division of Parks and Forestry). The house is listed on both the National and New Jersey Register of Historic Places.

The Grover Cleveland Birthplace Memorial Association was reactivated in 1986 for the Sesquicentennial of Grover Cleveland's Birth (1987), and still functions today as a voluntary

auxiliary working in full cooperation with the state. It is an officially recognized Friends Organization. In 1990, the Mayor of Caldwell appointed a liaison with the birthplace, a GCBMA trustee, establishing direct contact with the Borough. The Association continues to promote greater interest and use of this national historic site, which hosts several period exhibits and activities from the lifetime of Grover Cleveland. Throughout their long history, they have worked to bring awareness to the site and the great history surrounding Grover Cleveland.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Grover Cleveland Memorial Birthplace Association as they celebrate their Centennial.

AARON LONG

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Aaron Long for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Aaron Long is a 12th grader at Warren Tech North and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Aaron Long 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 Aaron Long 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 of his future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO TONY TIMM

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Tony Timm for being named a 2013 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2013 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Tony Timm serves as the executive director for the largest shelter facility in the State, Central Iowa Shelter & Services. In addition to his day-to-day role of managing the organization,

Tony recently accomplished a \$15 million campaign to open a new facility that will help expand the cause of addressing homelessness in central Iowa. The new facility, which opened in September, consists of more than two hundred beds; includes emergency, transitional, and permanent housing options; and features an on-site health clinic, food pantry, clothing closet, classroom, and a resource center for homeless veterans and other veterans in need of assistance. Outside of CISS, Mr. Timm has been the president of the Des Moines Downtown Chamber of Commerce, appointed to the Iowa Council of Homelessness by Governor Branstad, a board member of the Greater Des Moines Partnership and the Downtown Community Alliance, and was the recipient of the 2012 Social Czar designation from the Des Moines Social Club. Raised in Tipton, Iowa, Tony now resides in the Des Moines area with his wife Channon and their two children, Charlie and Sophia. In all facets of his life, Tony is an example of hard work and service that our State can be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Tony in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mr. Timm for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great State of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Tony on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF HARRIET TUBMAN'S DEATH

HON. DANIEL B. MAFFEI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join Auburn and the entire Central New York community in commemorating the 100th Anniversary of Harriet Tubman's death. Few Americans have fought so courageously for freedom and equality as Harriet Tubman. To pay tribute to her life and legacy, I introduced the Harriet Tubman National Historical Parks Act. This bill establishes two National Historic Parks in her honor: The Harriet Tubman National Historical Park in Auburn, NY and the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park on the Eastern Shore of Maryland.

The proposed national park encompasses several of Auburn's important historical sites including Harriet Tubman's Home, the Home for the Aged, the AME Zion Church, and the cemetery where she is buried. The legacy she left in Auburn is one of America's lasting treasures and we should honor her as the first African-American woman to have a national park established in her honor.

Establishing this park is not just about our history and the past, it is also about the present and our future, particularly our economic future. This new park would be a significant piece of an emerging tourist region with both historical and natural attractions.

We must work together to preserve Harriet Tubman's legacy and promote Auburn's future. Her story is a lasting lesson that still resonates today. Tubman was not someone who

accepted the circumstances of her time—she fought tirelessly for freedom and progress and that legacy is one worth fighting for. There is still work to be done to make this idea a reality and like Tubman, we cannot stop now. I am committed to working with my colleagues in the House, my counterparts in the Senate, and advocates in this community and around the country to pass this legislation which is long overdue.

HONORING GARY CASERI ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor Stanislaus County Agricultural Commissioner and Sealer of Weights Gary Caseri on his retirement. He retired on March 2, 2013, after 37 years of valuable service to the agricultural and business community and five years as the Agricultural Commissioner and Sealer of Weights for Stanislaus County.

Mr. Caseri has been a committed member of the California Agricultural Commissioner and Sealers Association (CACASA) for over 12 years. He has enforced laws and regulations from a prospective of service and outreach to the agricultural and business communities.

Mr. Caseri provided equity in the marketplace through fair enforcement of weights and measures laws and regulations. He was instrumental in establishing the first grower-led spray safe workshop—an event designed to help pesticide applicators apply material in a safe manner.

Mr. Caseri served on the Agricultural Advisory Board providing valuable guidance on important issues that included the Agricultural and the draft Ground Water Export Ordinance. Through his leadership on the CACASA Seed, Apiary and Nursery Committee, he facilitated the standardization of colony-strength inspection procedures used during the important almond pollination season.

Mr. Caseri served on the Shell Egg Advisory Committee and was successful in establishing a model pilot retail egg inspection program, which will be used throughout the State of California.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Stanislaus County Agricultural Commissioner and Sealer of Weights Gary Caseri on his retirement and in wishing him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE PEOPLE OF NAGORNO KARABAKH AND THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SUMGAI POGROMS

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the twenty-fifth anniversary of the pogroms against people of Armenian descent in Sumgait, Azerbaijan. This ungodly mas-

sacre in 1988 resulted in the murder of scores of Armenians. Tragically, women and girls were viciously raped and hundreds of Armenians were wounded. The chaos led to thousands of Armenian refugees who were left without homes or livelihoods. It was from the ashes of these terrible fires that arose the Nagorno Karabakh democracy movement that has, after many terrible years of Azerbaijani war, blockades, and aggression, resulted in hard-won freedom and democracy for the proud citizens of this ancient Christian land.

As we recognize this tragedy, it is also proper that we celebrate the courage of the people of Nagorno Karabakh as the first to rise up against the Soviet Union and to demand their right to freedom and self-governance. We celebrate the self-determination of the people of Nagorno Karabakh, their declaration of independence more than two decades ago, and their role in ending the Soviet threat to America. We should never forget the brave efforts of this small nation in sparking the democracy movement that ended decades of dictatorial rule in the USSR and eventually led to the fall of the Soviet Union.

Sadly, over the past quarter century, the Azerbaijani government has attacked the people of Karabakh with a clenched fist. Azerbaijan has consistently obstructed the peace process, walking away from its own agreements, and instead sought to incite hatred within its own population with anti-Armenian rhetoric and regular cross border attacks and threats of renewed war. Perhaps the most telling example was the President of Azerbaijan's decision to pardon, praise, and even promote Ramil Safarov, an Azerbaijani soldier who was sentenced to life in prison for the brutal murder of unarmed Armenian Army officer Gurgen Margaryan in Budapest in 2004.

Today, I ask my colleagues to stand with the proud people of Nagorno Karabakh because our two peoples share so many of the same foundational ideals including a commitment to the values of freedom, human rights, self-determination, and democracy.

CROWN CANDY KITCHEN

HON. WM. LACY CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 100th anniversary of the Crown Candy Kitchen restaurant in the great city of St. Louis. Since its founding in 1913, the Crown Candy Kitchen has become deeply intertwined into the community and continues to serve as an example of continued success in the Old North St. Louis neighborhood.

The story of the Crown Candy Kitchen is predominately an American story. The Crown Candy Kitchen was opened in 1913 by Harry Karandzieff and his best friend Pete Jugaloff. They were immigrants who brought their culinary skills from Greece, along with a dream of providing a friendly environment for diners to enjoy their unique dishes. During the early 50's Harry's son George took the business over and built the business into what it is today. Now George's three sons Andy, Tommy, and Mike run the business with a little help from the 4th generation.

Unique features of the Crown Candy Kitchen include homemade chocolate candy which

restaurant goers have enjoyed since the creation of the restaurant. Its decor is also unique. The restaurant has an old-fashioned decor with Coca-Cola memorabilia from the 1930s. Another impressive item within the restaurant includes the oldest operating soda fountain in the metro St. Louis area, and one of the oldest in the country.

A passerby may think the Crown Candy Kitchen's menu is simple. After a sampling of the menu they would quickly realize this "simple" menu is anything but. Its menu features sandwiches and is best known for its desserts, most especially for its malted milkshakes and homemade candy. Recently, the restaurant was featured on the Travel Channel's television series, *Man v. Food*. The show's host, Adam Richman, took on the Crown Candy Challenge, which is an attempt to drink five 24-ounce malts or shakes within 30 minutes. He was however, unsuccessful. In 2012, the restaurant was featured on another Adam Richman-hosted show, *Best Sandwich in America*, for its "Heart-Stopping BLT" sandwich. These accolades are a testament to the history and quality provided in the Crown Candy Kitchen.

Mr. Speaker, this remarkable accomplishment by the Crown Candy Kitchen is something that we can all take great pride in. It is a tribute to the people of St. Louis and the local community. It is a great honor to pay tribute to such an enduring and successful institution.

TRIBUTE TO FELIX GALLAGHER

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Felix Gallagher for being named a 2013 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, *Business Record*.

Since 2000, *Business Record* has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2013 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Felix Gallagher is the principal owner of his own company, PharmServ Solutions, which works to staff pharmacists in temporary and full-time positions in urban and rural communities. He arrived in the Des Moines area by way of a scholarship to play football at Drake University, where he captured three-time All-Conference and All-America honors and developed a strong desire to give back to his community for the help received along the way. In addition to owning his small business, Felix donates his time to mentoring high school youth from ethnically diverse backgrounds and passes on his skills and talents as a coach in a youth football league. He is also a past board member for the Alianza Business Association and is a current member

of the League of United Latin American Citizens of Iowa. In every facet of his life, Felix is an example of service and Iowa work ethic that our State can be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Felix in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mr. Gallagher for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great State of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Felix on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at *Business Record* for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

ADRIANA GONZALEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Adriana Gonzalez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Adriana Gonzalez is a 10th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Adriana Gonzalez 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 Adriana Gonzalez 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 of her future accomplishments.

AWARD THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO HUMANITARIAN AND SPORTING LEGEND MUHAMMAD ALI

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to reintroduce legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Muhammad Ali in recognition of his contributions to our nation. I believe it is long past time to recognize and honor an American civil rights activist and sporting legend with Congress' highest honor. Over the course of his illustrious career, Muhammad Ali has produced some of our nation's most lasting sports memories. From winning a Gold Medal at the 1960 Summer Olympics to lighting the Olympic torch at the 1996 Summer Olympics, his influence as an athlete and a humanitarian has spanned over fifty years.

Despite having been diagnosed with Parkinson's disease in the 1980s, Ali has devoted his life to charitable organizations. Ali and his wife, Lonnie, are founding directors of the Muhammad Ali Parkinson Center and Movement Disorders Clinic in Phoenix, AZ and have

helped raise over \$50 million for Parkinson's research. In addition to helping families cope with illness, Ali has led efforts to provide meals for the hungry and has helped countless organizations such as the Make-A-Wish Foundation and the Special Olympics.

Muhammad Ali's humanitarian efforts go beyond his charitable activities in the United States. In 1990 Muhammad Ali travelled to the Middle East to seek the release of American and British hostages that were being held as human shields in the first Gulf War. After his intervention, 15 hostages were freed. Thanks to his devotion to diplomatic causes and racial harmony, Ali is the recipient of many accolades, including being chosen as a "U.N. Messenger of Peace" in 1998 and receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 2005.

Through his unyielding dedication to his sport and to struggling populations around the world, Muhammad Ali serves as an example of service and self-sacrifice for generations of Americans. The Congressional Gold Medal is a fitting commemoration of his life and work, for which he is deservedly known as "the Greatest."

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing one of our nation's most lasting and influential figures by signing on to this important legislation.

HONORING KARL SHARP

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a constituent and friend, Karl Sharp of Centerville, Indiana.

Karl was actively involved in Wayne County political life, serving as an election official in Hagerstown and later in numerous posts in the City of Richmond, including as a member of the Richmond City Council from 1999 to 2007. A life-long Republican, Karl also served as Chairman of the Wayne County Republicans from 1989 to 1993 and as a delegate to the 1992 Republican National Convention.

Outside of politics, Karl was a man of faith and forty-year active member of the Central United Methodist Church of Richmond. In addition, Karl was a leader in the Wayne County Chamber of Commerce, the Yokefellows at Earlham College, and the local United Way Board.

Karl and his family's dedication to the people of Indiana will be forever appreciated. I will forever appreciate his friendship and ask the citizens of the 6th Congressional District to join me in keeping Karl's wife, Marjorie, children, Terry, Gail, and Karen, and the entire extended Sharp family in your thoughts and prayers.

GLENDALE SWIM TEAM, MISSOURI STATE HIGH SCHOOL SWIMMING CHAMPIONS

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Glendale Girls Swim Team for

winning the Missouri State High School Swimming Championship.

The team included sisters Nikki and Kaylee Sisson, Madeline Nelson, Lauren Beatty, Emma Chadwell, Tori Harmon, Hannah Leif, and Macie Beairsto. It was through their hard work and dedication that they took overall first place with a score of 190, beating the runner-up by nearly 40 points.

I would also like to commend Nikki Sisson on winning the 50-yard freestyle, as well as the 200 and 400-yard freestyle relay teams for also taking first place.

Head Coach Steve Boyce and Assistant Coach Robert Muench should also be proud of their accomplishments in guiding this group of talented athletes. I commend them all on a job well done. The Springfield community is justifiably proud of the extraordinary accomplishments of these young ladies. This is the first swim team from Southwest Missouri to win the championship.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Glendale High School State Champion Girls Swim Team.

ALINA TRUJILLO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alina Trujillo for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Alina Trujillo is an 11th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alina Trujillo 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 Alina Trujillo 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 of her future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO ANGELA DETHLEFS-TRETTIN

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Angela Dethlefs-Trettin for being named a 2013 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction,

which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2013 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Angela Dethlefs-Trettin has been an active member of the philanthropic community in Iowa and across the country for nearly her entire life. Originally from Waterloo, she first served on the foundation board Teen Trust as a high school student. She went on to work at the Community Foundation of Northeast Iowa and helped to establish community foundations in many of the rural communities in that part of the state, working with local citizens to capture charitable dollars that will positively impact important community projects for generations to come. Her passion led her to the Iowa Council of Foundations, where she worked with grantmakers across our great state, and ultimately to her new role as Director of Community Investment and Initiatives at the Community Foundation of Greater Des Moines. Angela continues to volunteer her time for various philanthropic initiatives throughout her community and was recently named to the National Standards Board for U.S. Community Foundations. Outside of her personal and professional philanthropy efforts, Angela's focus is on her husband, Matt, and her son, Henry. In every facet of her life, Angela is an example of service and Iowa work ethic that our state can be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Angela in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mrs. Dethlefs-Trettin for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Angela on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF MEL PARIS

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of Mel Paris, an American veteran from Illinois, who recently passed away on March 3rd, 2013. Mel was best known as a dedicated community leader, as well as an ardent public servant, and his loss is felt throughout the community.

Mel was truly a friend and advocate of working men and women across our state, along with those less fortunate. He held several positions throughout his career with the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), including President of his local union. Mel also served as a Winnebago County Board member, where he tirelessly worked for the betterment of his community.

Even after his retirement, he continued a life of service to others. Mel was elected as President of the UAW Rockford Area Building association where he continued to serve the members of the UAW, until his untimely passing. Mel touched everyone he met, and was some-

one whom you could always turn to with your personal or professional problems.

Mr. Speaker, I am forever grateful for Mel's contributions as a serviceman and leader in his community, and am deeply saddened by his passing. I offer my sincerest thoughts and prayers to his wife Charlotte, the rest of the Paris family, and the entire Rockford community.

HONORING BRIGADIER GENERAL EARL C. ACUFF USA (RET.) THE FORMER COMMANDANT OF THE VIRGINIA TECH CORPS OF CADETS

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Brigadier General Earl C. Acuff, USA (Ret.), the Commandant of the Virginia Tech Corps of Cadets from 1973 to 1980, who passed away on February 13, 2013. A native of Iowa, Earl Acuff learned to box as a young boy and became a Golden Gloves champion while in high school; he earned a full football scholarship to the University of Idaho, where he met his wife, Mary-Low, and enlisted in ROTC. After the attack on Pearl Harbor, Earl Acuff was shipped to the Aleutian Islands in Alaska, where he served as the executive officer to the 1st Intelligence Combat Platoon. He provided strong leadership as the unique unit scouted Japanese forces in the Aleutian Islands without resupply or personal contact with the outside world; after the war, the unit mapped the entire western coastline of Alaska.

Earl Acuff briefly left the military, working as a bush pilot, a big game guide, and a high school teacher in Anchorage before he was asked to rejoin the United States Army to teach Arctic survival skills. General Acuff went on to serve as commander of the 1st Battalion, 17th Infantry, 7th Infantry Division, and led the fight to defend Hills 255 and 266 during the Korean War. His extraordinary valor resulted in his being awarded a Purple Heart, second Combat Infantryman Badge, a Silver Star with Oak Leaf Cluster, and a Bronze Star with four Oak Leaf Clusters and V for Valor. He was a Master Parachutist who provided important insight as the United States Army reevaluated its Ranger training program; in 1965 he became the oldest man to successfully graduate as a United States Army Ranger at the age of 47.

Earl Acuff then earned a master's degree from George Washington University and worked for the United States Department of State before rejoining the battlefield as commander of the 3rd Brigade, 1st Infantry Division Republic of Vietnam, where he earned his third Combat Infantryman Badge. In 1969 Earl Acuff became the Deputy Post Commander at the U.S. Army Infantry School.

One year later, he joined the faculty at Virginia Tech as a military science instructor. In 1974 Earl Acuff was promoted to Brigadier General and became the commandant of the Virginia Tech Corps of Cadets, where he continued the proud tradition of training young men and women to become the nation's military leaders.

Earl Acuff also began a competitive career in racquetball, earning 20 gold medals at major national and international tournaments and induction into several halls of fame.

Brigadier General Acuff was predeceased by his wife, Mary-Low, and son, William, and will be fondly remembered and greatly missed by his children, Thomas, Dan, Ardis, Rodney, Janice, Teresa, and Dawn, and their families; and numerous other family members, friends, and admirers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering Brigadier General Acuff and his dedicated service to the nation.

CELEBRATING THE BICENTENNIAL
OF THE TOWNSHIP OF BLOOMFIELD

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Township of Bloomfield, located in Essex County, New Jersey, which is celebrating its Bicentennial Anniversary.

Bloomfield has a rich history that dates back to pre-revolutionary days. The land that would become Bloomfield was bought by English settlers from the Yantecaw Indians, a tribe of the Lenni Lenape, in the 1600s. In 1812, the town which was part of Newark, broke off and was incorporated as the Township of Bloomfield, taking its name from the historic Presbyterian parish in town named for Joseph Bloomfield. At that time it covered a vast 20.52 square miles, though many of the outlying towns soon would become their own municipalities. That same year, a Justice of the Peace and four constables were elected, as well as a Township Committee formed. By 1816, Bloomfield had opened a post office. In the following years the township government became further formalized.

As Bloomfield developed, so did its system of education; a characteristic that it takes great pride in today. The first school was set up in 1758, and more followed. In addition to this, by 1810, a notable private school named Bloomfield Academy was established. Later, in 1868, the building was taken over by the German Theological School of Newark, the forerunner of Bloomfield College. A special school law was passed for the Township of Bloomfield in 1849, establishing the public school system. Though rejected by social circles for its "proletarian atmosphere" at first, the school system grew in popularity and educational facilities. Today it comprises 11 schools, including Bloomfield High School, with over 6,000 students.

A very important facet of Bloomfield's history is the congregation of Old First Church. Formed in 1796, it was named to honor the Revolutionary War general Joseph Bloomfield. This building is still standing, now called the Bloomfield Presbyterian Church on the Green, and was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1978. Another aspect of Bloomfield's history is the first newspaper, the Bloomfield Gazette, published in 1872. Later, in 1883, this became the Independent Press, which is still published in Bloomfield to this day.

By the 19th Century, many changes had taken place. The Newark and Pompton Turn-

pike (now Bloomfield Ave), allowed Bloomfield to become a commercial center, housing many industrious mills and factories. Additionally, with the opening of the Morris Canal in 1831, commerce increased and provided recreation for the inhabitants. By the end of the century, many other amenities had reached Bloomfield; a railroad, streetcars, banks, telephone service, mail service, and lastly, electricity and sewage lines.

The industrious town of Bloomfield played a part in American history, most notably during the Civil War, as well as World War I and II, providing many vital materials and aid. Set up in 1830, the Oakes Mills provided the town with yarn and cloth, but after being rebuilt due to a fire, the mill then specialized in flannels. During a period of financial crisis, the people of Bloomfield kept the Mill alive, and in turn, the Oakes Mills again flourished, producing tweeds and wools. During the Civil War, Oakes Mills provided a great deal of the indigo blue cloth for the Union uniforms. Later, they provided most of the material used in making fire and police uniforms. In addition to the contributions of the Oakes Mills, during the World Wars, the Township of Bloomfield held many drives to collect essential materials needed by the troops, such as metals, bandage linens, and other commodities. Despite its closure in 1945, the Oakes Mills remain an important facet of Bloomfield's history.

Today, Bloomfield boasts a rich history, alongside its diverse population and culture. Its close-knit community atmosphere is a defining feature of the town, as has been maintained since the early years. Bloomfield is home to a middle and working class population, and also boasts many organizations, such as those in the cultural arts, and civic and neighborhood associations, with which many residents are involved. The Township of Bloomfield is proud to celebrate its history and looks forward to its future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Township of Bloomfield and its residents as they celebrate their Bicentennial Anniversary.

ALYSIA MORA-PINA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alysia Mora-Pina for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Alysia Mora-Pina is a 12th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alysia Mora-Pina 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 Alysia Mora-Pina 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 of her future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO LORI GELHAAR

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Lori Gelhaar for being named a 2013 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2013 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Lori Gelhaar serves as Kaplan University's Director of Career Services and Corporate Relations, where she manages all aspects of the Career Services department after redeveloping the entire department from scratch. Under her tenure, Kaplan University has seen career placement for graduates spike to an average of 94% as she coordinates and markets all employer relations events. Her work at Kaplan University has earned herself, her college, and her department numerous awards at the state and national levels. Outside of work, Lori is the chair of the Employers' Council of Iowa, on the board of directors for the Urbandale Chamber of Commerce, and founded Keeping Educated Youth in Des Moines. Lori has been married to her husband Gerry since 2003, and together they have three children: Tyler, Devin, and Madison. In every facet of her life, Lori is an example of service and Iowa work ethic that our state can be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Lori in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mrs. Gelhaar for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Lori on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

HONORING JAMES H.
DRUMWRIGHT, JR.

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a very special World War II veteran, Mr. James H. Drumwright, Jr. of Richardson, Texas. Recently, Mr. Drumwright, along with three other North Texas veterans, received France's highest distinction, the Legion of Honor, for their extraordinary service on the French battlefield. During the ceremony, Frederic Bontems, consul general of France in Houston, pinned the Knight in the French Order of Legion of Honor on these four

men for their notable actions to combat tyranny across the globe.

Mr. Drumwright, born and raised in Norfolk, Virginia, made the courageous decision to serve his country at the early age of 17. In 1939, he volunteered into the National Guard, and in February 1941 he joined the 29th Signal Company of the Army's 29th Infantry Division. With his companions and approximately 160,000 other Allied forces, he stormed the beaches of Normandy, France on D-day. At Omaha Beach, Drumwright courageously fought to liberate St. Lo, a key city to opening the Falaise Gap, which allowed the Allied forces to expel the Nazi Germans from northern France. Early in the invasion, Drumwright was injured and evacuated to England for treatment, but only a short five months later, he was back in the thick of battle with the 29th company.

At the end of World War II, he returned to Norfolk, Virginia where he received his graduate degree in Architecture in 1949. Throughout his studies, he remained in the Army Reserve until 1953 when he was called back into active duty during the Korean War. After retiring from the military, Mr. Drumwright began the next phase of his life working at DuPont, one of the largest chemical companies in the world. At Dupont, he met his wife, Amy Wright, and they now have two children, James and Kelley. Throughout recent years, Mr. Drumwright has remained active in various organizations recognizing veterans, such as Veterans of Foreign Wars and Boy Scout Troops of America, and has enjoyed traveling with his wife all across the globe.

Mr. Drumwright served our country with distinction, and I thank him for his sacrifice. Our country is blessed to have men like Mr. Drumwright who put their lives on the line to protect our freedoms and democracy across the world. His courage is a testament to the American spirit: a spirit of bravery, selflessness, and commitment to freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing an American patriot, Mr. James H. Drumwright, Jr. We honor your achievements and sincerely thank you for your service. God Bless you and God Bless America.

RECOGNIZING PRESTON "PRES"
HENNE

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and accomplishments of Preston "Pres" Henne, who will culminate a truly outstanding 44-year career in the aerospace industry when he retires from Gulfstream Aerospace on March 31, 2013 as senior vice president for Programs, Engineering and Test.

During Pres' 19 years with Gulfstream, he was responsible for leading the teams which designed, developed, tested and certified the Gulfstream V and G550 aircraft, which earned the Robert J. Collier trophies from the National Aeronautics Association in 1997 and 2003, respectively. The trophy is awarded annually for the greatest achievement in aeronautics and astronautics in North America.

Under Pres' direction, Gulfstream developed and certified six new aircraft—the G650,

G550, GV, G450, G280 and G150. In conjunction with these new products, Pres was also responsible for launching a number of industry-leading product enhancements, including the Gulfstream Enhanced Vision System and Synthetic Vision-Primary Flight Display.

Most recently, Pres oversaw the development of the company's much-anticipated G650, one of the world's most sophisticated business-jet aircraft. The G650, which entered service in 2012, was designed with technological advances such as a digital fly-by-wire system, triplex flight management systems, auto emergency descent and enhanced and synthetic vision systems. Pres also supervised the design and development of the G280, an aircraft that has been noted for its best-in-class performance, cabin comfort and technology.

Pres was also instrumental in the establishment of a strong engineering organization and a Research and Development Center campus with four office buildings and a state of the art laboratory building. All of which reflected Pres' extraordinary vision for the future of Gulfstream's product development.

Pres earned a bachelor's degree in aeronautical and astronautical engineering with highest undergraduate honors from the University of Illinois in 1969 and a master's degree in engineering from California State University at Long Beach in 1974.

Pres is a Fellow of the American Institute for Aeronautics and Astronautics (AIAA), a Fellow of the Royal Aeronautical Society and a member of the National Academy of Engineering. His awards include the AIAA 1996 Engineer of the Year Award, the AIAA 2001 Hap Arnold Award for Excellence in Aeronautical Program Management, the 2005 University of Illinois Alumni Award for Distinguished Service, a 2012 Living Legend of Aviation Award from the Kiddie Hawk Air Academy, the AIAA 2012 Reed Aeronautics Award and a 2012 Aviation Week Laureate Award.

SUPPORT OF TIFA WITH TAIWAN

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to endorse the resumption of Trade Investment Framework Agreement (TIFA) negotiations between the United States and the Republic of China (Taiwan). After five years of inaction, I was pleased to see these important talks get underway once again.

I believe that much progress was made during the previous rounds of TIFA talks and that improvements were made in intellectual property protection in particular. Furthermore, I am aware that many other challenges, including the need for even stronger intellectual property protection safeguards and market access for many American products, need to be resolved.

I have had the pleasure of meeting with many officials of the Taiwanese government, and I am pleased to hear of their willingness to come forward and resume talks to improve our mutual trading relationship. Many of these trading differences can be best resolved through the resumption of active bilateral negotiations.

Taiwan currently serves as our 10th largest goods trading partner, and has been a long-

standing political ally and partner to the United States. Bilateral goods and services trade totaled \$85 billion in 2011. Increased economic relations between the United States and Taiwan will provide significant economic advantages to both countries.

I am proud to express my strong support for strengthening the bilateral relationship between the United States and Taiwan. Taiwan is an important ally and trading partner, and we must continue to further our relationship.

ALLY BUCKNER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ally Buckner for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Ally Buckner is a 7th grader at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Ally Buckner 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 Ally Buckner 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 of her future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO NIKKI SYVERSON

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Nikki Syverson for being named a 2013 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2013 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Nikki Syverson is the Event Director at the Des Moines Wine Festival Foundation where she has helped grow the event from three days to eight days and add monthly wine tastings. The extended festival format was such a success in the previous year that event organizers are doubling down on their efforts this year. Nikki volunteers her exemplary event planning skills by planning ChildServe's Bubble Ball Gala and the Des Moines Community Playhouse's Hollywood Halloween

fundraising event. Mrs. Syverson is a Drake University alumnus where she met her husband, Jay, with whom she is expecting her second child. In every facet of her life, Nikki is an example of service and Iowa work ethic that our state can be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Nikki in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mrs. Syverson for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Nikki on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

THE 38TH ANNUAL LABOR AND COMMUNITY AWARDS RECEPTION

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to congratulate several of Northwest Indiana's most devoted and proficient workers. The Northwest Indiana Federation of Labor, American Federation of Labor—Congress of Industrial Organizations, recognized several individuals for their dedication during the 38th Annual Labor and Community Awards Reception, which was held at Duneland Falls Banquet and Meeting Center in Chesterton, Indiana on Thursday, March 7, 2013. These individuals, in addition to the other Northwest Indiana Federation of Labor members who have served Northwest Indiana so diligently for such a long period of time, are the epitome of the ideal American worker: loyal, dedicated, and hardworking.

At this year's event, several individuals and organizations received special recognition. Thomas Conway Sr., United Steelworkers International Vice President, Administration, received the Service to Labor Award for assisting organized labor to improve the quality of life of workers throughout Northwest Indiana.

The Union Label Award was presented posthumously to William Cantrell and Steven Skvara, retired members of United Steelworkers and Steelworkers Organization of Active Retirees (SOAR), for their unselfish devotion to the Labor Movement through its promotion in all areas of endeavor: social, civic, education, and political.

Michael Flores, of Teamsters Local 142, and Eric Jania, of Carpenters Local 272, received the George Meany Award for their significant contributions to the youth of their communities through their involvement with the Boy Scouts of America.

Brenda Bowler, of United Steelworkers Local 6787, was honored with the Community Services Award for her exemplary service to her community and to the enhancement of the quality of life for the people of Northwest Indiana.

Ray Jackson, Treasurer, United Steelworkers Local 6787, is this year's recipient of the President's Award. Mr. Jackson was honored for enhancing the well-being of workers throughout Northwest Indiana through countless contributions to further the philosophy of the Labor Movement.

The Industrial Sector Award was presented to Michael Young, Vice President, United Steelworkers Local 6103, for his leadership and support of working families throughout Northwest Indiana.

Thomas Williamson, Business Agent, Ironworkers Local 395, was the recipient of the Building Trades Award, which was bestowed upon him for his many years of service to the Labor Movement and his outstanding dedication to his fellow union members.

David Sikes, Director of Allocations/AFL-CIO Community Services Liaison for the Lake Area United Way, was honored with the Lifetime Achievement Award for his many years of Labor activism and his commitment to his community. For the exceptional service he has provided to the people of Northwest Indiana, he is worthy of our admiration and respect.

Northwest Indiana has a rich history of excellence in its craftsmanship and loyalty by its tradesmen. These individuals are all outstanding examples of these qualities. They have demonstrated their loyalty to both the union and the community through their hard work and self-sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating these dedicated, honorable, and exemplary citizens, as well as all of the hardworking union men and women throughout America. They have shown commitment and courage toward their pursuits, and I am proud to represent them in Washington, D.C.

COMMEMORATING THE CENTENNIAL OF ELLA HAVER

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the centennial of Miss Ella Haver, a lifelong resident of Franklin Township in Hunterdon County.

Ella Haver, whose 100th birthday was on February 21, has been rightfully recognized many times for her contributions to the local community as educator and civic leader.

Miss Haver's public service includes a long tenure as a schoolteacher and as a community volunteer. Ella Haver began her teaching career in 1935 in a one-room schoolhouse in Hamden, Clinton Township. She then taught in North Branch, Green Brook and North Plainfield. She was a science teacher at Cranford High School from 1945 to 1965, and finished her career with five years at Warren Hills Regional High School.

Ella Haver has also served for many decades as a Sunday school teacher at Clinton United Methodist Church and as a volunteer income-tax preparer.

She also volunteered as Franklin Township's senior citizen coordinator and today remains the active president of the Jennie M. Haver Scholarship Fund. The fund, named in memory of Ella's aunt, has given more than \$1.4 million in scholarships to nearly 500 Hunterdon students since 1956.

To commemorate the 100th birthday of Miss Ella Haver, her family's historical artifacts spanning more than 200 years were recently on display at the North County Branch Library in a rare exhibit of the Haver family's rich and distinguished history in Hunterdon County.

A 100th Birthday Gala is planned for Friday evening, March 15, at the Hunterdon Hills Playhouse. I am proud to be among those joining Miss Ella Haver in celebration of her many years of public service and accomplishments. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in wishing Ella Haver a happy birthday.

CONGRATULATING POLICE CHIEF ROLANDO BANASCO, RECIPIENT OF THE 2013 GRADUATE RECOGNITION OF EXCELLENCE, ACHIEVEMENT AND TALENT AWARD

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize Police Chief Rolando Banasco of Mascotte, Florida for being one of six recipients to receive the 2013 Graduate Recognition for Excellence, Achievement and Talent (GREAT) Award. This annual award is presented to successful and hardworking college graduates who have each overcome many obstacles while achieving their educational goals.

Chief Banasco has been a dedicated servant to our community throughout his 20 year law enforcement career. After receiving his Master of Arts in Criminal Justice from Keiser University, he was able to advance his career and was promoted to Chief of Police for the City of Mascotte, Florida, in December of 2011. He is the first Hispanic-Latino to serve as Police Chief in Lake County Florida. Due to the flexible nature of education provided by Keiser University, he intends to continue his education by pursuing a Doctorate in Business Administration.

On behalf of the citizens of Central Florida, I congratulate and applaud Police Chief Banasco for his diligence, commitment and leadership to his community and for his educational achievements. He is highly deserving of the 2013 GREAT Award. I wish him much success as he continues his studies, and may his investment in hard work and perseverance inspire others to follow in his footsteps.

AARON CISNEROS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Aaron Cisneros for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Aaron Cisneros is a 12th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Aaron Cisneros 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 Aaron Cisneros 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 of his future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO HANNAH INMAN

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Hannah Inman for being named a 2013 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, *Business Record*.

Since 2000, *Business Record* has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2013 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Hannah Inman serves as the Director of Communications for the Iowa Natural Heritage Foundation and is also the co-owner of two businesses—Maverly Lands, an agribusiness, and KDC Built, a home-building operation she owns with her husband of ten years, Mike. KDC Built was launched amid the fiscal crisis and has not only survived, but thrived as the business donates the proceeds from one house to charity. When Hannah is not juggling the responsibilities of her two businesses or the communications efforts for the largest conservation bond issue in Iowa, she also serves as a member of the Broadlawns Advocate Circle marketing committee, an executive committee member of the Greater Des Moines Leadership Institute class of 2011, and is a mother to her and Mike's two young children, six-year-old Maverick and Everly, who will turn two later this year. In every facet of her life, Hannah is an example of service and Iowa work ethic that our state can be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Hannah in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mrs. Inman for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Hannah on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at *Business Record* for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

CELEBRATING THE 34TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the 34th anniversary

of the enactment of the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA). Having served in this body during the passage of this historic legislation, I am happy to note the success that the Act has achieved.

When Congress debated the Act, it sought to protect the freedom and integrity of the people of Taiwan at a time when the island's future was uncertain. The TRA's success in helping to provide the climate for Taiwan's remarkable economic growth and its model democracy has proven beyond all doubt the merit of this particular agreement.

Today, Taiwan's people have one of the best health care systems in the world, which I believe we would be well-served to emulate. Its people enjoy a true democracy with all the benefits of a free people. Its economy is the envy of many nations around the world.

The Taiwan Relations Act continues to play an important role in maintaining peace in an important region of the world and I am certain that it will continue to do so for many years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE EXTRAORDINARY ACHIEVEMENT OF LAUREN ROJAS

HON. JERRY MCNERNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lauren Rojas, a seventh-grade student from Antioch, California, whose exceptional science experiment earned first place at the Association of Christian Schools International science fair for the Northern California region and gained the attention of the world.

Lauren launched a weather balloon 18 miles above Earth to gather atmospheric data from the troposphere. Her experiment on the air we breathe represents the benefits of science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) education in our nation. She is a bright, dedicated young woman who is passionate about learning.

Unfortunately, less than 25 percent of all STEM jobs are held by women. We must prioritize investments in STEM education to facilitate more opportunities for women to close this gap. Lauren Rojas and her science experiment are an example of what can be accomplished if we commit to this goal.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Lauren Rojas, her scientific achievement, and the upcoming generation of women scientists, engineers, and mathematicians.

DALE RUSSELL, MISSOURI SPORTS HALL OF FAME

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dale Russell on his induction into the Missouri Sports Hall of Fame.

Dale has seen success throughout his career, both on and off the basketball court. As a senior at Branson High School, he led the Pirate basketball team to a perfect 41–0 record, capped off by the 1955 Class B State

Championship. He was named the tournament's Most Valuable Player.

As a senior at Southwest Missouri State University, Dale and his teammates finished second in the National Division II Basketball Championship.

Dale went on to coach basketball for 24 years in Southwest Missouri, including his last 13 at Branson High. In addition to impacting our district's young people on the court, he taught science, health, and physical education classes.

The City of Branson, Branson High School, and the 7th District should be very proud of Dale's accomplishments. He truly represents us all in a positive manner.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dale, a phenomenal athlete, teacher, and coach on his impressive accomplishments.

ADRIAN MALFABON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Adrian Malfabon for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Adrian Malfabon is a 12th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Adrian Malfabon 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 Adrian Malfabon 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 of his future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO AIMEE STAUDT

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Aimee Staudt for being named a 2013 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, *Business Record*.

Since 2000, *Business Record* has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2013 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Aimee Staudt is the Director of Development for Knapp Properties, Inc. where she

oversees all of the company's real estate development and construction activities. Mrs. Staudt's portfolio includes more than 5,000 acres of development ground that involves more than \$11 million in infrastructure, \$20 million in new construction, and \$16 million in tenant improvements. Aimee is also heavily involved in her community, where she has been on the Ankeny Plan and Zoning Commission, a previous president and vice president of the Home Builder's Association of Greater Des Moines' developers' council, a current board member and youth mentor of the ACE Mentor Program, and a court-appointed special advocate for children in need of assistance. Aimee resides in Ankeny with her husband Ryan and their three children. In every facet of her life, Aimee is an example of service and Iowa work ethic that our state can be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Aimee in the United States Congress and it with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mrs. Staudt for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Aimee on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

A BILL TO AMEND THE SIKES ACT TO PROMOTE THE USE OF COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS UNDER SUCH ACT FOR LAND MANAGEMENT RELATED TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE READINESS ACTIVITIES AND TO AMEND TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO FACILITATE INTERAGENCY COOPERATION IN CONSERVATION PROGRAMS TO AVOID OR REDUCE ADVERSE IMPACTS ON MILITARY READINESS ACTIVITIES

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to amend the Sikes Act to promote the use of cooperative agreements for land management related to the Department of Defense (DoD) readiness activities and to facilitate interagency cooperation in conservation programs to avoid or reduce adverse impacts on military readiness activities. The bill provides common sense reforms to the Sikes Act and DoD Readiness Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI). These reforms afford both programs with greater flexibility to leverage cooperative agreements and other federal funds to meet program requirements.

In particular, section 1 of the bill would provide additional enhancements to the authorities provided to DoD under the Sikes Act and parallels a similar amendment made in the FY 2012 National Defense Authorization Act to the REPI program. Specifically, the provision would authorize DoD, pursuant to a cooperative agreement under the Sikes Act, to provide funds for the long term maintenance and improvement of natural resources on non-DoD lands without first having to protect such lands through acquisition of easements. This will

greatly enhance the ability of DoD to take action to relieve or eliminate current or anticipated challenges that could restrict, impede, or otherwise interfere with, whether directly or indirectly, current or anticipated military activities. For example, this provision would help DoD meet its obligations under the Endangered Species Act and other applicable statutory and regulatory requirements through actions on non-DoD lands pursuant to a cooperative agreement with a state or local agency or a private landowner. This authority would help avoid or reduce the need to restrict training and testing activities on DoD lands.

Section 2 of the bill would help DoD better protect military installations and ranges from encroachment under REPI and the Sikes Act by enhancing cooperation with the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior. Sustainability and the long-term viability of many DoD installations and ranges continue to be threatened by incompatible development and loss of habitat in areas in the vicinity of, or ecologically related to, those installations and ranges. Current law allows funds from non-DoD federal programs to be used by REPI partners as contributions under a REPI agreement. Greater partnership and cooperation is enhanced under this provision by allowing funds provided by the DoD to protect bases from encroachment to qualify as match or cost share in the conservation programs of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. For example, prior to the 2008 Farm Bill enactment, DoD, through the REPI program, was able to protect installations in Oklahoma, Kansas, and South Carolina from encroachment while at the same time assisting state and local governments and willing landowners in meeting the matching funds requirements of the Farm and Ranchland Protection Program (FRPP, now the Farmland Protection Program (FRP)). However, technical changes to this program in the 2008 Farm Bill had the unintended result of terminating the authority for DoD funds to be used as matching or cost-share requirements for that program. The provision reverses that unintended consequence and addresses the broader issue of allowing the DoD funds to be used as a match to other federal programs to help address encroachment issues at military installations. This provision is important to improving the readiness of our forces and ensuring their installations and ranges can be sustained.

Again, the bill is a common sense approach to better enabling DoD to meet its conservation goals and requirements while protecting its ability to meet readiness requirements. In a time of fiscal austerity, it is important for Congress to provide the Administration with the tools and authorities to be flexible and adaptable to challenges with innovative thinking and minimal investment. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

WILDLIFE SERVICES INVESTIGATION REQUEST AND AGENCY RESPONSE

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on November 30, 2012 I sent a letter to the U.S. Secretary

of Agriculture Thomas Vilsack, requesting an investigation into Wildlife Services and the conduct of its employees. Mr. Vilsack responded to my letter on February 1, 2013 and my office received this letter on February 13, 2013. I intend to monitor this situation closely and look forward to seeing the results of the internal investigation that is currently taking place of WS employees and their compliance with state and federal anti-cruelty and animal protection laws.

NOVEMBER 30, 2012.

THOMAS VILSACK,
Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY VILSACK: We are writing to request a thorough audit of Wildlife Services, especially its lethal predator control program, by the USDA Office of Inspector General (OIG) regarding the culture within Wildlife Services.

As you know, recent news reports indicate that Jamie P. Olson, a Wildlife Services employee working in Wyoming, may have apparently committed acts of animal cruelty that appear to violate Wildlife Services' Directives and Wyoming state law. If it is found that Mr. Olson committed these acts, it would bring disrepute to the Wildlife Services' program and the federal government at a time when Wildlife Services, and in particular its lethal control of predators to protect livestock, labors under heavy criticism for unnecessarily killing wild animals and lacking transparency and accountability. We urge you to be thorough in your investigation because these alleged acts clearly violate standards of human decency.

However, we are gravely concerned that photographs, published on Mr. Olson's Facebook in an album labeled "work" and since removed, do not represent an isolated occurrence, but may reflect a deep-rooted problem within the Wildlife Services program that allows for, and encourages, inhumane lethal methods of predator control. According to a recent Sacramento Bee article, Gary Strader, a former Wildlife Services trapper in Nevada, "was not surprised to learn about the controversial photos. 'That is very common,' Strader wrote in an email." (Toni Knudson, U.S. wildlife worker's online photos of animal abuse stir outrage. Sacramento Bee, Friday, November 2, 2012).

We look forward to seeing the results of your investigation, and thank you for your attention in this important matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN CAMPBELL,
Member of Congress.
PETER DeFAZIO,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, DC, Feb. 1, 2013.

Hon. PETER DeFAZIO,
U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DeFAZIO: Thank you for your letter of November 30, 2012, regarding allegations of animal cruelty by an employee with the Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Wildlife Services (WS) program. I apologize for the delayed response.

I, and other USDA officials, take this matter very seriously. USDA does not condone any form of animal cruelty and holds all employees responsible for adhering to Departmental and Agency standards and directives. WS personnel are expected to use approved and humane methods to euthanize captured or restrained animals whenever practicable, and in accordance with American Veterinary Medical Association guidelines. WS employees are also required to comply at all times with applicable State and Federal laws.

At this time, the Administrative Investigations and Compliance Branch (AICB) of USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service is engaged in an ongoing investigation of this matter. In response to a previous request to initiate an investigation into these allegations, USDA's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) has deferred to AICB's

active investigation. However, OIG officials have requested that AICB report its findings to them once the investigation has been finalized. In the meantime, WS officials are also taking this opportunity to reaffirm to program staff their ethical obligation to uphold professional standards and their responsibilities to the American public.

I appreciate the opportunity to address your concerns. I assure you that USDA remains steadfast in its commitment to responsible oversight and stewardship with regard to the WS program. I am sending a similar letter to Congressman Campbell.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. VILSACK,
Secretary.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1671–S1716

Measures Introduced: Nineteen bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 523–541, and S. Res. 75. **Pages S1709–10**

Measures Reported:

S. 146, to enhance the safety of America's schools, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 374, to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1709**

Measures Considered:

Department of Defense, Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 933, making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013. **Pages S1683–S1703**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Thursday, March 14, 2013. **Page S1703**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, March 13, 2013. **Page S1716**

Appointments:

Senate National Security Working Group for the 113th Congress: The Chair announced, on behalf of the Republican Leader, pursuant to the provisions of S. Res. 64, adopted March 5, 2013, the appointment of the following Senators as members of the Senate National Security Working Group for the 113th Congress: Mitch McConnell of Kentucky

(serving in his capacity as Republican Leader), Marco Rubio of Florida (Republican Co-Chairman and designated as Administrative Co-Chairman), Thad Cochran of Mississippi (Republican Co-Chairman), Lindsey Graham of South Carolina (Republican Co-Chairman), Bob Corker of Tennessee, Jeff Sessions of Alabama, John McCain of Arizona, James Risch of Idaho, Roy Blunt of Missouri, James Inhofe of Oklahoma. **Pages S1715–16**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 on March 15, 1995; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–5) **Pages S1708–09**

Executive Communications: **Page S1709**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1710–11**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1711–14**

Additional Statements: **Page S1708**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S1714–15**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S1715**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1715**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:49 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, March 13, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1716.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 AND THE FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the U.S. Strategic Command and

U.S. Cyber Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from General C. R. Kehler, Commander, United States Strategic Command, and General Keith B. Alexander, Commander, United States Cyber Command, both of the Department of Defense.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Richard Cordray, of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, who was introduced by Senator Brown, and Mary Jo White, of New York, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, who was introduced by Senator Schumer, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OVERSIGHT

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Communications Commission, after receiving testimony from Julius Genachowski, Chairman, and Robert M. McDowell, Mignon L. Clyburn, Jessica Rosenworcel, and Ajit Pai, each a Commissioner, all of the Federal Communications Commission.

JOB CORPS BUDGET

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Employment and Workplace Safety concluded a hearing to examine Job Corps budget shortfall, focusing on safeguarding workforce train-

ing for America's disconnected youth, after receiving testimony from Jane Oates, Assistant Secretary for the Employment and Training Administration, and Elliot P. Lewis, Assistant Inspector General for Audit, Office of Inspector General, both of the Department of Labor; and Antoine L. Dixon, National Director, Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 374, to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

S. 146, to enhance the safety of America's schools, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

NATIONAL SECURITY THREATS TO THE UNITED STATES

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded a hearing to examine current and projected national security threats to the United States, after receiving testimony from James R. Clapper, Director of National Intelligence; Robert Mueller, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice; John Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency; Phillip Goldberg, Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of Intelligence and Research; Lieutenant General Michael T. Flynn, Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Department of Defense; and Mathew Olsen, Director of the National Counterterrorism Center.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 42 public bills, H.R. 1062–1103; and 6 resolutions, H.J. Res. 34; and H. Res. 106, 108–111, were introduced. **Pages H1355–57**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1359–60**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 803, to reform and strengthen the workforce investment system of the Nation to put Americans back to work and make the United States more competitive in the 21st century, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–14, Pt. 1) and

H. Res. 107, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 890) to prohibit waivers relating to compliance with the work requirements for the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–15). **Page H1355**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Walorski to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1333**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:18 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H1335**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:17 p.m. and reconvened at 5:01 p.m. **Page H1337**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Eliminate Privacy Notice Confusion Act: H.R. 749, to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual privacy notice requirement and **Pages H1337–39**

Requiring a study of voluntary community-based flood insurance options: H.R. 1035, to require a study of voluntary community-based flood insurance options and how such options could be incorporated into the national flood insurance program, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 397 yeas to 17 nays, Roll No. 63. **Pages H1339–41, H1341–42**

Recess: The House recessed at 5:21 p.m. and reconvened at 6:31 p.m. **Page H1341**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency declared with respect to Iran is to continue in effect beyond March 15, 2013—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 113–15). **Page H1337**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H1337.

Senate Referral: S. 166 was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. **Page H1354**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of today and appears on pages H1341–42. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a hearing on Securities Exchange Commission Oversight. Testimony was heard from Carl W. Hoecker, Inspector General, Securities Exchange Commission.

PRESERVING WORK REQUIREMENTS FOR WELFARE ACT OF 2013

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held hearing on H.R. 890, the “Preserving Work Requirements for Welfare Act of 2013”. The Committee, granted by record vote of 7–4, a closed rule for H.R. 890. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority mem-

ber of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print 113–3 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Camp and Representative Levin.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel, to hold hearings to examine sexual assaults in the military, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on the Budget: business meeting to consider the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014, 2 p.m., SD–608.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold closed hearings to examine strategic counterterrorism, focusing on meeting current and emerging challenges, 10 a.m., SVC–217.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the costs and impacts of crisis budgeting, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine fulfilling the promise of open government five years after the “OPEN Government Act”, 10:30 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: to hold hearings to examine Veterans’ Affairs (VA) claims process, focusing on a review of Veterans’ Affairs transformation efforts, 10 a.m., SR–418.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine Jamaican phone fraud targeting seniors, 2 p.m., SD–562.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry, hearing on National Forest Management and its Impacts on Rural Economies and Communities, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies, hearing on Water Infrastructure Financing Oversight, 9:30 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, hearing USDA Food and Nutrition Service Oversight, 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related

Agencies, hearing for Public and Outside Witnesses, 10 a.m., 2358—C Rayburn.

Committee on Appropriations, Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies, hearing on the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Oversight, 11 a.m., H-309 Capitol.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, hearing on Syria Oversight, 12 p.m., H-140 Capitol. This is a closed hearing.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, hearing on U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; and Hurricane Sandy Supplemental Implementation, 2:45 p.m., 2362—B Rayburn.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, hearing on oversight of the American Battle Monuments Commission; U.S. Court of Appeal for Veterans Claims; Armed Forces Retirement Home; and Army National Cemeteries Program, 2:45 p.m., H-309 Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing on the Impact of the Continuing Resolution, Sequestration, and Declining Operations and Maintenance Budgets on Military Personnel and Family Related Programs, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities, hearing entitled Information Technology and Cyber Operations, Modernization and Policy Issues to Support the Future Force, 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, markup on the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014, 10:30 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Keeping College Within Reach: Examining Opportunities to Strengthen Federal Student Loan Programs”, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “DOE Management and Oversight of Its Nuclear Weapons Complex: Lessons of the Y-12 Security Failure”, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Obamacare’s Impact on Jobs”, 10:15 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance, hearing entitled “Mortgage Insurance: Comparing Private Sector and Government-Subsidized Approaches”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, hearing entitled “The Rebalance to Asia:

Why South Asia Matters” (Part II), 11 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, hearing entitled “DHS Cybersecurity: Roles and Responsibilities to Protect the Nation’s Critical Infrastructure”, 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice, hearing entitled “Examination of Litigation Abuses”, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security and Investigations, hearing entitled “Investigating and Prosecuting 21st Century Cyber Threats”, 11:30 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, hearing entitled “Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency (FACT) Act of 2013”, 2:30 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing on the reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Addressing Transparency in the Federal Bureaucracy: Moving Toward A More Open Government”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 803, the “Supporting Knowledge and Investing in Lifelong Skills Act”, 3 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Research, hearing entitled “STEM Education: Industry and Philanthropic Initiatives”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled “Federal Financial Support for Energy Technologies: Assessing Costs and Benefits”, 3 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, hearing entitled “FBI Headquarters Consolidation”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Meeting Patient Care Needs: Measuring the Value of VA Physician Staffing Standards”, 10 a.m., 340 Cannon.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “Gulf War: What Kind of Care are Veterans Receiving 20 Years Later?”, 2:30 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Trade, hearing entitled “U.S.-India Trade Relations: Opportunities and Challenges”, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 13

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, March 13

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 933, Department of Defense, Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act.

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 890—Preserving Work Requirements for Welfare Programs Act of 2013 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue.

HOUSE

Andrews, Robert E., N.J., E268
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E277
Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E272
Carson, André, Ind., E271
Clay, Wm. Lacey, Mo., E270
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E276
Costa, Jim, Calif., E270
DeFazio, Peter A., Ore., E277

Denham, Jeff, Calif., E270
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E269, E273
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E267
Johnson, Sam, Tex., E273
Kingston, Jack, Ga., E274
Lance, Leonard, N.J., E275
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E267, E268, E269, E271, E272, E273, E274, E276, E276
Long, Billy, Mo., E271, E276
McNerney, Jerry, Calif., E276

Maffei, Daniel B., N.Y., E268, E270
Messer, Luke, Ind., E271
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E269
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E267, E268, E269, E269, E271, E272, E273, E274, E275, E276
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E267
Sessions, Pete, Tex., E274
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E275
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E275
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E272



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at www.fdsys.gov, 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. ¶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.